HISTORY
FOR READY REFERENCE

FROM THE BEST
HISTORIANS, BIOGRAPHERS, AND SPECIALISTS

THEIR OWN WORDS IN A COMPLETE

SYSTEM OF HISTORY

FOR ALL USES, EXTENDING TO ALL COUNTRIES AND SUBJECTS,
AND REPRESENTING FOR BOTH READERS AND STUDENTS THE BETTER AND
NEWER LITERATURE OF HISTORY IN THE
ENGLISH LANGUAGE

BY

J. N. LARNED

WITH NUMEROUS HISTORICAL MAPS FROM ORIGINAL STUDIES AND DRAWINGS BY

ALAN C. REILEY

IN FIVE VOLUMES

VOLUME IV—NICÆA TO TUNIS

SPRINGFIELD, MASS.
THE C. A. NICHOLS CO., PUBLISHERS
MDCCCXCV

COPYRIGHT, 1894.
BY J. N. LARNED.

The Riverside Press, Cambridge, Mass., U. S. A.
Printed by H. O. Houghton & Company.

LIST OF MAPS AND PLANS.

Two maps of Central Europe, at the abdication of Charles V. (1556), and showing the distribution of Religions about 1618, ... To follow page 2458
Map of Eastern Europe in 1768, and of Central Europe at the Peace of Campo Formio (1797), ... To follow page 2554
Map of the Roman Empire at its greatest extent, under Trajan (A. D. 116), . To follow page 2712
Map of Europe at the death of Justinian (A. D. 565), ... To follow page 2742
Two maps, of Eastern Europe and Central Europe, in 1715, ... To follow page 2762
Four development maps of Spain, 9th, 11th, 12th and 13th centuries, . . . To follow page 2976

LOGICAL OUTLINE, IN COLORS.

Roman history, ... To follow page 2656

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLES.

Ninth and Tenth Centuries, ... To follow page 2746

NICÆA OR NICE: The founding of the city.—Nicæa, or Nice, in Bithynia, was founded by Antigonus, one of the successors of Alexander the Great, and received originally the name Antigonea. Lysimachus changed the name to Nicæa, in honor of his wife.

Capture by the Goths. See GOTHS: A. D. 258–267.

A. D. 325.—The First Council.—"Constantine . . . determined to lay the question of Arianism [see ARIANISM] before an Œcumenical council. . . . The council met [A. D. 325] at Nicæa—the 'City of Victory'—in Bithynia, close to the Ascanian Lake, and about twenty miles from Nicomedia. . . . It was an Eastern council, and, like the Eastern councils, was held within a measurable distance from the seat of government. . . . Of the 318 bishops . . . who subscribed its decrees, only eight came from the West, and the language in which the Creed was composed was Greek, which scarcely admitted of a Latin rendering. The words of the Creed are even now recited by the Russian Emperor at his coronation. Its character, then, is strictly Oriental. . . . Of the 318 members of the Council, we are told by Philostorgius, the Arian historian, that 22 espoused the cause of Arius, though other writers regard the minority as still less, some fixing it at 17, others at 15, others as low as 13. But of those 318 the first place in rank, though not the first in mental power and energy of character, was accorded to the aged bishop of Alexandria. He was the representative of the most intellectual diocese in the Eastern Church. He alone, of all the bishops, was named 'Papa,' or 'Pope.' The 'Pope of Rome' was a phrase which had not yet emerged in history; but 'Pope of Alexandria' was a well-known title of dignity."—R. W. Bush, *St. Athanasius, ch.* 6.

ALSO IN: A. P. Stanley, *Lects. on the Hist. of the Eastern Church, lect.* 3–5.

A. D. 1080.—Acquired by the Turks.—The capital of the Sultan of Roum. See TURKS (THE SELJUK): A. D. 1073–1092.

A. D. 1096-1097.—Defeat and slaughter of the First Crusaders.—Recovery from the Turks. See CRUSADES: A. D. 1096–1099.

A. D. 1204-1261.—Capital of the Greek Empire. See GREEK EMPIRE OF NICÆA.

A. D. 1330.—Capture by the Ottoman Turks. See TURKS (OTTOMAN): A. D. 1326–1359.

A. D. 1402.—Sacked by Timour. See TIMOUR.

NICARAGUA: The Name.—Nicaragua was originally the name of a native chief who ruled in the region on the Lake when it was first penetrated by the Spaniards, under Gil Gonzalez, in 1522. "Upon the return of Gil Gonzalez, the name Nicaragua became famous, and besides being applied to the cacique and his town, was gradually given to the surrounding country, and to the lake."—H. H. Bancroft, *Hist. of the Pacific States, v.* 1, *p.* 489, *foot-note.*

A. D. 1502.—Coasted by Columbus. See AMERICA: A. D. 1498–1505.

A. D. 1821-1871.—Independence of Spain.—Brief annexation to Mexico.—Attempted federations and their failure. See CENTRAL AMERICA: A. D. 1821–1871.

A. D. 1850.—The Clayton-Bulwer Treaty.—Joint protectorate of the United States and Great Britain over the proposed inter-oceanic canal.—"The acquisition of California in May, 1848, by the treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo, and the vast rush of population, which followed almost immediately on the development of the gold mines, to that portion of the Pacific coast, made the opening of interoceanic communication a matter of paramount importance to the United States. In December, 1846, had been ratified a treaty with New Granada (which in 1862 assumed the name of Colombia) by which a right of transit over the isthmus of Panama was given to the United States, and the free transit over the isthmus 'from the one to the other sea' guaranteed by both of the contracting powers. Under the shelter of this treaty the Panama Railroad Company, composed of citizens of the United States, and supplied by capital from the United States, was organized in 1850 and put in operation in 1855. In 1849, before, therefore, this company had taken shape, the United States entered into a treaty with Nicaragua for the opening of a ship-canal from Greytown (San Juan), on the Atlantic coast, to the Pacific coast, by way of the Lake of Nicaragua. Greytown, however, was then virtually occupied by British settlers, mostly from Jamaica, and the whole eastern coast of Nicaragua, so far at least as the eastern terminus of such a canal was concerned, was held, so it was maintained by Great Britain, by the Mosquito Indians, over whom Great Britain claimed to exercise a protectorate. That the Mosquito Indians had no such settled territorial site; that, if they had, Great Britain had no such protectorate or sovereignty over them as authorized her to exercise dominion over their soil, even if they had any, are positions which . . . the United States has repeatedly affirmed. But the fact that the pretension was set up by Great Britain, and that, though it were baseless, any attempt to force a canal through the Mosquito country might precipitate a war, induced Mr. Clayton, Secretary of State in the administration of General Taylor, to ask through Sir H. L. Bulwer, British minister at Washington, the administration of Lord John Russell (Lord Palmerston being then foreign secretary) to withdraw the British pretensions to the coast so as to permit the construction of the canal under the joint auspices of the United States and of Nicaragua. This the British Government declined to do, but agreed to enter into a treaty for a joint protectorate over the proposed canal." This treaty, which was signed at Washington April 19, 1850, and of which the ratifications were exchanged on the 4th of July following, is commonly referred to as the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty. Its language in the first article is that "the Governments of the United States and of Great Britain hereby declare that neither the one nor the other will ever obtain or maintain for itself any exclusive control over the said ship-canal; agreeing that neither will ever erect or maintain any fortifications commanding the same, or in the vicinity thereof, or occupy, or fortify, or colonize, or assume or exercise any dominion over Nicaragua, Costa Rica, the Mosquito coast, or any part of Central America; nor will either make use of any protection which either affords, or may afford, or any alliance which either has or may have to or with any state or people, for the purpose of erecting or maintaining any such fortifications, or of occu-

pying, fortifying, or colonizing Nicaragua, Costa Rica, the Mosquito coast, or any part of Central America, or of assuming or exercising dominion over the same; nor will the United States or Great Britain take advantage of any intimacy, or use any alliance, connection, or influence that either may possess, with any State or Government through whose territory the said canal may pass, for the purpose of acquiring or holding, directly or indirectly, for the citizens or subjects of the one, any rights or advantages in regard to commerce or navigation through the said canal which shall not be offered on the same terms to the citizens or subjects of the other." Since the execution of this treaty there have been repeated controversies between the two governments respecting the interpretation of its principal clauses. Great Britain having maintained her dominion over the Belize, or British Honduras, it has been claimed by the United States that the treaty is void, or has become voidable at the option of the United States, on the grounds (in the language of a dispatch from Mr. Frelinghuysen, Secretary of State, dated July 19, 1884) "first, that the consideration of the treaty having failed, its object never having been accomplished, the United States did not receive that for which they covenanted; and, second, that Great Britain has persistently violated her agreement not to colonize the Central American coast." —F. Wharton, *Digest of the International Law of the U. S., ch.* 6, *sect.* 150*f.* (*v.* 2).

Also in: *Treaties and Conventions between the U. S. and other Powers* (*ed. of* 1889), *p.* 440.

A. D. 1855-1860.—The invasion of Walker and his Filibusters.—"Its geographical situation gave . . . importance to Nicaragua. It contains a great lake, which is approached from the Atlantic by the river San Juan; and from the west end of the lake there are only 20 miles to the coast of the Pacific. Ever since the time of Cortes there have been projects for connecting the two oceans through the lake of Nicaragua. . . . Hence Nicaragua has always been thought of great importance to the United States. The political struggles of the state, ever since the failure of the confederation, had sunk into a petty rivalry between the two towns of Leon and Granada. Leon enjoys the distinction of being the first important town in Central America to raise the cry of independence in 1815, and it had always maintained the liberal character which this disclosed. Castellon, the leader of the Radical party, of which Leon was the seat, called in to help him an American named William Walker. Walker, who was born in 1824, was a young roving American who had gone during the gold rush of 1850 to California, and become editor of a newspaper in San Francisco. In those days it was supposed in the United States that the time for engulfing the whole of Spanish America had come. Lopez had already made his descent on Cuba; and Walker, in July, 1853, had organized a band of filibusters for the conquest of Sonora, and the peninsula of California, which had been left to Mexico by the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. This wild expedition . . . was a total failure; but when Walker came back to his newspapers after an absence of seven months, he found himself a hero. His fame, as we see, had reached Central America; and he at once accepted Castellon's offer. In 1855, having collected a band of 70 adventurers in California, he landed in the country, captured the town of Granada, and, aided by the intrigues of the American consul, procured his own appointment as General-in-Chief of the Nicaraguan army. Walker was now master of the place: and his own provisional President, Rivas, having turned against him, he displaced him, and in 1856 became President himself. He remained master of Nicaragua for nearly two years, levying arbitrary customs on the traffic of the lake, and forming plans for a great military state to be erected on the ruins of Spanish America. One of Walker's first objects was to seize the famous gold-mines of Chontales, and the sudden discovery that the entire sierra of America is a gold-bearing region had a good deal to do with his extraordinary enterprise. Having assured himself of the wealth of the country, he now resolved to keep it for himself, and this proved in the end to be his ruin. The statesmen of the United States, who had at first supposed that he would cede them the territory, now withdrew their support from him: the people of the neighbouring states rose in arms against him, and Walker was obliged to capitulate, with the remains of his filibustering party, at Rivas in 1857. Walker, still claiming to be President of Nicaragua, went to New Orleans, where he collected a second band of filibusters, at the head of whom he again landed near the San Juan river towards the end of the year: this time he was arrested and sent back home by the American commodore. His third and last expedition, in 1860, was directed against Honduras, where he hoped to meet with a good reception at the hands of the Liberal party. Instead of this he fell into the hands of the soldiers of Guardiola, by whom he was tried as a pirate and shot, September 12, 1860."—E. J. Payne, *Hist. of European Colonies, ch.* 21, *sect.* 8.—"Though he never evinced much military or other capacity, Walker, so long as he acted under color of authority from the chiefs of the faction he patronized, was generally successful against the pitiful rabble styled soldiers by whom his progress was resisted. . . . But his very successes proved the ruin of the faction to which he had attached himself, by exciting the natural jealousy and alarm of the natives who mainly composed it; and his assumption . . . of the title of President of Nicaragua, speedily followed by a decree reëstablishing Slavery in that country, exposed his purpose and insured his downfall. As if madly bent on ruin, he proceeded to confiscate the steamboats and other property of the Nicaragua Transit Company, thereby arresting all American travel to and from California through that country, and cutting himself off from all hope of further recruiting his forces from the throngs of sanguine or of baffled gold-seekers, who might otherwise have been attracted to his standard. Yet he maintained the unequal contest for about two years."—H. Greeley, *The American Conflict, v.* 1, *ch.* 19.

Also in: H. H. Bancroft, *Hist. of the Pacific States, v.* 3, *ch.* 16-17.—J. J. Roche, *The Story of the Filibusters, ch.* 5-18.

NICE (NICÆA), Asia Minor. See Nicæa.

NICE (NIZZA), France; A. D. 1388.—Acquisition by the House of Savoy. See Savoy: 11-15th Centuries.

A. D. 1542.—Siege by French and Turks.—Capture of the town.—Successful resistance of the citadel. See FRANCE: A. D. 1532–1547.

A. D. 1792.—Annexation to the French Republic. See FRANCE: A. D. 1792 (SEPTEMBER—DECEMBER).

A. D. 1860.—Cession to France. See ITALY: A. D. 1859–1861.

NICEPHORUS I., Emperor in the East (Byzantine or Greek), A. D. 802–811.....Nicephorus II., Emperor in the East (Byzantine or Greek), 963–969.....Nicephorus III., Emperor in the East (Byzantine or Greek), 1078–1081.

NICHOLAS, Czar of Russia, A. D. 1825–1855.....Nicholas I., Pope, 858–867.....Nicholas II., Pope, 1058–1061.....Nicholas III., Pope, 1277–1280.....Nicholas IV., Pope, 1288–1292.....Nicholas V., Pope, 1447–1455.....Nicholas Swendson, King of Denmark, 1103–1134.

NICIAS (NIKIAS), and the Siege of Syracuse. See SYRACUSE: B. C. 415–413.

NICIAS (NIKIAS), The Peace of. See GREECE: B. C. 424–421.

NICOLET, Jean, Explorations of. See CANADA: A. D. 1634–1673.

NICOMEDIA: A. D. 258.—Capture by the Goths. See GOTHS: A. D. 258–267.

A. D. 292-305.—The court of Diocletian.—"To rival the majesty of Rome was the ambition . . . of Diocletian, who employed his leisure, and the wealth of the east, in the embellishment of Nicomedia, a city placed on the verge of Europe and Asia, almost at an equal distance between the Danube and the Euphrates. By the taste of the monarch, and at the expense of the people, Nicomedia acquired, in the space of a few years, a degree of magnificence which might appear to have required the labour of ages, and became inferior only to Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch, in extent or populousness. . . . Till Diocletian, in the twentieth year of his reign, celebrated his Roman triumph, it is extremely doubtful whether he ever visited the ancient capital of the empire."—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, ch.* 13.—See ROME: A. D. 284–305.

A. D. 1326.—Capture by the Turks.—See TURKS (OTTOMAN): A. D. 1326–1359.

NICOPOLIS.—Augustus gave this name to a city which he founded, B. C. 31, in commemoration of the victory at Actium, on the site of the camp which his army occupied.—C. Merivale, *Hist. of the Romans, ch.* 28.

NICOPOLIS, Armenia, Battle of (B. C. 66).—The decisive battle in which Pompeius defeated Mithridates and ended the long Mithridatic wars was fought, B. C. 66, in Lesser Armenia, at a place near which Pompeius founded a city called Nicopolis, the site of which is uncertain.—G. Long, *Decline of the Roman Republic, v.* 3, *ch.* 8.

Battle of (B. C. 48). See ROME: B. C. 47–46.

NICOPOLIS, Bulgaria, Battle of (A. D. 1396). See TURKS (THE OTTOMAN): A. D. 1389–1403.

NICOSIA: Taken and sacked by the Turks (1570). See TURKS: A. D. 1566–1571.

NIEUPORT, Battle of (1600). See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1594–1609.

NIGER COMPANY, The Royal. See AFRICA: A. D. 1884–1891.

NIHILISM.—NIHILISTS.—"In Tikomirov's work on Russia seven or eight pages are devoted to the severe condemnation of the use of the expressions 'nihilism' and 'nihilist.' Nevertheless . . . they are employed universally, and all the world understands what is meant by them in an approximate and relative way. . . . It was a novelist who first baptized the party who called themselves at that time 'new men.' It was Ivan Turguenief, who by the mouth of one of the characters in his celebrated novel, 'Fathers and Sons,' gave the young generation the name of nihilists. But it was not of his coinage; Royer-Collard first stamped it; Victor Hugo had already said that the negation of the infinite led directly to nihilism, and Joseph Lemaistre had spoken of the nihilism, more or less sincere, of the contemporary generations; but it was reserved for the author of 'Virgin Soil' to bring to light and make famous this word, which after making a great stir in his own country attracted the attention of the whole world. The reign of Nicholas I. was an epoch of hard oppression. When he ascended the throne, the conspiracy of the Decembrists broke out, and this sudden revelation of the revolutionary spirit steeled the already inflexible soul of the Czar. Nicholas, although fond of letters and an assiduous reader of Homer, was disposed to throttle his enemies, and would not have hesitated to pluck out the brains of Russia; he was very near suppressing all the universities and schools, and inaugurating a voluntary retrocession to Asiatic barbarism. He did mutilate and reduce the instruction, he suppressed the chair of European political laws, and after the events of 1848 in France he seriously considered the idea of closing his frontiers with a cordon of troops to beat back foreign liberalism like the cholera or the plague. . . . However, it was under his sceptre, under his systematic oppression, that, by confession of the great revolutionary statesman Herzen, Russian thought developed as never before; that the emancipation of the intelligence, which this very statesman calls a tragic event, was accomplished, and a national literature was brought to light and began to flourish. When Alexander II. succeeded to the throne, when the bonds of despotism were loosened and the blockade with which Nicholas vainly tried to isolate his empire was raised, the field was ready for the intellectual and political strife. . . . Before explaining how nihilism is the outcome of intelligence, we must understand what is meant by intelligence in Russia. It means a class composed of all those, of whatever profession or estate, who have at heart the advancement of intellectual life, and contribute in every way toward it. It may be said, indeed, that such a class is to be found in every country; but there is this difference,—in other countries the class is not a unit; there are factions, or a large number of its members shun political and social discussion in order to enjoy the serene atmosphere of the world of art, while in Russia the intelligence means a common cause, a homogeneous spirit, subversive and revolutionary withal. . . . Whence came the revolutionary element in Russia? From the Occident, from France, from the negative,

materialist, sensualist philosophy of the Encyclopædia, imported into Russia by Catherine II.; and later from Germany, from Kantism and Hegelianism, imbibed by Russian youth at the German universities, and which they diffused throughout their own country with characteristic Sclav impetuosity. By 'Pure Reason' and transcendental idealism, Herzen and Bakunine, the first apostles of nihilism, were inspired. But the ideas brought from Europe to Russia soon allied themselves with an indigenous or possibly an Oriental element; namely, a sort of quietist fatalism, which leads to the darkest and most despairing pessimism. On the whole, nihilism is rather a philosophical conception of the sum of life than a purely democratic and revolutionary movement. . . . Nihilism had no political color about it at the beginning. During the decade between 1860 and 1870 the youth of Russia was seized with a sort of fever for negation, a fierce antipathy toward everything that was,—authorities, institutions, customary ideas, and old-fashioned dogmas. In Turguenief's novel, 'Fathers and Sons,' we meet with Bazarof, a froward, ill-mannered, intolerable fellow, who represents this type. After 1871 the echo of the Paris Commune and emissaries of the Internationals crossed the frontier, and the nihilists began to bestir themselves, to meet together clandestinely, and to send out propaganda. Seven years later they organized an era of terror, assassination, and explosions. Thus three phases have followed upon one another,—thought, word, and deed,—along that road which is never so long as it looks, the road that leads from the word to the act, from Utopia to crime. And yet nihilism never became a political party as we understand the term. It has no defined creed or official programme. The fulness of its despair embraces all negatives and all acute revolutionary forms. Anarchists, federalists, cantonalists, covenanters, terrorists, all who are unanimous in a desire to sweep away the present order, are grouped under the ensign of nihil."—E. P. Bazan, *Russia, its People and its Literature, bk. 2, ch. 1–2.*—"Out of Russia, an already extended list of revolutionary spirits in this land has attracted the attention and kept curiosity on the alert. We call them Nihilists,—of which the Russian pronunciation is neegilist, which, however, is now obsolete. Confined to the terrorist group in Europe, the number of these persons is certainly very small. Perhaps, as is thought in Russia, there are 500 in all, who busy themselves, even if reluctantly, with thoughts of resorting to bombs and murderous weapons to inspire terror. But it is not exactly this group that is meant when we speak of that nihilistic force in society which extends everywhere, into all circles, and finds support and strongholds at widely spread points. It is indeed not very different from what elsewhere in Europe is regarded as culture, advanced culture: the profound scepticism in regard to our existing institutions in their present form, what we call royal prerogative, church, marriage, property."—Georg Brandes, *Impressions of Russia, ch. 4.*—"The genuine Nihilism was a philosophical and literary movement, which flourished in the first decade after the Emancipation of the Serfs, that is to say, between 1860 and 1870. It is now [1883] absolutely extinct, and only a few traces are left of it, which are rapidly disappearing. . . . Nihilism was a struggle for the emancipation of intelligence from every kind of dependence, and it advanced side by side with that for the emancipation of the labouring classes from serfdom. The fundamental principle of Nihilism, properly so-called, was absolute individualism. It was the negation, in the name of individual liberty, of all the obligations imposed upon the individual by society, by family life, and by religion. Nihilism was a passionate and powerful reaction, not against political despotism, but against the moral despotism that weighs upon the private and inner life of the individual. But it must be confessed that our predecessors, at least in the earlier days, introduced into this highly pacific struggle the same spirit of rebellion and almost the same fanaticism that characterises the present movement."—Stepniak, *Underground Russia, introd.*

Also in: The same, *The Russian Storm-Cloud.*—L. Tikhomirov, *Russia, Political and Social, bk. 6–7 (v. 2).*—E. Noble, *The Russian Revolt.*—A. Leroy-Beaulieu, *The Empire of the Tsars, pt. 1, bk. 3, ch. 4.*—See, also, Russia: A. D. 1879–1881; and Anarchists.

NIKA SEDITION, The. See Circus, Factions of the Roman.

NIKIAS. See Nicias.

NILE, Naval Battle of the. See France: A. D. 1798 (May—August).

NIMEGUEN: Origin. See Batavians.

A. D. 1591.—Siege and capture by Prince Maurice. See Netherlands: A. D. 1588–1593.

NIMEGUEN, The Peace of (1678-1679).—The war which Louis XIV. began in 1672 by attacking Holland, with the co-operation of his English pensioner, Charles II., and which roused against him a defensive coalition of Spain, Germany and Denmark with the Dutch (see Netherlands: A. D. 1672–1674, and 1674–1678), was ended by a series of treaties negotiated at Nimeguen in 1678 and 1679. The first of these treaties, signed August 10, 1678, was between France and Holland. "France and Holland kept what was in their possession, except Maestricht and its dependencies which were restored to Holland. France therefore kept her conquests in Senegal and Guiana. This was all the territory lost by Holland in the terrible war which had almost annihilated her. The United Provinces pledged themselves to neutrality in the war which might continue between France and the other powers, and guaranteed the neutrality of Spain, after the latter should have signed the peace. France included Sweden in the treaty; Holland included in it Spain and the other allies who should make peace within six weeks after the exchange of ratifications. To the treaty of peace was annexed a treaty of commerce, concluded for twenty-five years."—H. Martin, *Hist. of France: Age of Louis XIV. (trans. by M. L. Booth), v. 1, ch. 6.*—The peace between France and Spain was signed September 17. France gave back, in the Spanish Netherlands and elsewhere, "Charleroi, Binch, Ath, Oudenarde, and Courtrai, which she had gained by the Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle; the town and duchy of Limburg, all the country beyond the Meuse, Ghent, Rodenhus, and the district of the Waes, Leuze, and St. Ghislain, with Puycerda in Catalonia, these having been taken since that peace. But she retained Franche

Comté, with the towns of Valenciènnes, Bouchain, Condé, Cambrai and the Cambrésis, Aire, St. Omer, Ypres, Werwick, Warneton, Poperinge, Bailleul, Cassel, Bavai, and Maubeuge. . . . On February 2, 1679, peace was declared between Louis, the Emperor, and the Empire. Louis gave back Philippsburg, retaining Freiburg with the desired liberty of passage across the Rhine to Breisach; in all other respects the Treaty of Munster, of October 24, 1648, was re-established. . . . The treaty then dealt with the Duke of Lorraine. To his restitution Louis annexed conditions which rendered Lorraine little more than a French province. Not only was Nancy to become French, but, in conformity with the treaty of 1661, Louis was to have possession of four large roads traversing the country, with half a league's breadth of territory throughout their length, and the places contained therein. . . . To these conditions the Duke refused to subscribe, preferring continual exile until the Peace of Ryswick in 1697, when at length his son regained the ancestral estates." Treaties between the Emperor and Sweden, between Brandenburg and France and Sweden, between Denmark and the same, and between Sweden, Spain and Holland, were successively concluded during the year 1679. "The effect of the Peace of Nimwegen was, . . . speaking generally, to reaffirm the Peace of Westphalia. But . . . it did not, like the Peace of Westphalia, close for any length of time the sources of strife."—O. Airy, *The English Restoration and Louis XIV., ch.* 22.

Also in: Sir W. Temple, *Memoirs, pt.* 2 (*Works, v.* 2).

NINE WAYS, The. See Amphipolis; also, Athens: B. C. 466–454.

NINETY-FIVE THESES OF LUTHER, The. See Papacy: A. D. 1517.

NINETY-TWO, The. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1767–1768.

NINEVEH.—"In or about the year before Christ 606, Nineveh, the great city, was destroyed. For many hundred years had she stood in arrogant splendor, her palaces towering above the Tigris and mirrored in its swift waters; army after army had gone forth from her gates and returned laden with the spoils of conquered countries; her monarchs had ridden to the high place of sacrifice in chariots drawn by captive kings. But her time came at last. The nations assembled and encompassed her around [the Medes and the Babylonians, with their lesser allies]. Popular tradition tells how over two years lasted the siege; how the very river rose and battered her walls; till one day a vast flame rose up to heaven; how the last of a mighty line of kings, too proud to surrender, thus saved himself, his treasures and his capital from the shame of bondage. Never was city to rise again where Nineveh had been." The very knowledge of the existence of Nineveh was lost so soon that, two centuries later, when Xenophon passed the ruins, with his Ten Thousand retreating Greeks, he reported them to be the ruins of a deserted city of the Medes and called it Larissa. Twenty-four centuries went by, and the winds and the rains, in their slow fashion, covered the bricks and stones of the desolated Assyrian capital with a shapeless mound of earth. Then came the searching modern scholar and explorer, and began to excavate the mound, to see what lay beneath it. First the French Consul, Botta, in 1842; then the Englishman Layard, in 1845; then the later English scholar, George Smith, and others; until buried Nineveh has been in great part brought to light. Not only the imperishable monuments of its splendid art have been exposed, but a veritable library of its literature, written on tablets and cylinders of clay, has been found and read. The discoveries of the past half-century, on the site of Nineveh, under the mound called Koyunjik, and elsewhere in other similarly-buried cities of ancient Babylonia and Assyria, may reasonably be called the most extraordinary additions to human knowledge which our age has acquired. — Z. A. Ragozin, *Story of Chaldea, introd., ch.* 1–4.

Also in: A. H. Layard, *Nineveh and its Remains;* and *Discoveries among the Ruins of Nineveh and Babylon.*—G. Smith, *Assyrian Discoveries.* — See, also, Assyria; and Libraries, Ancient.

NINEVEH, Battle of (A. D. 627). See Persia: A. D. 226–627.

NINFEO, Treaty of. See Genoa: A. D. 1261–1299.

NINIQUIQUILAS, The. See American Aborigines: Pampas Tribes.

NIPAL, OR NEPAUL: English war with the Ghorkas. See India: A. D. 1805–1816.

NIPMUCKS, OR NIPNETS, The. See American Aborigines: Algonquian Family; also, New England: A. D. 1674–1675, 1675, and 1676–1678 King Philip's War.

NISÆAN PLAINS, The.—The famous horse-pastures of the ancient Medes. "Most probably they are to be identified with the modern plains of Khawah and Alishtar, between Behistun and Khorramabad, which are even now considered to afford the best summer pasturage in Persia. . . . The proper Nisæa is the district of Nishapur in Khorasan, whence it is probable that the famous breed of horses was originally brought."—G. Rawlinson, *Five Great Monarchies: Media, ch.* 1, *with foot-note.*

NISCHANDYIS. See Sublime Porte.

NISHAPOOR: Destruction by the Mongols (1221). See Khorassan: A. D. 1220–1221.

NISIB, Battle of (1839). See Turks: A. D. 1831–1840.

NISIBIS, Sieges of (A. D. 338-350). See Persia: A. D. 226–627.

NISIBIS, Theological School of. See Nestorians.

NISMES: Origin. See Volcæ.

A. D. 752-759.—Recovery from the Moslems. See Mahometan Conquest: A. D. 752–759.

NISSA, Siege and battle (1689-1690). See Hungary: A. D. 1683–1699.

NITIOBRIGES, The.—These were a tribe in ancient Gaul whose capital city was Aginnum, the modern town of Agen on the Garonne.—G. Long, *Decline of the Roman Republic, v.* 4, *ch.* 17.

NIVELLE, Battle of the (1813). See Spain: A. D. 1812–1814.

NIVÔSE, The month. See France: A. D. 1793 (October) The new republican calendar.

NIZAM.—Nizam's dominions. See India. A. D. 1662–1748.

NIZZA. See Nice.

NO.—NO AMON. See Thebes, Egypt.

NO MAN'S LAND, Africa. See Griquas.

NO MAN'S LAND, England.—In the open or common field system which prevailed in early England, the fields were divided into long, narrow strips, wherever practicable. In some cases, "little odds and ends of unused land remained, which from time immemorial were called 'no man's land,' or 'any one's land,' or 'Jack's land,' as the case might be."—F. Seebohm, *Eng. Village Community, ch.* 1.

NO POPERY RIOTS, The. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1778–1780.

NOBLES, Roman: Origin of the term.—"When Livy in his first six books writes of the disputes between the Patres or Patricians and the Plebs about the Public Land, he sometimes designates the Patricians by the name Nobiles, which we have in the form Nobles. A Nobilis is a man who is known. A man who is not known is Ignobilis, a nobody. In the later Republic a Plebeian who attained to a curule office elevated his family to a rank of honour, to a nobility, not acknowledged by any law, but by usage. . . . The Patricians were a nobility of antient date. . . . The Patrician nobility was therefore independent of all office, but the new Nobility and their Jus Imaginum originated in some Plebeian who first of his family attained a curule office. . . . The true conclusion is that Livy in his first six books uses the word Nobiles improperly, for there is no evidence that this name was given to the Patres before the consulship of L. Sextius."—G. Long, *Decline of the Roman Republic, v.* 1, *ch.* 11.—See, also, ROME: B. C. 146.

NOËTIANS AND SABELLIANS.—"At the head of those in this century [the 3d] who explained the scriptural doctrine of the Father, Son, and holy Spirit, by the precepts of reason, stands Noëtus of Smyrna; a man little known, but who is reported by the ancients to have been cast out of the church by presbyters (of whom no account is given), to have opened a school, and to have formed a sect. It is stated that, being wholly unable to comprehend how that God, who is so often in Scripture declared to be one and undivided, can, at the same time, be manifold, Noëtus concluded that the undivided Father of all things united himself with the man Christ, was born in him, and in him suffered and died. On account of this doctrine his followers were called Patripassians. . . . After the middle of this century, Sabellius, an African bishop, or presbyter, of Ptolemais, the capital of the Pentapolitan province of Libya Cyrenaica, attempted to reconcile, in a manner somewhat different from that of Noëtus, the scriptural doctrine of Father, Son, and holy Spirit, with the doctrine of the unity of the divine nature." Sabellius assumed "that only an energy or virtue, emitted from the Father of all, or, if you choose, a particle of the person or nature of the Father, became united with the man Christ. And such a virtue or particle of the Father, he also supposed, constituted the holy Spirit."—J. L. von Mosheim, *Historical Commentaries, 3d century, sects.* 32–33.

NÖFELS, OR NAEFELS, Battle of (1388). See SWITZERLAND: A. D. 1386–1388.....**Battle of (1799).** See FRANCE: A. D. 1799 (AUGUST—DECEMBER).

NOLA, Battle of (B. C. 88). See ROME: B. C. 90–88.

NOMBRE DE DIOS: Surprised and plundered by Drake (1572). See AMERICA: A. D. 1572–1580.

NOMEN, COGNOMEN, PRÆNOMEN. See GENS.

NOMES.—A name given by the Greeks to the districts into which Egypt was divided from very ancient times.

NOMOPHYLAKES.—In ancient Athens, under the constitution introduced by Pericles, seven magistrates called Nomophylakes, or "Law-Guardians," "sat alongside of the Proëdri, or presidents, both in the senate and in the public assembly, and were charged with the duty of interposing whenever any step was taken or any proposition made contrary to the existing laws. They were also empowered to constrain the magistrates to act according to law."—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece, pt.* 2, *ch.* 46.

NOMOTHETÆ, The.—A legislative commission, elected and deputed by the general assembly of the people, in ancient Athens, to amend existing laws or enact new ones.—G. F. Schömann, *Antiq. of Greece: The State, pt.* 3, *ch.* 3.

NONCONFORMISTS, OR DISSENTERS, English: First bodies organized.—Persecutions under Charles II. and Anne.—Removal of Disabilities. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1559–1566; 1662–1665; 1672–1673; 1711–1714; 1827–1828.

NONES. See CALENDAR, JULIAN.

NONINTERCOURSE LAW OF 1809, The American. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1804–1809.

NONJURORS, The. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1689 (APRIL—AUGUST).

NOOTKAS, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: WAKASHAN FAMILY.

NOPH. See MEMPHIS.

NÖRDLINGEN, Siege and Battle (1634). See GERMANY: A. D. 1634–1639.....**Second Battle, or Battle of Allerheim (1645).** See GERMANY: A. D. 1640–1645.

NORE, Mutiny at the. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1797.

NOREMBEGA. See NORUMBEGA.

NORFOLK, Va.: A. D. 1776.—Bombardment and destruction. See VIRGINIA: A. D. 1775–1776.

A. D. 1779.—Pillaged by British marauders. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1778–1779 WASHINGTON GUARDING THE HUDSON.

A. D. 1861 (April).—Abandoned by the United States commandant.—Destruction of ships and property.—Possession taken by the Rebels. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1861 (APRIL).

A. D. 1862 (February).—Threatened by the Federal capture of Roanoke Island. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1862 (JANUARY—APRIL: NORTH CAROLINA).

A. D. 1862 (May).—Evacuated by the Confederates. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1862 (MAY: VIRGINIA) EVACUATION OF NORFOLK.

NORFOLK ISLAND PENAL COLONY. See AUSTRALIA: A. D. 1601–1800.

NORICUM. See PANNONIA; also, RHÆTIANS.

NORMANDY: A. D. 876-911.—Rollo's conquest and occupation. See NORMANS.—NORTHMEN: A. D. 876–911.

A. D. 911-1000.—The solidifying of Rollo's duchy.—The Normans become French.—The first century which passed after the settlement of the Northmen along the Seine saw "the steady growth of the duchy in extent and power. Much of this was due to the ability of its rulers, to the vigour and wisdom with which Hrolf forced order and justice on the new community, as well as to the political tact with which both Hrolf and William Longsword [son and successor of Duke Rollo or Hrolf, A. D. 927-943] clung to the Karolings in their strife with the dukes of Paris. But still more was owing to the steadiness with which both these rulers remained faithful to the Christianity which had been imposed on the northmen as a condition of their settlement, and to the firm resolve with which they trampled down the temper and traditions which their people had brought from their Scandinavian homeland, and welcomed the language and civilization which came in the wake of their neighbours' religion. The difficulties that met the dukes were indeed enormous. . . . They were girt in by hostile states, they were threatened at sea by England, under Æthelstan a network of alliances menaced them with ruin. Once a French army occupied Rouen, and a French king held the pirates' land at his will; once the German lances were seen from the walls of their capital. Nor were their difficulties within less than those without. The subject population which had been trodden under foot by the northern settlers were seething with discontent. The policy of Christianization and civilization broke the Normans themselves into two parties. . . . The very conquests of Hrolf and his successor, the Bessin, the Cotentin, had to be settled and held by the new comers, who made them strongholds of heathendom. . . . But amidst difficulties from within and from without the dukes held firm to their course, and their stubborn will had its reward. . . . By the end of William Longsword's days all Normandy, save the newly settled districts of the west, was Christian, and spoke French. . . . The work of the statesman at last completed the work of the sword. As the connexion of the dukes with the Karoling kings had given them the land, and helped them for fifty years to hold it against the House of Paris, so in the downfall of the Karolings the sudden and adroit change of front which bound the Norman rulers to the House of Paris in its successful struggle for the Crown secured the land for ever to the northmen. The close connexion which France was forced to maintain with the state whose support held the new royal line on its throne told both on kingdom and duchy. The French dread of the 'pirates' died gradually away, while French influence spread yet more rapidly over a people which clung so closely to the French crown."—J. R. Green, *The Conquest of England, ch.* 8.

A. D. 1035-1063.—Duke William establishes his authority.—Duke Robert, of Normandy, who died in 1035, was succeeded by his young son William, who bore in youth the opprobrious name of "the Bastard," but who extinguished it in later life under the proud appellation of "the Conqueror." By reason of his bastardy he was not an acceptable successor, and, being yet a boy, it seemed little likely that he would maintain himself on the ducal throne. Normandy, for a dozen years, was given up to lawless strife among its nobles. In 1047 a large part of the duchy rose in revolt, against its objectionable young lord. "It will be remembered that the western part of Normandy, the lands of Bayeux and Coutances, were won by the Norman dukes after the eastern part, the lands of Rouen and Evreux. And it will be remembered that these western lands, won more lately, and fed by new colonies from the North, were still heathen and Danish some while after eastern Normandy had become Christian and French-speaking. Now we may be sure that, long before William's day, all Normandy was Christian, but it is quite possible that the old tongue may have lingered on in the western lands. At any rate there was a wide difference in spirit and feeling between the more French and the more Danish districts, to say nothing of Bayeux, where, before the Normans came, there had been a Saxon settlement. One part of the duchy in short was altogether Romance in speech and manners, while more or less of Teutonic character still clave to the other. So now Teutonic Normandy rose against Duke William, and Romance Normandy was faithful to him. The nobles of the Bessin and Côtentin made league with William's cousin Guy of Burgundy, meaning, as far as one can see, to make Guy Duke of Rouen and Evreux, and to have no lord at all for themselves. . . . When the rebellion broke out, William was among them at Valognes, and they tried to seize him. But his fool warned him in the night; he rode for his life, and got safe to his own Falaise. All eastern Normandy was loyal; but William doubted whether he could by himself overcome so strong an array of rebels. So he went to Poissy, between Rouen and Paris, and asked his lord King Henry [of France] to help him. So King Henry came with a French army; and the French and those whom we may call the French Normans met the Teutonic Normans in battle at Val-ès-dunes, not far from Caen. It was William's first pitched battle," and he won a decisive victory. "He was now fully master of his own duchy; and the battle of Val-ès-dunes finally fixed that Normandy should take its character from Romance Rouen and not from Teutonic Bayeux. William had in short overcome Saxons and Danes in Gaul before he came to overcome them in Britain. He had to conquer his own Normandy before he could conquer England. . . . But before long King Henry got jealous of William's power, and he was now always ready to give help to any Norman rebels. . . . And the other neighbouring princes were jealous of him as well as the King. His neighbours in Britanny, Anjou, Chartres, and Ponthieu, were all against him. But the great Duke was able to hold his own against them all, and before long to make a great addition to his dominions." Between 1053 and 1058 the French King invaded Normandy three times and suffered defeat on every occasion. In 1063 Duke William invaded the county of Maine, and reduced it to entire submission. "From this time he ruled over Maine as well as over Normandy," although its people were often in revolt. "The conquest of Maine raised William's power and fame to a higher pitch than it reached at any other time before his conquest of England."—E. A. Freeman, *Short Hist. of the Norman Conquest, ch.* 4.

Also in: The same, *Hist. of the Norman Conq., ch.* 8.—Sir F. Palgrave, *Hist. of Normandy and Eng., bk.* 2, *ch.* 4.

A. D. 1066.—Duke William becomes King of England. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1042–1066; 1066; and 1066–1071.

A. D. 1087-1135.—Under Duke Robert and Henry Beauclerc. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1087–1135.

A. D. 1096.—The Crusade of Duke Robert. See CRUSADES: A. D. 1096–1099.

A. D. 1203-1205.—Wrested from England and restored to France. See FRANCE: A. D. 1180–1224; and ENGLAND: A. D. 1205.

A. D. 1419.—Conquest by Henry V. of England. See FRANCE: A. D. 1417–1422.

A. D. 1449.—Recovery from the English. See FRANCE: A. D. 1431–1453.

16th Century.—Spread of the Reformation.—Strength of Protestantism. See FRANCE: A. D. 1559–1561.

NORMANS.—NORTHMEN: Name and Origin.—"The northern pirates, variously called Danes or Normans, according as they came from the islands of the Baltic Sea or the coast of Norway, . . . descended from the same primitive race with the Anglo-Saxons and the Franks; their language had roots identical with the idioms of these two nations: but this token of an ancient fraternity did not preserve from their hostile incursions either Saxon Britain or Frankish Gaul, nor even the territory beyond the Rhine, then exclusively inhabited by Germanic tribes. The conversion of the southern Teutons to the Christian faith had broken all bond of fraternity between them and the Teutons of the north. In the 9th century the man of the north still gloried in the title of son of Odin, and treated as bastards and apostates the Germans who had become children of the church. . . . A sort of religious and patriotic fanaticism was thus combined in the Scandinavian with the fiery impulsiveness of their character, and an insatiable thirst for gain. They shed with joy the blood of the priests, were especially delighted at pillaging the churches, and stabled their horses in the chapels of the palaces. . . . In three days, with an east wind, the fleets of Denmark and Norway, two-sailed vessels, reached the south of Britain. The soldiers of each fleet obeyed in general one chief, whose vessel was distinguished from the rest by some particular ornament. . . . All equal under such a chief, bearing lightly their voluntary submission and the weight of their mailed armour, which they promised themselves soon to exchange for an equal weight of gold, the Danish pirates pursued the 'road of the swans,' as their ancient national poetry expressed it. Sometimes they coasted along the shore, and laid wait for the enemy in the straits, the bays, and smaller anchorages, which procured them the surname of Vikings, or 'children of the creeks'; sometimes they dashed in pursuit of their prey across the ocean."—A. Thierry, *Conquest of England by the Normans, bk.* 2 (*v.* 1).

ALSO IN: T. Carlyle, *The Early Kings of Norway.*

8-9th Centuries.—The Vikings and what sent them to sea.—"No race of the ancient or modern world have ever taken to the sea with such heartiness as the Northmen. The great cause which filled the waters of Western Europe with their barks was that consolidation and centralization of the kingly power all over Europe which followed after the days of Charlemagne, and which put a stop to those great invasions and migrations by land which had lasted for centuries. Before that time the north and east of Europe, pressed from behind by other nationalities, and growing straitened within their own bounds, threw off from time to time bands of emigrants which gathered force as they slowly marched along, until they appeared in the west as a fresh wave of the barbarian flood. As soon as the west, recruited from the very source whence the invaders came, had gained strength enough to set them at defiance, which happened in the time of Charlemagne, these invasions by land ceased after a series of bloody defeats, and the north had to look for another outlet for the force which it was unable to support at home. Nor was the north itself slow to follow Charlemagne's example. Harold Fairhair, no inapt disciple of the great emperor, subdued the petty kings in Norway one after another, and made himself supreme king. At the same time he invaded the rights of the old freeman, and by taxes and tolls laid on his allodial holding drove him into exile. We have thus the old outlet cut off and a new cause for emigration added. No doubt the Northmen even then had long been used to struggle with the sea, and sea-roving was the calling of the brave, but the two causes we have named gave it a great impulse just at the beginning of the tenth century, and many a freeman who would have joined the host of some famous leader by land, or have lived on a little king at home, now sought the waves as a birthright of which no king could rob him. Either alone, or as the follower of some sea-king, whose realm was the sea's wide wastes, he went out year after year, and thus won fame and wealth. The name given to this pursuit was Viking, a word which is in no way akin to king. It is derived from 'Vik,' a bay or creek, because these sea-rovers lay moored in bays and creeks on the look-out for merchant ships; the 'ing' is a well known ending, meaning, in this case, occupation or calling. Such a sea-rover was called 'Vikingr,' and at one time or another in his life almost every man of note in the North had taken to the sea and lived a Viking life."—G. W. Dasent, *Story of Burnt Njal, v.* 2, *app.*—"Western viking expeditions have hitherto been ascribed to Danes and Norwegians exclusively. Renewed investigations reveal, however, that Swedes shared widely in these achievements, notably in the acquisition of England, and that, among other famous conquerors, Rolf, the founder of the Anglo-Norman dynasty, issued from their country. . . . Norwegians, like Swedes, were, in truth, merged in the terms Northmen and Danes, both of which were general to all Scandinavians abroad. . . . The earlier conversion of the Danes to Christianity and their more immediate contact with Germany account for the frequent application of their name to all Scandinavians."—W. Roos, *The Swedish Part in the Viking Expeditions* (*Eng. Hist. Rev., April,* 1892).

ALSO IN: S. Laing, *Preliminary Dissertation to Heimskringla.*—C. F. Keary, *The Vikings of Western Christendom, ch.* 5.—P. B. Du Chaillu, *The Viking Age.*—See, also, SCANDINAVIAN STATES.

8-9th Centuries.—The island empire of the Vikings.—"We have hitherto treated the Norwegians, Swedes, and Danes under the common

appellation of Northmen; and this is in many ways the most convenient, for it is often impossible to decide the nationality of the individual settlement. Indeed, it would appear probable that the devastating bands were often composed indiscriminately of the several nationalities. Still, in tracing the history of their conquests, we may lay it down as a general rule that England was the exclusive prey of the Danes; that Scotland and the islands to the north as far as Iceland, and to the south as far as Anglesea and Ireland, fell to the Norwegians, and Russia to the Swedes; while Gaul and Germany were equally the spoil of the Norwegians and the Danes. . . . While England had been overcome by the Danes, the Norwegians had turned their attention chiefly to the north of the British Isles and the islands of the West. Their settlements naturally fell into three divisions, which tally with their geographical position. 1. The Orkneys and Shetlands, lying to the N. E. of Scotland. 2. The isles to the west as far south as Ireland. 3. Iceland and the Faroë Isles. The Orkneys and Shetlands: Here the Northmen first appear as early as the end of the 8th century, and a few peaceful settlements were made by those who were anxious to escape from the noisy scenes which distracted their northern country. In the reign of Harald Harfagr [the Fairhaired] they assumed new importance, and their character is changed. Many of those driven out by Harald sought a refuge here, and betaking themselves to piracy periodically infested the Norwegian coast in revenge for their defeat and expulsion. These ravages seriously disturbing the peace of his newly acquired kingdom, Harald fitted out an expedition and devoted a whole summer to conquering the Vikings and extirpating the brood of pirates. The country being gained, he offered it to his chief adviser, Rögnwald, Jarl of Möri in Norway, father of Rollo of Normandy, who, though refusing to go himself, held it during his life as a family possession, and sent Sigurd, his brother, there. . . . Rögnwald next sent his son Einar, and from his time [A. D. 875] we may date the final establishment of the Jarls of Orkney, who henceforth owe a nominal allegiance to the King of Norway. . . . The close of the 8th century also saw the commencement of the incursions of the Northmen in the west of Scotland, and the Western Isles soon became a favourite resort of the Vikings. In the Keltic annals these unwelcome visitors had gained the name of Fingall, 'the white strangers,' from the fairness of their complexion; and Dugall, the black strangers, probably from the iron coats of mail worn by their chiefs. . . . By the end of the 9th century a sort of naval empire had arisen, consisting of the Hebrides, parts of the western coasts of Scotland, especially the modern Argyllshire, Man, Anglesea, and the eastern shores of Ireland. This empire was under a line of sovereigns who called themselves the Hy-Ivar (grandsons of Ivar), and lived now in Man, now in Dublin. Thence they often joined their kinsmen in their attacks on England, and at times aspired to the position of Jarls of the Danish Northumbria."—A. H. Johnson, *The Normans in Europe*, *ch.* 2.—"Under the government of these Norwegian princes [the Hy Ivar] the Isles appear to have been very flourishing. They were crowded with people; the arts were cultivated, and manufactures were carried to a degree of perfection which was then thought excellence. This comparatively advanced state of society in these remote isles may be ascribed partly to the influence and instructions of the Irish clergy, who were established all over the island before the arrival of the Norwegians, and possessed as much learning as was in those ages to be found in any part of Europe, except Constantinople and Rome; and partly to the arrival of great numbers of the provincial Britons flying to them as an asylum when their country was ravaged by the Saxons, and carrying with them the remains of the science, manufactures, and wealth introduced among them by their Roman masters. Neither were the Norwegians themselves in those ages destitute of a considerable portion of learning and of skill in the useful arts, in navigation, fisheries, and manufactures; nor were they in any respect such barbarians as those who know them only by the declamations of the early English writers may be apt to suppose them. The principal source of their wealth was piracy, then esteemed an honourable profession, in the exercise of which these islanders laid all the maritime countries of the west part of Europe under heavy contributions."—D. Macpherson, *Geog. Illustrations of Scottish Hist.* (Quoted by J. H. Burton, *Hist. of Scotland*, *ch.* 15, *v.* 2, *foot-note*).—See, also, IRELAND: 9–10TH CENTURIES.

A. D. 787-880.—The so-called Danish invasions and settlements in England.—"In our own English chronicles, 'Dena' or Dane is used as the common term for all the Scandinavian invaders of Britain, though not including the Swedes, who took no part in the attack, while Northman generally means 'man of Norway.' Asser however uses the words as synonymous, 'Nordmanni sive Dani.' Across the channel 'Northman' was the general name for the pirates, and 'Dane' would usually mean a pirate from Denmark. The distinction however is partly a chronological one; as, owing to the late appearance of the Danes in the middle of the ninth century, and the prominent part they then took in the general Wiking movement, their name tended from that time to narrow the area of the earlier term of 'Nordmanni.'"—J. R. Green, *The Conq. of Eng.*, *p.* 68, *foot-note*.—Prof. Freeman divides the Danish invasions of England into three periods: 1. The period of merely plundering incursions, which began A. D. 787. 2. The period of actual occupation and settlement, from 866 to the Peace of Wedmore, 880. 3. The later period of conquest, within which England was governed by Danish kings, A. D. 980–1042.—See ENGLAND: A. D. 855–880.

ALSO IN: C. F. Keary, *The Vikings in Western Christendom*, *ch.* 6 *and* 12.

A. D. 841.—First expedition up the Seine.—In May, A. D. 841, the Seine was entered for the first time by a fleet of Norse pirates, whose depredations in France had been previously confined to the coasts. The expedition was commanded by a chief named Osker, whose plans appear to have been well laid. He led his pirates straight to the rich city of Rouen, never suffering them to slacken oar or sail, or to touch the tempting country through which they passed, until the great prize was struck. "The city was fired and plundered. Defence was wholly impracticable, and great slaughter ensued. . . . Osker's three days' occupation of Rouen was

remuneratingly successful. Their vessels loaded with spoil and captives, gentle and simple, clerks, merchants, citizens, soldiers, peasants, nuns, dames, damsels, the Danes dropped down the Seine, to complete their devastation on the shores. . . . The Danes then quitted the Seine, having formed their plans for renewing the encouraging enterprize,—another time they would do more. Normandy dates from Osker's three days' occupation of Rouen."—Sir F. Palgrave, *Hist. of Normandy and England, bk.* 1, *ch.* 2 (*v.* 1).

Also in: C. F. Keary, *The Vikings in Western Christendom, ch.* 9.

A. D. 845-861.—Repeated ravages in the Seine.—Paris thrice sacked. See Paris: A. D. 845; and 857–861.

A. D. 849-860.—The career of Hasting.—"About the year of Alfred's birth [849] they laid siege to Tours, from which they were repulsed by the gallantry of the citizens, assisted by the miraculous aid of Saint Martin. It is at this siege that Hasting first appears as a leader. His birth is uncertain. In some accounts he is said to have been the son of a peasant of Troyes, the capital of Champagne, and to have forsworn his faith, and joined the Danes in his early youth, from an inherent lust of battle and plunder. In others he is called the son of the jarl Atte. But, whatever his origin, by the middle of the century he had established his title to lead the Northern hordes in those fierce forays which helped to shatter the Carlovingian Empire to fragments. . . . When the land was bare, leaving the despoiled provinces he again put to sea, and, sailing southwards still, pushed up the Tagus and Guadalquiver, and ravaged the neighbourhoods of Lisbon and Seville. But no settlement in Spain was possible at this time. The Peninsula had lately had for Caliph Abdalrahman the Second, called El Mouzaffer, 'The Victorious,' and the vigour of his rule had made the Arabian kingdom in Spain the most efficient power for defence in Europe. Hasting soon recoiled from the Spanish coasts, and returned to his old haunts. The leaders of the Danes in England, the Sidrocs and Hinguar and Hubba, had, as we have seen, a special delight in the destruction of churches and monasteries, mingling a fierce religious fanaticism with their thirst for battle and plunder. This exceeding bitterness of the Northmen may be fairly laid in great measure to the account of the thirty years of proselytising warfare, which Charlemagne had waged in Saxony, and along all the northern frontier of his empire. . . . Hasting seems to have been filled with a double portion of this spirit, which he had indulged throughout his career in the most inveterate hatred to priests and holy places. It was probably this, coupled with a certain weariness—commonplace murder and sacrilege having grown tame, and lost their charm—which incited him to the most daring of all his exploits, a direct attack on the head of Christendom, and the sacred city. Hasting then, about the year 860, planned an attack on Rome, and the proposal was well received by his followers. Sailing again round Spain, and pillaging on their way both on the Spanish and Moorish coasts, they entered the Mediterranean, and, steering for Italy, landed in the bay of Spezzia, near the town of Luna. Luna was the place where the great quarries of the Carrara marble had been worked ever since the times of the Cæsars. The city itself was, it is said, in great part built of white marble, and the 'candentia mœnia Lunæ' deceived Hasting into the belief that he was actually before Rome: so he sat down before the town which he had failed to surprise. The hope of taking it by assault was soon abandoned, but Hasting obtained his end by guile. . . . The priests were massacred, the gates thrown open, and the city taken and spoiled. Luna never recovered its old prosperity after the raid of the Northmen, and in Dante's time had fallen into utter decay. But Hasting's career in Italy ended with the sack of Luna; and, giving up all hope of attacking Rome, he re-embarked with the spoil of the town, the most beautiful of the women, and all the youths who could be used as soldiers or rowers. His fleet was wrecked on the south coasts of France on its return westward, and all the spoil lost; but the devil had work yet for Hasting and his men, who got ashore in sufficient numbers to recompense themselves for their losses by the plunder of Provence."—T. Hughes, *Alfred the Great, ch.* 20.

A. D. 860-1100.—The discovery and settlement of Iceland.—Development of the Saga literature.—The discovery of Iceland is attributed to a famous Norse Viking named Naddodd, and dated in 860, at the beginning of the reign, in Norway, of Harald Haarfager, who drove out so many adventurers, to seek fortune on the seas. He is said to have called it Snowland; but others who came to the cold island in 870 gave it the harsher name which it still bears. "Within sixty years after the first settlement by the Northmen the whole was inhabited; and, writes Uno Von Troil (p. 64), 'King Harold, who did not contribute a little towards it by his tyrannical treatment of the petty kings and lords in Norway, was obliged at last to issue an order, that no one should sail to Iceland without paying four ounces of fine silver to the Crown, in order to stop those continual emigrations which weakened his kingdom.'. . . Before the tenth century had reached its half-way period, the Norwegians had fully peopled the island with not less, perhaps, than 50,000 souls. A census taken about A. D. 1100 numbered the franklins who had to pay Thing-tax at 4,500, without including cotters and proletarians."—R. F. Burton, *Ultimâ Thule, introd., sect.* 3 (*v.* 1).—"About sixty years after the first settlement of the island, a step was taken towards turning Iceland into a commonwealth, and giving the whole island a legal constitution; and though we are ignorant of the immediate cause which led to this, we know enough of the state of things in the island to feel sure, that it could only have been with the common consent of the great chiefs, who, as Priests, presided over the various local Things [see Thing]. The first want was a man who could make a code of laws." The man was found in one Ulfljót, who came from a Norwegian family long famous for knowledge of the customary law, and who was sent to the mother country to consult the wisest of his kin. "Three years he stayed abroad; and when he returned, the chiefs, who, no doubt, day by day felt more strongly the need of a common centre of action as well as of a common code, lost no time in carrying out their scheme. . . . The time of the annual meeting was fixed at first for the middle of the month of June, but

in the year 999 it was agreed to meet a week later, and the Althing then met when ten full weeks of summer had passed. It lasted fourteen days. . . . In its legal capacity it [the Althing] was both a deliberative and executive assembly; both Parliament and High Court of Justice in one. . . . With the establishment of the Althing we have for the first time a Commonwealth in Iceland."—G. W. Dasent, *The Story of Burnt Njal, introd.* (*v.* 1).—"The reason why Iceland, which was destitute of inhabitants at the time of its discovery, about the middle of the 9th century, became so rapidly settled and secured so eminent a position in the world's history and literature, must be sought in the events which took place in Norway at the time when Harald Hárfragi (Fairhair), after a long and obstinate resistance, succeeded in usurping the monarchical power. . . . The people who emigrated to Iceland were for the most part the flower of the nation. They went especially from the west coast of Norway, where the peculiar Norse spirit had been most perfectly developed. Men of the noblest birth in Norway set out with their families and followers to find a home where they might be as free and independent as their fathers had been before them. No wonder then that they took with them the cream of the ancient culture of the fatherland. . . . Toward the end of the 11th century it is expressly stated that many of the chiefs were so learned that they with perfect propriety might have been ordained to the priesthood [Christianity having been formally adopted by the Althing in the year 1000], and in the 12th century there were, in addition to those to be found in the cloisters, several private libraries in the island. On the other hand, secular culture, knowledge of law and history, and of the skaldic art, were, so to speak, common property. And thus, when the means for committing a literature to writing were at hand, the highly developed popular taste for history gave the literature the direction which it afterward maintained. The fact is, there really existed a whole literature which was merely waiting to be put in writing. . . . Many causes contributed toward making the Icelanders preëminently a historical people. The settlers were men of noble birth, who were proud to trace their descent from kings and heroes of antiquity, nay, even from the gods themselves, and we do not therefore wonder that they assiduously preserved the memory of the deeds of their forefathers. But in their minds was developed not only a taste for the sagas of the past; the present also received its full share of attention. . . . Nor did they interest themselves for and remember the events that took place in Iceland only. Reports from foreign lands also found a most hearty welcome, and the Icelanders had abundant opportunity of satisfying their thirst for knowledge in this direction. As vikings, as merchants, as courtiers and especially as skalds accompanying kings and other distinguished persons, and also as varangians in Constantinople, many of them found splendid opportunities of visiting foreign countries. . . . Such were then the conditions and circumstances which produced that remarkable development of the historical taste with which the people were endowed, and made Iceland the home of the saga."—F. W. Horn, *Hist. of the Literature of the Scandinavian North, pt.* 1, *ch.* 1.

—"The Icelanders, in their long winter, had a great habit of writing, and were, and still are, excellent in penmanship, says Dahlmann. It is to this fact that any little history there is of the Norse Kings and their old tragedies, crimes, and heroisms, is almost all due. The Icelanders, it seems, not only made beautiful letters on their paper or parchment, but were laudably observant and desirous of accuracy; and have left us such a collection of narratives (Sagas, literally 'Says') as, for quantity and quality, is unexampled among rude nations."—T. Carlyle, *Early Kings of Norway, Preface.*—See, also, THINGS.—THINGVALLA.

A. D. 876-911.—Rollo's acquisition of Normandy.—"One alone among the Scandinavian settlements in Gaul was destined to play a real part in history. This was the settlement of Rolf or Rollo at Rouen. [The genuine name is Hrolfr, Rolf, in various spellings. The French form is Rou, sometimes Rous . . . ; the Latin is Rollo. —Foot-note.] This settlement, the kernel of the great Norman Duchy, had, I need hardly say, results of its own and an importance of its own, which distinguish it from every other Danish colony in Gaul. But it is well to bear in mind that it was only one colony among several, and that, when the cession was made, it was probably not expected to be more lasting or more important than the others. But, while the others soon lost any distinctive character, the Rouen settlement lasted, it grew, it became a power in Europe, and in Gaul it became even a determining power. . . . The lasting character of his work at once proves that the founder of the Rouen colony was a great man, but he is a great man who must be content to be judged in the main by the results of his actions. The authentic history of Rolf, Rollo, or Rou, may be summed up in a very short space. We have no really contemporary narrative of his actions, unless a few meagre and uncertain entries in some of the Frankish annals may be thought to deserve that name. . . . I therefore do not feel myself at all called upon to narrate in detail the exploits which are attributed to Rolf in the time before his final settlement. He is described as having been engaged in the calling of a Wiking both in Gaul and in Britain for nearly forty years before his final occupation of Rouen. . . . The exploits attributed to Rolf are spread over so many years, that we cannot help suspecting that the deeds of other chieftains have been attributed to him, perhaps that two leaders of the same name have been confounded. Among countless expeditions in Gaul, England, and Germany, we find Rolf charged with an earlier visit to Rouen [A. D. 876], with a share in the great siege of Paris [A. D. 885], and with an occupation or destruction of Bayeux. But it is not till we have got some way into the reign of Charles the Simple, not till we have passed several years of the tenth century, that Rolf begins clearly to stand out as a personal historic reality. He now appears in possession of Rouen, or of whatever vestiges of the city had survived his former ravages, and from that starting-point he assaulted Chartres. Beneath the walls of that city he underwent a defeat [A. D. 911] at the hands of the Dukes Rudolf of Burgundy and Robert of Paris, which was attributed to the miraculous powers of the great local relic, the under-garment of the Virgin. But this victory, like most victories over the

Northmen, had no lasting effect. Rolf was not dislodged from Rouen, nor was his career of devastation and conquest at all seriously checked. But, precisely as in the case of Guthrum in England, his evident disposition to settle in the country suggested an attempt to change him from a devastating enemy into a peaceable neighbour. The Peace of Clair-on-Epte [A. D. 911] was the duplicate of the Peace of Wedmore, and King Charles and Duke Robert of Paris most likely had the Peace of Wedmore before their eyes. A definite district was ceded to Rolf, for which he became the King's vassal; he was admitted to baptism and received the king's natural daughter in marriage. And, just as in the English case, the territory ceded was not part of the King's immediate dominions. . . . The grant to Rolf was made at the cost not of the Frankish King at Laôn but of the French Duke at Paris. The district ceded to Rolf was part of the great Neustrian March or Duchy which had been granted to Odo [or Eudes] of Paris and which was now held by his brother Duke Robert. . . . It must not be thought that the district now ceded to Rolf took in the whole of the later Duchy of Normandy. Rouen was the heart of the new state, which took in lands on both sides of the Seine. From the Epte to the sea was its undoubted extent from the south-east to the north. But the western frontier is much less clearly defined. On the one hand, the Normans always claimed a certain not very well defined superiority over Britanny as part of the original grant. On the other hand, it is quite certain that Rolf did not obtain immediate possession of what was afterwards the noblest portion of the heritage of his descendants. The Bessin, the district of Bayeux, was not won till several years later, and the Côtentin, the peninsula of Coutances, was not won till after the death of Rolf. The district granted to Rolf . . . had — sharing therein the fate of Germany and France — no recognized geographical name. Its inhabitants were the Northmen, the Northmen of the Seine, the Northmen of Rouen. The land itself was, till near the end of the century, simply the Land of the Northmen"— the Terra Northmannorum.—E. A. Freeman, *Hist. Norman Conquest of Eng., ch.* 4 (*v.* 1).

Also in: Sir F. Palgrave, *Hist. of Normandy and England, bk.* 1, *ch.* 3-5.—A. Thierry, *Norman Conquest of England, bk.* 2.—See, also, France: A. D. 877-987.

A. D. 876-984.— Discovery and settlement of Greenland. — "The discovery of Greenland was a natural consequence of the settlement of Iceland, just as the discovery of America afterward was a natural consequence of the settlement of Greenland. Between the western part of Iceland and the eastern part of Greenland there is a distance of only 45 geographical miles. Hence, some of the ships that sailed to Iceland, at the time of the settlement of this island and later, could in case of a violent east wind, which is no rare occurrence in those regions, scarcely avoid approaching the coast of Greenland sufficiently to catch a glimpse of its jokuls,— nay, even to land on its islands and promontories. Thus it is said that Gunnbjorn, Ulf Krage's son, saw land lying in the ocean at the west of Iceland, when, in the year 876, he was driven out to the sea by a storm. Similar reports were heard, from time to time, by other mariners. About a century later a certain man, by name Erik the Red, . . . resolved to go in search of the land in the west that Gunnbjorn and others had seen. He set sail in the year 984, and found the land as he had expected, and remained there exploring the country for two years. At the end of this period he returned to Iceland, giving the newly-discovered country the name of Greenland, in order, as he said, to attract settlers, who would be favorably impressed with so pleasing a name. The result was that many Icelanders and Norsemen emigrated to Greenland, and a flourishing colony was established, with Gardar for its capital city, which, in the year 1261, became subject to the crown of Norway. The Greenland colony maintained its connection with the mother countries for a period of no less than 400 years; yet it finally disappeared, and was almost forgotten. Torfæus gives a list of seventeen bishops who ruled in Greenland."— R. B. Anderson, *America not Discovered by Columbus, ch.* 7.

Also in: D. Crantz, *Hist. of Greenland, bk.* 4, *ch.* 1.

A. D. 885-886.—The Great Siege of Paris. See Paris: A. D. 885-886.

9-10th Centuries.— The Danish conquests and settlements in Ireland. See Ireland: 9-10th Centuries; and A. D. 1014.

9-10th Centuries.—The ravages of the Vikings on the Continent.—"Take the map and colour with vermilion the provinces, districts and shores which the Northmen visited. The colouring will have to be repeated more than ninety times successively before you arrive at the conclusion of the Carlovingian dynasty. Furthermore, mark by the usual symbol of war, two crossed swords, the localities where battles were fought by or against the pirates: where they were defeated or triumphant, or where they pillaged, burned or destroyed; and the valleys and banks of Elbe, Rhine and Moselle, Scheldt, Meuse, Somme and Seine, Loire, Garonne and Adour, the inland Allier, and all the coasts and coast-lands between estuary and estuary and the countries between the river-streams, will appear bristling as with chevaux-de-frise. The strongly-fenced Roman cities, the venerated Abbeys and their dependent bourgades, often more flourishing and extensive than the ancient seats of government, the opulent seaports and trading towns, were all equally exposed to the Danish attacks, stunned by the Northmen's approach, subjugated by their fury. . . . They constitute three principal schemes of naval and military operations, respectively governed and guided by the great rivers and the intervening sea-shores. . . . The first scheme of operations includes the territories between Rhine and Scheldt, and Scheldt and Elbe: the furthest southern point reached by the Northmen in this direction was somewhere between the Rhine and the Neckar. Eastward, the Scandinavians scattered as far as Russia; but we must not follow them there. The second scheme of operations affected the countries between Seine and Loire, and again from the Seine eastward towards the Somme and Oise. These operations were connected with those of the Rhine Northmen. The third scheme of operations was prosecuted in the countries between Loire and Garonne, and Garonne and Adour, frequently flashing towards Spain, and expanding inland as far as the Allier and central France, nay, to the very centre, to Bourges."— Sir F. Palgrave, *Hist. of Normandy and Eng., bk.* 1, *ch.* 3 (*v.* 1).

ALSO IN: C. F. Keary, *The Vikings in Western Christendom, ch.* 9–15.

A. D. 979-1016.—The Danish conquest of England. See ENGLAND: A. D. 979–1016.

A. D. 986-1011. — Supposed voyages to America. See AMERICA: 10–11TH CENTURIES.

10-13th Centuries.—The breaking up of the Norse island empire.—"At the close of the 10th and beginning of the 11th century the battles of Tara and Clontarf overthrew the power of these Norsemen (or Ostmen as they were called) in Ireland, and restored the authority of the native Irish sovereign. About this time they [the 'Hy-Ivar,' or sovereigns of the island-empire of the Northmen — see above: 8–9TH CENTURIES] became Christians, and in the year 1066 we find one of their princes joining Harald Hardrada of Norway in his invasion of England, which ended so disastrously in the battle of Stamford Bridge. Magnus of Norway, thirty-two years later, after subduing the independent Jarls of Shetland and the Orkneys, attempted to reassert his supremacy along the western coast. But after conquering Anglesea, whence he drove out the Normans [from England] who had just made a settlement there, he crossed to Ireland to meet his death in battle. The sovereignty of the Isles was then restored to its original owners, but soon after split into two parts — the Suderies and Norderies (whence the term Sodor and Man), north and south of Ardnamurchan Point. The next glimpse we have of these dominions is at the close of the 12th century, when we find them under a chief named Somarled, who exercised authority in the islands and Argyleshire, and from him the clans of the Highlands and the Western Isles love to trace their ancestry. After his death, according to the Highland traditions, the islands and Argyleshire were divided amongst his three sons. Thus the old Norse empire was finally broken up, and in the 13th century, after another unsuccessful attempt by Haco, King of Norway, to re-establish the authority of the mother kingdom over their distant possessions, an attempt which ended in his defeat at the battle of Largs by the Scottish king, Alexander III., they were ceded to the Scottish kings by Magnus IV., his son, and an alliance was cemented between the two kingdoms by the marriage of Alexander's daughter, Margaret, to Eric of Norway." At the north of Scotland the Jarls of Orkney, in the 11th century, "conquered Caithness and Sutherland, and wrested a recognition of their claim from Malcolm II. of Scotland. Their influence was continually felt in the dynastic and other quarrels of Scotland; the defeat of Duncan, in 1040, by the Jarl of Orkney, contributing not a little to Duncan's subsequent overthrow by Macbeth. They fostered the independence of the north of Scotland against the southern king, and held their kingdom until, in 1355, it passed by the female line to the house of Sinclair. The Sinclairs now transferred their allegiance to their natural master, the King of Scotland; and finally the kingdom of the Orkneys was handed over to James III. as the dowry of his bride, Margaret of Norway."—A. H. Johnson, *The Normans in Europe, ch.* 2.

ALSO IN: J. H. Burton, *Hist. of Scotland, ch.* 15 (*v.* 2).—See, also, IRELAND: A. D. 1014.

A. D. 1000-1063.—The Northmen in France become French. See NORMANDY: A. D. 911–1000; and 1035–1063.

A. D. 1000-1194.—Conquests and settlement in Southern Italy and Sicily. See ITALY (SOUTHERN): A. D. 1000–1090; and 1081–1194.

A. D. 1016-1042.—The reign of the Danish kings in England. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1016–1042.

A. D. 1066-1071.—Conquest of England by Duke William of Normandy. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1042–1066; 1066; and 1066–1071.

A. D. 1081-1085.—Attempted conquest of the Byzantine Empire. See BYZANTINE EMPIRE: A. D. 1081–1085.

A. D. 1084.—The sack and burning of Rome. See ROME: A. D. 1081–1084.

A. D. 1146.—Ravages in Greece. See BYZANTINE EMPIRE: A. D. 1146.

A. D. 1504.—Early enterprise on the Newfoundland fishing banks. See NEWFOUNDLAND: A. D. 1501–1578.

NORTH, Lord, Administration of. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1770, to 1782–1783.

NORTH ANNA, The passage of the. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1864 (MAY: VIRGINIA).

NORTH BRITON, No. 45, The. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1762–1764.

NORTH CAROLINA: The aboriginal inhabitants. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: ALGONQUIAN FAMILY, CHEROKEES, IROQUOIS TRIBES OF THE SOUTH, SHAWANESE, and TIMUQUANAN FAMILY.

A. D. 1524.—Discovery of the coast by Verrazano. See AMERICA: A. D. 1523–1524.

A. D. 1585-1587.—Raleigh's attempted settlements at Roanoke. See AMERICA: A. D. 1584–1586; and 1587–1590.

A. D. 1629. — The grant to Sir Robert Heath. See AMERICA: A. D. 1629.

A. D. 1639-1663.—Pioneer and unorganized colonization.—"An abortive attempt at colonization was made in 1639, and a titular governor appeared in Virginia; but this, and a number of conflicting claims originating in this patent [to Sir Robert Heath], and sufficiently troublesome to the proprietaries of a later time, were the only results of the grant of Charles I. This action on the part of the Crown, and the official information received, did not, however, suffice to prevent the Virginia Assembly lending itself to a scheme by which possession might be obtained of the neighboring territory, or at least substantial benefits realized therefrom by their constituents. With this object, they made grants to a trading company, which led, however, only to exploration and traffic. Other grants of a similar nature followed for the next ten years, at the expiration of which a company of Virginians made their way from Nansemond to Albemarle, and established a settlement there. The Virginian Burgesses granted them lands, and promised further grants to all who would extend these settlements to the southward. Emigration from Virginia began. Settlers, singly and in companies, crossed the border, and made scattered and solitary clearings within the wilds of North Carolina. Many of these people were mere adventurers; but some of them were of more substantial stuff, and founded permanent settlements on the Chowan and elsewhere. Other eyes, however, as watchful as those of the Virginians, were also turned to the rich regions of the South. New

England enterprise explored the American coast from one end to the other, in search of lucrative trade and new resting-places. After a long acquaintance with the North Carolina coast, they bought land of the Indians, near the mouth of Cape Fear River, and settled there. For some unexplained cause — possibly on account of the wild and dangerous character of the scattered inhabitants, who had already drifted thither from Virginia, possibly from the reason which they themselves gave — the New England colonists abandoned their settlement and departed, leaving a written opinion of the poor character of the country expressed in very plain language and pinned to a post. Here it was found by some wanderers from Barbadoes, who were of a different opinion from the New Englanders as to the appearance of things; and they accordingly repurchased the land from the Indians and began a settlement. At this date [1663], therefore, there was in North Carolina this infant settlement of the Barbadoes men, on the extreme south-eastern point of the present State, and in the north-eastern corner the Virginia settlers scattered about, with here a solitary plantation and there a little group of farms, and always a restless van of adventurers working their way down the coast and into the interior. . . . Whatever rights the North Carolina settlers may have had in the eyes of the Virginians, who had granted them land, or in those of the Indians who had sold it, they had none recognized by the English King, who claimed to own all that vast region. It may be doubted whether anything was known of these early colonists in England; and their existence was certainly not regarded in the least when Charles II. lavished their territory, and much besides, upon a band of his courtiers and ministers."—H. C. Lodge, *Short Hist. of the English Colonies, ch.* 5.

Also in: J. W. Moore, *Hist. of N. C., v.* 1, *ch.* 2.

A. D. 1663-1670.—The grant to Monk, Clarendon, Shaftesbury and others.—The organized colonies.—"On the 24th March, 1663, King Charles II. granted to Edward, Earl of Clarendon; George [Monk], Duke of Albemarle; William, Earl of Craven; John, Lord Berkeley; Anthony, Lord Ashley [Earl of Shaftesbury]; Sir George Carteret, Sir John Colleton, and Sir William Berkeley, all the country between the Pacific and Atlantic Oceans, between 31° and 36° parallels of latitude, called Carolina, in honor of Charles. [The grant embraced the present States of Georgia, Alabama and Mississippi, as well as the two Carolinas.] In 1663, Sir William Berkeley, Governor of the Colony of Virginia, visited the province, and appointed William Drummond Governor of the Colony of Carolina. . . . Drummond, at his death in 1667, was succeeded by Stevens as governor. . . . The first assembly that made laws for Carolina, assembled in the fall of 1669. . . . A form of government, magnificent in design, and labored in detail, called 'The fundamental constitutions of Carolina,' were drawn up by the celebrated author of the Essay on the Human Understanding, John Locke. . . . On the death of Governor Stevens, who died in the colony full of years and wealth, the assembly chose Carteret for their governor, and on his return to England soon after, Eastchurch, who then was in England, was appointed governor, and Miller secretary."—J. H. Wheeler, *Historical Sketches of North Carolina, ch.* 4.—"The earliest grant made to the lords proprietors did not include the whole of the present State of North Carolina. Its northern line fell short of the southern boundary of Virginia by half a degree of latitude. Notwithstanding this, an unwarranted exhibition of authority established virtually the proprietary dominion over this unappropriated territory. . . . Colonel Byrd of Virginia, who was born not long after the charter of 1665 was made, and who lived during the administration of Berkeley, states, and no doubt truly, that 'Sir William Berkeley, who was one of the grantees, and at that time governor of Virginia, finding a territory of 31 miles in breadth between the inhabited part of Virginia and the above-mentioned boundary of Carolina [36°], advised the Lord Clarendon of it. And his lordship had interest enough with the king to obtain a second patent to include it, dated June 30th, 1665.' By this patent very large powers were granted; so large that, as Chalmers has remarked, 'no one prerogative of the crown was preserved, except only the sovereign dominion. . . . The existence of the colony from Barbadoes, under Sir John Yeamans, that settled in the old county of Clarendon, from its inception in 1665 to its abandonment in 1690, forms but an episode in the proprietary history of North Carolina. The colony, like all others similarly situated, sought at first to make provision for the supply of bodily wants, in securing food and shelter only; but having done this it next proceeded to make profitable the gifts of Heaven that were around it. Yeamans had brought with him negro slaves from Barbadoes, and so inviting was the new settlement deemed, that in the second year of its existence it contained 800 inhabitants. . . . But with all this prosperity, the colony on the Cape Fear was not destined to be permanent. The action of the lords proprietors themselves caused its abandonment. . . . In 1670, the lords proprietors, who seem to have been anxious to proceed more and more to the southward, sent out a considerable number of emigrants to form a colony at Port Royal, now Beaufort, in the present State of South Carolina. The individual who led the expedition was William Sayle, 'a man of experience,' says Chalmers, 'who had been appointed governor of that part of the coast lying southwestward of Cape Carteret.' . . . Scarcely however, had Sayle carried out his instructions and made his colonists somewhat comfortable, before his constitution yielded to a new and insalubrious climate, and he died. . . . It was not easy for the proprietors immediately to find a fit successor; and, even had such been at hand, some time must necessarily have elapsed before he could safely reach the scene of his labors. But Sir John Yeamans was near the spot: his long residence had acclimated him, and, as the historian states, he 'had hitherto ruled the plantation around Cape Fear with a prudence which precluded complaint.' He therefore was directed to extend his command from old Clarendon, on the Cape Fear, to the territory which was southwest of Cape Carteret. This was in August, 1671. The shores with the adjacent land, and the streams making into the sea, were by this time very well known to all the dwellers in Carolina, for the proprietors had caused them to be surveyed with accuracy. On the banks of

Ashley River there was good pasturage, and land fit for tillage. The planters of Clarendon, therefore, turned their faces southward, while those from Port Royal travelled northward; and so the colonists from both settlements met on the banks of the Ashley, as on a middle ground, and here in the same year (1671) they laid, 'on the first high land,' the foundations of 'old Charlestown.' In 1679, it was found that 'Oyster Point,' formed by the confluence of Ashley and Cooper rivers, was more convenient for a town than the spot previously selected, and the people, with the encouragement of the lords proprietors, began to remove thither. In the next year (1680) were laid the foundations of the present city of Charleston; thirty houses were built, and it was declared to be the capital of the southern part of the province, and also the port for all commercial traffic. This gradually depopulated old Clarendon. . . . We now return to trace the fortunes of the settlement on Albemarle, under Stephens. As before stated he entered upon his duties as governor in October, 1667. . . . His instructions were very full and explicit. The Assembly was to be composed of the governor, a council of twelve, and twelve delegates chosen by the freeholders. Of the twelve councillors, whose advice, by the way, the governor was required always to take and follow, one half was to be appointed by the Assembly, the other half by himself. To this Assembly belonged not only the power to make laws, but a large share of the executive authority also. . . . In 1669, the first legislature under this constitution assembled. And it is worthy of remark, that at this period, when the province may be said to have had, for the first time, a system of regular government, there was in it a recognition of two great principles which are now part of the political creed of our whole country, without distinction of party. These are, first, that the people are entitled to a voice in the selection of their law-makers; and secondly, that they cannot rightfully be taxed but by their own representatives. . . . The people, we have reason to believe, were contented and happy during the early part of Stephens' administration. . . . But this quiet condition of affairs was not to last. We have now reached a period in our history which illustrates the fact, that whatever wisdom may be apparent in the constitution given to the Albemarle colony by the proprietors, on the accession of Stephens, was less the result of deliberation than of a happy accident. . . . But the time had now come for the proprietors to carry out their magnificent project of founding an empire; and disregarding alike the nature of man, the lessons of experience, and the physical obstacles of an unsubdued wilderness (even not yet entirely reclaimed), they resolved that all should yield to their theories of government, and invoked the aid of philosophy to accomplish an impossibility. Locke was employed to prepare 'the fundamental constitutions.'"—F. L. Hawks, *Hist. of N. Carolina, v. 2, pp.* 441–462.

Also in: W. C. Bryant and S. H. Gay, *Popular Hist. of the U. S., v. 2, ch.* 12.

A. D. 1669-1693.—The Fundamental Constitutions of John Locke, and their failure.—The royal grant of the Carolinas to Monk, Shaftesbury, Clarendon, and their associates invested them with "all the rights, jurisdiction, royalties, privileges, and liberties within the bounds of their province, to hold, use, and enjoy the same, in as ample a manner as the bishop of Durham did in that county-palatine in England. . . . Agreeably to these powers, the proprietors proceeded to frame a system of laws for the colony which they projected. Locke, the well-known philosopher, was summoned to this work, and the largest expectations were entertained in consequence of his co-operation. Locke, though subsequently one of the proprietors, was, at the beginning, simply the secretary of the earl of Shaftesbury. The probability is that, in preparing the constitution for the Carolinas, he rather carried out the notions of that versatile nobleman than his own. . . . The code of laws called the 'Fundamental Constitutions,' which was devised, and which subsequently became unpopular in the colony, is not certainly the work of his hands. It is ascribed by Oldmixon, a contemporary, to the earl of Shaftesbury, one of the proprietors. The most striking feature in this code provided for the creation of a nobility, consisting of landgraves, cassiques, and barons. These were to be graduated by the landed estates which were granted with the dignity; the eldest of the proprietary lords was to be the superior, with the title of Palatine, and the people were to be serfs." The tenants, and the issue of the tenants, "were to be transferred with the soil, and not at liberty to leave it, but with the lord's permission, under hand and seal. The whole system was rejected after a few years' experiment. It has been harshly judged as . . . the crude conception of a mind conversant rather with books than men — with the abstract rather than the practical in government and society. And this judgment is certainly true of the constitutions in the case in which they were employed. They did not suit the absolute conditions of the country, or the class of people which subsequently made their way to it. But contemplating the institution of domestic slavery, as the proprietors had done from the beginning — a large villanage and a wealthy aristocracy, dominating almost without restraint or responsibility over the whole — the scheme was not without its plausibilities. But the feudal tenures were everywhere dying out. The time had passed, even in Europe, for such a system. . . . The great destitution of the first settlers left them generally without the means of procuring slaves; and the equal necessities, to which all are subject who peril life and fortune in a savage forest and on a foreign shore, soon made the titular distinctions of the few a miserable mockery, or something worse."—W. G. Simms, *Hist. of S. Carolina, bk.* 2, *ch.* 1.—"The constitutions were signed on the 21st of July, 1669;" but subsequently revised by the interpolation of a clause, against the wishes of Locke, establishing the Church of England. "This revised copy of 'the model' was not signed till March, 1670. To a colony of which the majority were likely to be dissenters, the change was vital; it was scarcely noticed in England, where the model became the theme of extravagant applause. . . . As far as depended upon the proprietaries, the government was immediately organized with Monk, duke of Albemarle, as palatine." But, meantime, the colonists in the northern part of the Carolina province had instituted a simple form of government for themselves, with a council of twelve, and an assembly

composed of the governor, the council, and twelve delegates from the freeholders of the incipient settlements. The assembly had already met and had framed some important laws, which remained "valid in North Carolina for more than half a century. Hardly had these laws been established when the new constitution was forwarded to Albemarle. Its promulgation did but favor anarchy by invalidating the existing system, which it could not replace. The proprietaries, contrary to stipulations with the colonists, superseded the existing government, and the colonists resolutely rejected the substitute." Much the same state of things appeared in the South Carolina settlements (not yet separately named), and successive disorders and revolutionary changes made up the history of the pseudo palatinate for many years.—G. Bancroft, *Hist. of the U. S.* (*Author's last rev.*), *pt.* 2, *ch.* 7 (*v.* 1).—In 1693, "to conciliate the colonists, and to get rid of the dispute which had arisen as to the binding force of the 'Grand Model,' the proprietors voted that, 'as the people have declared they would rather be governed by the powers granted by the charter, without regard to the fundamental constitutions, it will be for their quiet, and the protection of the well-disposed, to grant their request.' This abrogation of the labors of Locke removed one bone of contention; but as the 'Grand Model' had never been actually carried into effect, the government went on much as before. Each of the proprietaries continued to have his special delegate in the colony, or rather two delegates, one for South Carolina, the other for Albemarle, the eight together constituting the council in either province, over which the governor presided as delegate of the palatine, to whom his appointment belonged."—R. Hildreth, *Hist. of the U. S.*, *ch.* 21 (*v.* 2).—The text of the "fundamental constitutions" is printed in volume 9 of the 12th edition of Locke's complete works, and in volume 10 of several prior editions.

A. D. 1688-1729.—Slow progress and unprosperous state of the colony.—End of the Proprietary Government.—In 1688, Carolina (the northern province) being afflicted with a governor, one Seth Sothel, who is accused of every variety of extortion and rapacity, the colonists rose up against him, tried him before their assembly, deposed him from his office and drove him into exile. "The Proprietors demurred to the form of this procedure, but acquiesced in the substance of it, and thereby did something to confirm that contempt for government which was one of the leading characteristics of the colony. During the years which followed, the efforts of the Proprietors to maintain any authority over their Northern province, or to connect it in any way with their Southern territory, were little more than nominal. For the most part the two settlements were distinguished by the Proprietors as 'our colony north-east of Cape Fear,' and 'our colony south-west of Cape Fear.' As early as 1691 we find the expression North Carolina once used. After that we do not meet with it till 1696. From that time onward both expressions are used with no marked distinction, sometimes even in the same document. At times the Proprietors seem to have aimed at establishing a closer connexion between the two colonies by placing them under a single Governor. But in nearly all these cases provision was made for the appointment of separate Deputy-Governors, nor does there seem to have been any project for uniting the two legislative bodies. . . . In 1720 the first event occurred which throws any clear light from without on the internal life of the colony. In that year boundary disputes arose between Virginia and her southern neighbour and it was found necessary to appoint representatives on each side to settle the boundary line. The chief interest of the matter lies in the notes left to us by one of the Virginia Commissioners [Colonel William Byrd]. . . . After making all . . . deductions and checking Byrd's report by that of graver writers, there remains a picture of poverty, indolence, and thriftlessness which finds no counterpart in any of the other southern colonies. That the chief town contained only some fifty poor cottages is little or nothing more than what we find in Maryland or Virginia. But there the import trade with England made up for the deficiencies of colonial life. North Carolina, lacking the two essentials of trade, harbours and a surplus population, had no commercial dealings with the mother country. . . . The only possessions which abounded were horses and swine, both of which could be reared in droves without any care or attention. . . . The evils of slavery existed without its counterbalancing advantages. There was nothing to teach those habits of administration which the rich planters of Virginia and South Carolina learnt as part of their daily life. At the same time the colony suffered from one of the worst effects of slavery, a want of manual skill. . . . In 1729 the faint and meaningless shadow of proprietary government came to an end. The Crown bought up first the shares of seven Proprietors, then after an interval that of the eighth. In the case of other colonies the process of transfer had been effected by a conflict and by something approaching to revolution. In North Carolina alone it seems to have come about with the peaceful assent of all parties. . . . Without a struggle, North Carolina cast off all traces of its peculiar origin and passed into the ordinary state of a crown colony."—J. A. Doyle, *The English in America: Virginia, Maryland and the Carolinas*, *ch.* 12.

A. D. 1710.—Palatine colonization at New Berne. See PALATINES.

A. D. 1711-1714.—Indian rising and massacre of colonists.—Subjugation and expulsion of the Tuscaroras. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: IROQUOIS TRIBES OF THE SOUTH.

A. D. 1740.—War with the Spaniards in Florida. See GEORGIA: A. D. 1738-1743.

A. D. 1759-1761.—The Cherokee War. See SOUTH CAROLINA: A. D. 1759-1761.

A. D. 1760-1766.—The question of taxation by Parliament.—The Stamp Act.—The First Continental Congress.—The repeal of the Stamp Act and the Declaratory Act. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1760-1775; 1763-1764; 1765; and 1766.

A. D. 1766-1768.—The Townshend Duties.—The Circular Letter of Massachusetts. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1766-1767; and 1767-1768.

A. D. 1766-1771.—The insurrection of the Regulators.—Battle of Alamance.—Complaints of official extortion, which were loud in several of the colonies at about the same period, led to serious results in North Carolina. "Complaints were most rife in the middle counties, a

very barren portion of the province, with a population generally poor and ignorant. These people complained, and not without reason — for the poor and ignorant are ever most exposed to oppression — not only that excessive fees were extorted, but that the sheriffs collected taxes of which they rendered no account. They seem also to have held the courts and lawyers — indeed, the whole system for the collection of debts — in great detestation. Presently, under the name of 'Regulators,' borrowed from South Carolina, they formed associations which not only refused the payment of taxes, but assaulted the persons and property of lawyers, judges, sheriffs, and other obnoxious individuals, and even proceeded so far as to break up the sessions of the courts. The common name of Regulators designated, in the two Carolinas, combinations composed of different materials, and having different objects in view. The Assembly of the province took decided ground against them, and even expelled one of their leaders, who had been elected a member. After negotiations and delays, and broken promises to keep the peace, Governor Tryon, at the head of a body of volunteers, marched into the disaffected counties. The Regulators assembled in arms, and an action was fought at Alamance, on the Haw, near the head waters of Cape Fear River, in which some 200 were left dead upon the field. Out of a large number taken prisoners, six were executed for high treason. Though the Regulators submitted, they continued to entertain a deadly hatred against the militia of the lower counties, which had taken part against them. Tryon was presently removed from North Carolina to New York. His successor, Joseph Martin, anxious to strengthen himself against the growing discontents of the province, promised to redress the grievances, and sedulously cultivated the good will of the Regulators, and with such success that they became, in the end, staunch supporters of the royal authority."—R. Hildreth, *Hist. of the U. S., ch.* 29 (*v.* 2).

Also in: F. X. Martin, *Hist. of N. Carolina, ch.* 7–8.—J. H. Wheeler, *Hist. of N. Carolina, ch.* 8.—F. L. Hawks, *Battle of the Alamance* (*Rev. Hist. of N. C.*).

A. D. 1768-1774.—Opening events of the Revolution. See Boston: A. D. 1768, to 1773; and United States of Am.: A. D. 1770, to 1774.

A. D. 1769-1772.—The first settlement of Tennessee.—The Watauga Association. See Tennessee: A. D. 1769–1772.

A. D. 1775.—The beginning of the War of the American Revolution.—Lexington.—Concord.—Action on the news.—Ticonderoga.—The Siege of Boston.—Bunker Hill.—The Second Continental Congress. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1775.

A. D. 1775 (May).—The Mecklenburg Declaration.—"It has been strenuously claimed and denied that, at a meeting of the people of Mecklenburg County, in North Carolina, on May 20, 1775, resolutions were passed declaring their independence of Great Britain. The facts in the case appear to be these:—On the 31st of May, 1775, the people of this county did pass resolutions quite abreast of the public sentiment of that time, but not venturing on the field of independency further than to say that these resolutions were to remain in force till Great Britain resigned its pretensions. These resolutions were well written, attracted notice, and were copied into the leading newspapers of the colonies, North and South, and can be found in various later works (Lossing's 'Field-Book,' ii, 619, etc.). A copy of the 'S. Carolina Gazette' containing them was sent by Governor Wright, of Georgia, to Lord Dartmouth, and was found by Bancroft in the State Paper Office, while in the Sparks MSS. (no. lvi) is the record of a copy sent to the home government by Governor Martin of North Carolina, with a letter dated June 30, 1775. Of these resolutions there is no doubt (Frothingham's 'Rise of the Republic,' 422). In 1793, or earlier, some of the actors in the proceeding, apparently ignorant that the record of these resolutions had been preserved in the newspapers, endeavored to supply them from memory, unconsciously intermingling some of the phraseology of the Declaration of July 4th, in Congress, which gave them the tone of a pronounced independency. Probably through another dimness of memory they affixed the date of May 20, 1775, to them. These were first printed in the 'Raleigh Register,' April 30, 1819. They are found to resemble in some respects the now known resolves of May 31st, as well as the national Declaration in a few phrases. In 1829 Martin printed them, much altered, in his 'North Carolina' (ii, 272) but it is not known where this copy came from. In 1831 the State printed the text of the 1819 copy, and fortified it with recollections and certificates of persons affirming that they were present when the resolutions were passed on the 20th."—J. Winsor, *Note in Narrative and Critical Hist. of Am., v.* 6, *p.* 256.—"We are inclined to conjecture that there was a popular meeting at Charlottetown on the 19th and 20th of May, where discussion was had on the subject of independence, and probably some more or less explicit understanding arrived at, which became the basis of the committee's action on the 31st. If so, we make no doubt that J. McN. Alexander was secretary of that meeting. He, probably, in that case, recorded the proceedings, and among them some resolution or resolutions in regard to the propriety of throwing off the British yoke. . . . It was in attempting to remember the records of that meeting, destroyed by fire, that John McN. Alexander, then an old man, fell into the errors" which led him, in 1800, to certify, as Secretary, a copy of the document called the Mecklenburg Declaration of Independence.—H. S. Randall, *Life of Jefferson, v.* 3, *app.* 2.

Also in: W. A. Graham, *Address on the Mecklenburg Declaration*, 1875.—F. L. Hawks, *The Mecklenburg Declaration* (*Rev. Hist. of Georgia*).

A. D. 1775-1776.—The arming of the loyalist Highlanders and their defeat at Moore's Creek.—The first colony vote for independence.—"North Carolina was the first colony to act as a unit in favor of independence. It was the fourth in importance of the United Colonies. Its Provincial Congress had organized the militia, and vested the public authority in a provincial council for the whole colony, committees of safety for the districts, and county and town committees. A large portion of the people were adherents of the crown,—among them a body of Highland emigrants, and most of the party of regulators. Governor Martin represented, not without grounds, that, if these loyalists were supported by a British force, the colony might be

gained to the royal side. The loyalists were also numerous in Georgia and South Carolina. Hence it was determined by the King to send an expedition to the Southern Colonies in the winter, to restore the royal authority. This was put under the command of Sir Henry Clinton, and ordered to rendezvous at Cape Fear. 'I am clear,' wrote George III., 'the first attempt should be made on North Carolina, as the Highland settlers are said to be well inclined.' Commissions were issued to men of influence among them, one being Allan McDonald, the husband of the chivalrous Flora McDonald, who became famous by romantic devotion to Prince Charles Edward. Donald McDonald was appointed the commander. These officers, under the direction of the governor, after much secret consultation, enrolled about 1,500 men. The popular leaders, however, were informed of their designs. The militia were summoned, and took the field under Colonel James Moore. At length, when Sir Henry Clinton was expected at Cape Fear, General McDonald erected the royal standard at Cross Creek, now Fayetteville, and moved forward to join Clinton. Colonel Moore ordered parties of the militia to take post at Moore's Creek Bridge, over which McDonald would be obliged to pass. Colonel Richard Caswell was at the head of one of these parties: hence the force here was under his command: and this place on the 27th of February [1776] became a famous battle-field. The Provincials were victorious. They captured a great quantity of military supplies, nearly 900 men, and their commander. This was the Lexington and Concord of that region. The newspapers circulated the details of this brilliant result. The spirit of the Whigs run high. . . . A strong force was soon ready and anxious to meet Clinton. Amidst these scenes, the people elected delegates to a Provincial Congress, which met, on the 4th of April [1776], at Halifax. . . . Attempts were made to ascertain the sense of the people on independence. . . . The subject was referred to a committee, of which Cornelius Harnett was the chairman. They reported an elaborate preamble . . . and a resolution to empower the delegates in the General Congress 'to concur with the delegates in the other colonies in declaring independency and forming foreign alliances,— reserving to the colony the sole and exclusive right of forming a constitution and laws for it,' also 'of appointing delegates in a general representation of the colonies for such purposes as might be agreed upon.' This was unanimously adopted on the 12th of April. Thus the popular party carried North Carolina as a unit in favor of independence, when the colonies, from New England to Virginia, were in solid array against it. The example was warmly welcomed by the patriots, and commended for imitation."— R. Frothingham, *The Rise of the Republic, ch.* 11.

Also in: J. W. Moore, *Hist. of N. C., v.* 1, *ch.* 10.— D. L. Swain, *British Invasion of N. Carolina in* 1776 (*Rev. Hist. of N. C.*).—See, also, United States of Am.: A. D. 1776 (June).

A. D. 1776.— Annexation of the Watauga settlements (Tennessee). See Tennessee: A. D. 1776-1784.

A. D. 1776-1780.—Independence declared.— Adoption of State Constitution.— The war in the North.—British conquest of Georgia. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1776, to 1780.

A. D. 1780-1783.—The war in the South.— Greene's campaign.—King's Mountain.—The Cowpens.—Guilford Court House.—Hobkirk's Hill.— Eutaw Springs.— Yorktown.— Peace. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1780, to 1783.

A. D. 1784.—Revolt of the Tennessee settlements against their cession to Congress. See Tennessee: A. D. 1776-1784.

A. D. 1785-1788.—The state of Franklin organized by the Tennessee settlers.— Its brief and troubled history. See Tennessee: A. D. 1785; and 1785-1796.

A. D. 1786.— Importation of Negroes discouraged. See Slavery, Negro: A. D. 1776-1808.

A. D. 1787-1789.—Formation and adoption of the Federal Constitution. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1787; and 1787-1789.

A. D. 1790.— Renewed cession of western Territory (Tennessee) to the United States. See Tennessee: A. D. 1785-1796; also, United States of Am.: A. D. 1781-1786.

A. D. 1861 (January—May).— The difficult dragging of the state into Secession.— "A large majority of the people of North Carolina were opposed to secession. They did not regard it as a constitutional right. They were equally opposed to a separation from the Union in resentment of the election of Mr. Lincoln. But the Governor, John W. Ellis, was in full sympathy with the secessionists. He spared no pains to bring the state into line with South Carolina [which had passed her ordinance of Secession December 20, 1860,— see United States of Am.: A. D. 1860 (November— December)]. The legislature met on the 20th of November. The governor, in his message, recommended that the legislature should invite a conference with the Southern States, or send delegates to them for the purpose of securing their co-operation. He also recommended the reorganization of the militia, and the call of a state convention. Bills were introduced for the purpose of carrying these measures into effect. . . . On the 30th of January, a bill for calling a state convention was passed. It provided that no secession ordinance, nor one connecting the state with the Southern Confederacy, would be valid until it should be ratified by a majority of the qualified voters of the state. The vote of the people was appointed to take place on the 28th of February. The delegates were elected on the day named. A large majority of them were Unionists. But, at the same time, the convention itself was voted down. The vote for a convention was 46,671; against a convention, 47,333. The majority against it was 662. This majority against a convention, however, was no criterion of popular sentiment in regard to secession. The true test was the votes received, respectively, by the Union and secession delegates. The former received a majority of nearly 30,000. But the indefatigable governor was not to be balked by the popular dislike for secession. The legislature was called together in extra session on May 1. On the same day they voted to have another election for delegates to a state convention on the 13th of the month. The election took place accordingly, and the delegates convened on the 20th. On the following day the secession ordinance was adopted, and the Confederate Constitution ratified. To save time, and avoid further

obstructions, the question of popular approval was taken for granted."— S. S. Cox, *Three Decades of Federal Legislation, pp.* 119–120.

ALSO IN: J. W. Moore, *Hist. of N. Carolina, v.* 2, *ch.* 5.—See, also, UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1861 (MARCH—APRIL).

A. D. 1861 (April).—Governor Ellis' reply to President Lincoln's call for troops. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1861 (APRIL) PRESIDENT LINCOLN'S CALL TO ARMS.

A. D. 1861 (August).—Hatteras Inlet taken by the Union forces. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1861 (AUGUST: NORTH CAROLINA).

A. D. 1862 (January — April). — Capture of Roanoke Island, Newbern and Beaufort by the Union forces. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1862 (JANUARY — APRIL: NORTH CAROLINA).

A. D. 1862 (May).—Appointment of a Military Governor. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1862 (MARCH—JUNE).

A. D. 1864 (April—May).—Exploits of the ram Albemarle.—Confederate capture of Plymouth. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1864 (APRIL—MAY: NORTH CAROLINA).

A. D. 1864 (October).—Destruction of the ram Albemarle. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1864 (OCTOBER: NORTH CAROLINA).

A. D. 1864-1865 (December—January).—The capture of Fort Fisher. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1864–1865 (DECEMBER—JANUARY: NORTH CAROLINA).

A. D. 1865 (February—March).—Sherman's March.— The Battle of Bentonsville. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1865 (FEBRUARY —MARCH: THE CAROLINAS).

A. D. 1865 (February—March).—Federal occupation of Wilmington.—Battle of Kinston. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1865 (FEBRUARY—MARCH: NORTH CAROLINA).

A. D. 1865 (May).—Provisional government under President Johnson's Plan of Reconstruction. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1865 (MAY—JULY).

A. D. 1865-1868. — Reconstruction. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1865 (MAY—JULY), and after, to 1868–1870.

NORTH DAKOTA: Admission to the Union (1889). See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1889–1890.

NORTH GERMAN CONFEDERATION. See GERMANY: A. D. 1866.

NORTH RIVER, The. See SOUTH RIVER.

NORTHAMPTON, Battle of.—One of the battles in the English civil wars of the 15th century called the Wars of the Roses, fought July 10, 1460. The royalist party (Lancastrians) were signally defeated, King Henry VI. taken prisoner, and Queen Margaret driven in flight to the north. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1455–1471.

NORTHAMPTON, Peace of. See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1328.

NORTHBROOK, LORD, The Indian administration of. See INDIA: A. D. 1862–1876.

NORTHEASTERN BOUNDARY QUESTION, Settlement of the. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1842.

NORTHERN CIRCARS, OR SIRKARS. See INDIA: A. D. 1758–1761.

NORTHERN MARITIME LEAGUE, The. See FRANCE: A. D. 1801–1802.

NORTHMEN. See NORMANS.

NORTHUMBRIA, Kingdom of. — The northernmost of the kingdoms formed by the Angles in Britain in the 6th century. It embraced the two kingdoms of Bernicia and Deira, sometimes ruled by separate princes, sometimes united, as Northumbria, under one, and extending from the Humber to the Forth. See ENGLAND: A. D. 547–633.

10-11th Centuries.—Lothian joined to Scotland. See SCOTLAND: 10–11TH CENTURIES.

NORTHWEST FUR COMPANY. See CANADA: A. D. 1869–1873.

NORTHWEST TERRITORIES OF CANADA.—"The North West Territories comprise all lands [of the Dominion of Canada] not within the limits of any province or of the District of Keewatin. The area of the Territories is about 3,000,000 square miles or four times as great as the area of all the provinces together. The Territories were ceded to Canada by an Order in Council dated the 24th June 1870 [see CANADA: A. D. 1869–1873]. . . . The southern portion of the territories between Manitoba and British Columbia has been formed into four provisional districts, viz. Assiniboia, Saskatchewan, Alberta and Athabasca. By the Dominion Act 38 Vic. c. 49 executive and legislative powers were conferred on a Lieutenant-Governor and a Council of five members subject to instructions given by Order in Council or by the Canadian Secretary of State."—J. E. C. Munro, *The Const. of Canada, ch.* 2.

NORTHWEST TERRITORY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, The Old.—"This northwestern land lay between the Mississippi, the Ohio, and the Great Lakes. It now constitutes five of our large States and part of a sixth [namely, western Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, and Michigan]. But when independence was declared it was quite as much a foreign territory, considered from the standpoint of the old thirteen colonies, as Florida or Canada; the difference was that, whereas during the war we failed in our attempts to conquer Florida and Canada, we succeeded in conquering the Northwest. The Northwest formed no part of our country as it originally stood; it had no portion in the declaration of independence. It did not revolt; it was conquered. . . . We made our first important conquest during the Revolution itself."—T. Roosevelt, *The Winning of the West, v.* 1, *pp.* 32–33.

A. D. 1673-1751.—Early French exploration and occupation. See CANADA: A. D. 1634–1673; 1669–1687; 1700–1735; also ILLINOIS: A. D. 1700–1750; and 1751.

A. D. 1748-1763.—Struggle of the French and English for possession. See OHIO (VALLEY): A. D. 1748–1754, 1754, 1755; and CANADA: A. D. 1758.

A. D. 1763.—Cession to Great Britain by the Treaty of Paris.—Possession taken. See SEVEN YEARS WAR: THE TREATIES; and ILLINOIS: A. D. 1765.

A. D. 1763.—The king's proclamation excluding settlers, and reserving the whole interior of the continent for the Indians.—"On the 7th of October, 1763, George III. issued a proclamation, providing for four new governments or colonies, namely: Quebec, East Florida, West Florida, and Grenada [the latter embracing 'the island of that name, together with the

Grenadines, and the islands of Dominico, St. Vincent and Tobago'], and defining their boundaries. The limits of Quebec did not vary materially from those of the present province of that name, and those of East and West Florida comprised the present State of Florida and the country north of the Gulf of Mexico to the parallel of 31° latitude. It will be seen that no provision was made for the government of nine tenths of the new territory acquired by the Treaty of Paris, and the omission was not an oversight, but was intentional. The purpose was to reserve as crown lands the Northwest territory, the region north of the great lakes, and the country between the Alleghanies and the Mississippi, and to exclude them from settlement by the American colonies. They were left, for the time being, to the undisputed possession of the savage tribes. The king's 'loving subjects' were forbidden making purchases of land from the Indians, or forming any settlements 'westward of the sources of the rivers which fall into the sea from the West and Northwest,' 'and all persons who have wilfully or inadvertently seated themselves upon any lands' west of this limit were warned 'forthwith to remove themselves from such settlements.' Certain reasons for this policy were assigned in the proclamation, such as, 'preventing irregularities in the future, and that the Indians may be convinced of our justice,' etc.; but the real explanation appears in the Report of the Lords Commissioners for Trade and Plantations, in 1772, on the petition of Thomas Walpole and others for a grant of land on the Ohio. The report was drawn by Lord Hillsborough, the president of the board. The report states: 'We take leave to remind your lordships of that principle which was adopted by this Board, and approved and confirmed by his Majesty, immediately after the Treaty of Paris, viz.: the confining the western extent of settlements to such a distance from the sea-coasts as that those settlements should lie within reach of the trade and commerce of this kingdom, . . . and also of the exercise of that authority and jurisdiction which was conceived to be necessary for the preservation of the colonies in a due subordination to, and dependence upon, the mother country. And these we apprehend to have been the two capital objects of his Majesty's proclamation of the 7th of October, 1763. . . . The great object of colonizing upon the continent of North America has been to improve and extend the commerce, navigation, and manufactures of this kingdom. . . . It does appear to us that the extension of the fur trade depends entirely upon the Indians being undisturbed in the possession of their hunting-grounds, and that all colonizing does in its nature, and must in its consequences, operate to the prejudice of that branch of commerce. . . . Let the Savages enjoy their deserts in quiet. Were they driven from their forests the peltry-trade would decrease.'. . . Such in clear and specific terms was the cold and selfish policy which the British crown and its ministers habitually pursued towards the American colonies; and in a few years it changed loyalty into hate, and brought on the American Revolution."—W. F. Poole, *The West, from* 1763 *to* 1783 (*Narrative and Critical Hist. of Am., v.* 6, *ch.* 9).—"The king's proclamation [of 1763] shows that, in the construction put upon the treaty by the crown authorities, the ceded territory was a new acquisition by conquest. The proclamation was the formal appropriation of it as the king's domain, embracing all the country west of the heads or sources of the rivers falling into the Atlantic."—R. King, *Ohio, ch.* 5.—The text of the Proclamation of 1763 is in Force's *American Archives, series* 4, *v.* 1, *p.* 172.

A. D. 1763-1764.—Pontiac's War. See PONTIAC'S WAR.

A. D. 1765-1768.—The Indian Treaties of German Flats and Fort Stanwix.—Boundary arrangement with the Six Nations. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1765–1768.

A. D. 1774.—The territorial claims of Virginia.—Lord Dunmore's War. See OHIO (VALLEY): A. D. 1774; also UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1781–1786.

A. D. 1774.—Embraced in the Province of Quebec. See CANADA: A. D. 1763–1774.

A. D. 1778-1779.—Its conquest from the British by the Virginian General Clark, and its organization under the jurisdiction of Virginia. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1778–1779 CLARK'S CONQUEST.

A. D. 1781-1786.—Cession of the conflicting territorial claims of the States to the United States. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1781–1786.

A. D. 1784.—Jefferson's plan for new States. —"The condition of the northwestern territory had long been under the consideration of the House [the Congress of the Confederation]. Several committees had been appointed, and several schemes listened to, for laying out new States, but it was not till the middle of April [1784], that a resolution was finally reached. One plan was to divide the ceded and purchased lands into seventeen States. Eight of these were to lie between the banks of the Mississippi and a north and south line through the falls of the Ohio. Eight more were to be marked out between this line and a second one parallel to it, and passing through the western bank of the mouth of the Great Kanawha. What remained was to form the seventeenth State. But few supporters were found for the measure, and a committee, over which Jefferson presided, was ordered to place before Congress a new scheme of division. Chase and Howe assisted him, and the three devised a plan whereby the prairie-lands were to be parted out among ten new States. The divisions then marked down have utterly disappeared, and the names given to them become so forgotten that nine tenths of the population which has, in our time, covered the whole region with wealthy cities and prosperous villages, and turned it from a waste to a garden, have never in their lives heard the words pronounced. Some were borrowed from the Latin and some from the Greek; while others were Latinized forms of the names the Indians had given to the rivers. The States were to be, as far as possible, two degrees of latitude in width and arranged in three tiers. The Mississippi and a meridian through the falls of the Ohio included the western tier. The meridian through the falls of the Ohio and a second through the mouth of the Great Kanawha were the boundaries of the middle tier. Between this and the Pennsylvania West Line lay the third tier. That vast tract stretching from the 45th parallel of latitude to the Lake of the Woods, and dense with forests

of pine, of hickory, and of oak, they called Sylvania. It was the northern State of the western tier. To the long tongue of land separating the water of Michigan from the waters of Erie and Huron they gave the name Cherronesus. A narrow strip, not more than two degrees of latitude in width, and stretching from Lake Michigan to the Mississippi, was called Michigania. As marked down on their rude maps, Michigania lay under Sylvania, in the very heart of what is now Wisconsin. South of this to the 41st parallel of latitude was Assenisipia, a name derived from Assenisipi, the Indian title of the river now called the Rock. Eastward, along the shore of Lake Erie, the country was named Metropotamia. It took the name Mother of Rivers from the belief that within its boundary were the fountains of many rivers, the Muskingum, the two Miamis of Ohio, the Wabash, the Illinois, the Sandusky, and the Miami of the Lake. That part of Illinois between the 39th and 41st parallels was called, from the river which waters it, Illinoia. On to the east was Saratoga, and beyond this lay Washington, a broad and level tract shut in by the Ohio river, the waters of the lake, and the boundaries of Pennsylvania. Under Illinoia and Saratoga, and stretching along the Ohio, was the ninth State. Within its confines the waters of the Wabash, the Sawane, the Tanissee, the Illinois, and the Ohio were mingled with the waters of the Mississippi and Missouri. The committee therefore judged that a fitting name would be Polypotamia. Pelisipia was the tenth State. It lay to the east of Polypotamia, and was named from Pelisipi, a term the Cherokees often applied to the river Ohio. At the same time that the boundaries of the new States were defined, a code of laws was drawn up which should serve as a constitution for each State, till 20,000 free inhabitants acquired the right of self-government. The code was in no wise a remarkable performance, yet there were among its articles two which cannot be passed by in silence. One provided for the abolition of slavery after the year 1800. The other announced that no one holding an hereditary title should ever become a citizen of the new States. Each was struck out by the House. Yet each is deserving of notice. The one because it was the first attempt at a national condemnation of slavery, the other because it was a public expression of the dread with which our ancestors beheld the growth of the Society of the Cincinnati."—J. B. McMaster, *Hist. of the People of the U. S., ch.* 2 (*v.* 1).—The report of Jefferson's committee "was recommitted to the same committee on the 17th of March, and a new one was submitted on the 22d of the same month. The second report agreed in substance with the first. The principal difference was the omission of the paragraph giving names to the States to be formed out of the Western Territory." After striking out the clauses prohibiting slavery after the year 1800 and denying citizenship to all persons holding hereditary titles, the Congress adopted the report, April 23, 1784. "Thus the substance of the report of Mr. Jefferson of a plan for the government of the Western Territory (without restrictions as to slavery) became a law, and remained so during 1784 to 1787, when these resolutions were repealed in terms by the passage of the ordinance for the government of the 'Territory of the United States northwest of the river Ohio.'"—T. Donaldson, *The Public Domain: its History, pp.* 148–149.

A. D. 1786-1788.—The Ohio Company of Revolutionary soldiers and their land purchase.—The settlement at Marietta.—"The Revolutionary War had hardly closed before thousands of the disbanded officers and soldiers were looking anxiously to the Western lands for new homes, or for means of repairing their shattered fortunes. In June, 1783, a strong memorial was sent to Congress asking a grant of the lands between the Ohio and Lake Erie. Those who lived in the South were fortunate in having immediate access to the lands of Kentucky, Tennessee, and the back parts of Georgia. The strife in Congress over the lands of the Northwest delayed the surveys and the bounties so long that the soldiers of the North almost lost hope." Finally, there "was a meeting of officers and soldiers, chiefly of the Massachusetts, Rhode Island and Connecticut lines, at Boston, March 1, 1786, when they formed a new Ohio Company for the purchase and settlement of Western lands, in shares of $1,000. General Putnam [Rufus], General Samuel H. Parsons, and the Rev. Manasseh Cutler, were made the directors, and selected for their purchase the lands on the Ohio River situated on both sides of the Muskingum, and immediately west of the Seven Ranges. The treasury board in those days were the commissioners of public lands, but with no powers to enter into absolute sales unless such were approved by Congress. Weeks and months were lost in waiting for a quorum of that body to assemble. This was effected on the 11th of July, and Dr. Cutler, deputed by his colleagues, was in attendance, but was constantly baffled in pursuing his objects. . . . The members were disposed to insert conditions which were not satisfactory to the Ohio Company. But the doctor carried his point by formally intimating that he should retire, and seek better terms with some of the States, which were offering their lands at half the price Congress was to receive. The grant to the Ohio Company, upon the terms proposed, was voted by Congress, and the contract formally signed October 27, 1787, by the treasury board, and by Dr. Cutler and Winthrop Sargent, as agents of the Ohio Company. Two companies, including surveyors, boat-builders, carpenters, smiths, farmers and laborers, 48 persons in all, with their outfit, were sent forward in the following months of December and January, under General Putnam as leader and superintendent. They united in February on the Youghiogheny River and constructed boats. . . . Embarking with their stores they descended the Ohio, and on the 7th of April, 1788, landed at the Muskingum. On the upper point, opposite Fort Harmar, they founded their town, which at Boston had first been named Adelphia. At the first meeting of the directors, held on the ground July 2d, the name of Marietta was adopted, in honor of the French Queen Marie Antoinette, and compounded of the first and last syllables."—R. King, *Ohio, ch.* 8.

Also in: W. P. and J. P. Cutler, *Life, Journals and Cor. of Rev. Manasseh Cutler, v.* 1, *ch.* 4–7 *and* 9.—C. M. Walker, *Hist. of Athens County, Ohio, ch.* 2.

A. D. 1787.—The great Ordinance for its government.—Perpetual Exclusion of Slavery.—"Congress at intervals discussed the future of

this great domain, but for a while little progress was made except to establish that Congress could divide the territory as might seem best. Nathan Dane came forward with a motion for a committee to plan some temporary scheme of government. A committee on this point reported (May 10, 1786) that the number of States should be from two to five, to be admitted as States according to Jefferson's proposition, but the question of slavery in them was left open. Nothing definite was done till a committee—Johnson of Connecticut, Pinckney of South Carolina, Smith of New York, Dane of Massachusetts, and Henry of Maryland—reported on April 26, 1787, 'An ordinance for the government of the Western territory,' and after various amendments it was fairly transcribed for a third reading, May 10th. Further consideration was now delayed until July. It was at this point that Manasseh Cutler appeared in New York, commissioned to buy land for the Ohio Company in the region whose future was to be determined by this ordinance, and it was very likely, in part, by his influence that those features of the perfected ordinance as passed five days later, and which has given it its general fame, were introduced. On July 9th the bill was referred to a new committee, of which a majority were Southern men, Carrington of Virginia taking the chairmanship from Johnson; Dane and Smith were retained, but Richard Henry Lee and Kean of South Carolina supplanted Pinckney and Henry. This change was made to secure the Southern support; on the other hand, acquiescence in the wishes of Northern purchasers of lands was essential in any business outcome of the movement. 'Up to this time,' says Poole, 'there were no articles of compact in the bill, no anti-slavery clause, nothing about liberty of conscience or of the press, the right of habeas corpus, or of trial by jury, or the equal distribution of estates. The clause that, "religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall be forever encouraged," was not there.' These omissions were the New England ideas, which had long before this been engrafted on the Constitution of Massachusetts. This new committee reported the bill, embodying all these provisions except the anti-slavery clause, on the 11th, and the next day this and other amendments were made. On the 13th, but one voice was raised against the bill on its final passage, and that came from Yates of New York. Poole intimates that it was the promise of the governorship of the territory under the ordinance which induced St. Clair, then President of Congress, to lend it his countenance. The promise, if such it was, was fulfilled, and St. Clair became the first governor."—J. Winsor and E. Channing, *Territorial Acquisitions and Divisions* (*Narrative and Crit. Hist. of Am., v. 7, app.*).

Also in: B. A. Hinsdale, *The Old Northwest, ch.* 15.—W. F. Poole, *Doctor Cutler and the Ordinance of* 1787 (*North Am. Rev., Apr.*, 1876.—W. P. and J. P. Cutler, *Life of Manasseh Cutler, v.* 1, *ch.* 8.—J. P. Dunn, Jr., *Indiana, ch.* 5.—T. Donaldson, *The Public Domain, pp.* 149–159.—J. A. Barrett, *Evolution of the Ordinance of* 1787 (*Univ. of Nebraska, Seminary Papers*, 1891).—J. P. Dunn, ed., *Slavery Petitions* (*Ind. Hist. Soc., v.* 2, *no.* 12).—See, also, Education, Modern: America: A. D. 1785–1880.

The following is the text of the "Ordinance for the Government of the Territory of the United States Northwest of the River Ohio," commonly known as the "Ordinance of 1787": "Be it ordained by the United States in Congress assembled, That the said territory, for the purposes of temporary government, be one district, subject, however, to be divided into two districts, as future circumstances may, in the opinion of Congress, make it expedient. Be it ordained by the authority aforesaid, That the estates, both of resident and non-resident proprietors in the said territory, dying intestate, shall descend to, and be distributed among, their children, and the descendants of a deceased child, in equal parts; the descendants of a deceased child or grandchild to take the share of their deceased parent in equal parts among them: And where there shall be no children or descendants, then in equal parts to the next of kin in equal degree; and, among collaterals, the children of a deceased brother or sister of the intestate shall have, in equal parts among them, their deceased parents' share; and there shall, in no case, be a distinction between kindred of the whole and half-blood; saving, in all cases, to the widow of the intestate her third part of the real estate for life, and one-third part of the personal estate; and this law, relative to descents and dower, shall remain in full force until altered by the legislature of the district. And, until the governor and judges shall adopt laws as hereinafter mentioned, estates in the said territory may be devised or bequeathed by wills in writing, signed and sealed by him or her, in whom the estate may be (being of full age,) and attested by three witnesses; and real estates may be conveyed by lease and release, or bargain and sale, signed, sealed, and delivered by the person, being of full age, in whom the estate may be, and attested by two witnesses, provided such wills be duly proved, and such conveyances be acknowledged, or the execution thereof duly proved, and be recorded within one year after proper magistrates, courts, and registers shall be appointed for that purpose; and personal property may be transferred by delivery; saving, however to the French and Canadian inhabitants, and other settlers of the Kaskaskias, St. Vincents, and the neighboring villages who have heretofore professed themselves citizens of Virginia, their laws and customs now in force among them, relative to the descent and conveyance of property. Be it ordained by the authority aforesaid, That there shall be appointed, from time to time, by Congress, a governor, whose commission shall continue in force for the term of three years, unless sooner revoked by Congress; he shall reside in the district, and have a freehold estate therein in 1,000 acres of land, while in the exercise of his office. There shall be appointed, from time to time, by Congress, a secretary, whose commission shall continue in force for four years unless sooner revoked; he shall reside in the district, and have a freehold estate therein in 500 acres of land, while in the exercise of his office; it shall be his duty to keep and preserve the acts and laws passed by the legislature, and the public records of the district, and the proceedings of the governor in his Executive department; and transmit authentic copies of such acts and proceedings, every six months, to the Secretary of Congress: There

shall also be appointed a court to consist of three judges, any two of whom to form a court, who shall have a common law jurisdiction, and reside in the district, and have each therein a freehold estate in 500 acres of land while in the exercise of their offices; and their commissions shall continue in force during good behavior. The governor and judges, or a majority of them, shall adopt and publish in the district such laws of the original States, criminal and civil, as may be necessary and best suited to the circumstances of the district, and report them to Congress from time to time: which laws shall be in force in the district until the organization of the General Assembly therein, unless disapproved of by Congress; but, afterwards, the legislature shall have authority to alter them as they shall think fit. The governor, for the time being, shall be commander-in-chief of the militia, appoint and commission all officers in the same below the rank of general officers; all general officers shall be appointed and commissioned by Congress. Previous to the organization of the General Assembly, the governor shall appoint such magistrates and other civil officers, in each county or township, as he shall find necessary for the preservation of the peace and good order in the same: After the General Assembly shall be organized, the powers and duties of the magistrates and other civil officers, shall be regulated and defined by the said assembly; but all magistrates and other civil officers, not herein otherwise directed, shall, during the continuance of this temporary government, be appointed by the governor. For the prevention of crimes and injuries, the laws to be adopted or made shall have force in all parts of the district, and for the execution of process, criminal and civil, the governor shall make proper divisions thereof; and he shall proceed, from time to time, as circumstances may require, to lay out the parts of the district in which the Indian titles shall have been extinguished, into counties and townships, subject, however, to such alterations as may thereafter be made by the legislature. So soon as there shall be 5,000 free male inhabitants of full age in the district, upon giving proof thereof to the governor, they shall receive authority, with time and place, to elect representatives from their counties or townships to represent them in the General Assembly: Provided, That, for every 500 free male inhabitants, there shall be one representative, and so on progressively with the number of free male inhabitants, shall the right of representation increase, until the number of representatives shall amount to 25; after which, the number and proportion of representatives shall be regulated by the legislature: Provided, That no person be eligible or qualified to act as a representative unless he shall have been a citizen of one of the United States three years, and be a resident in the district, or unless he shall have resided in the district three years; and, in either case, shall likewise hold in his own right, in fee simple, 200 acres of land within the same: Provided, also, That a freehold in 50 acres of land in the district, having been a citizen of one of the States, and being resident in the district, or the like freehold and two years residence in the district, shall be necessary to qualify a man as an elector of a representative. The representatives thus elected, shall serve for the term of two years; and, in case of the death of a representative, or removal from office, the governor shall issue a writ to the county or township for which he was a member, to elect another in his stead, to serve for the residue of the term. The General Assembly, or Legislature, shall consist of the governor, legislative council, and a house of representatives. The legislative council shall consist of five members, to continue in office five years, unless sooner removed by Congress; any three of whom to be a quorum: and the members of the council shall be nominated and appointed in the following manner, to wit: As soon as representatives shall be elected, the governor shall appoint a time and place for them to meet together; and, when met, they shall nominate ten persons, residents in the district, and each possessed of a freehold in 500 acres of land, and return their names to Congress; five of whom Congress shall appoint and commission to serve as aforesaid; and, whenever a vacancy shall happen in the council, by death or removal from office, the house of representatives shall nominate two persons, qualified as aforesaid, for each vacancy, and return their names to Congress; one of whom Congress shall appoint and commission for the residue of the term. And every five years, four months at least before the expiration of the time of service of the members of council, the said house shall nominate ten persons, qualified as aforesaid, and return their names to Congress; five of whom Congress shall appoint and commission to serve as members of the council five years, unless sooner removed. And the governor, legislative council, and house of representatives, shall have authority to make laws in all cases, for the good government of the district, not repugnant to the principles and articles in this ordinance established and declared. And all bills, having passed by a majority in the house, and by a majority in the council, shall be referred to the governor for his assent; but no bill, or legislative act whatever, shall be of any force without his assent. The governor shall have power to convene, prorogue, and dissolve the General Assembly, when, in his opinion, it shall be expedient. The governor, judges, legislative council, secretary, and such other officers as Congress shall appoint in the district, shall take an oath or affirmation of fidelity and of office; the governor before the President of Congress, and all other officers before the governor. As soon as a legislature shall be formed in the district, the council and house assembled in one room, shall have authority, by joint ballot, to elect a delegate to Congress, who shall have a seat in Congress, with a right of debating but not of voting during this temporary government. And, for extending the fundamental principles of civil and religious liberty, which form the basis whereon these republics, their laws and constitutions are erected; to fix and establish those principles as the basis of all laws, constitutions, and governments, which forever hereafter shall be formed in the said territory: to provide also for the establishment of States, and permanent government therein, and for their admission to a share in the federal councils on an equal footing with the original States, at as early periods as may be consistent with the general interest: It is hereby ordained and declared by the authority aforesaid, That the following articles shall be considered as

articles of compact between the original States and the people and States in the said territory and forever remain unalterable, unless by common consent, to wit: **Art. 1st.** No person, demeaning himself in a peaceable and orderly manner, shall ever be molested on account of his mode of worship or religious sentiments, in the said territory. **Art. 2d.** The inhabitants of the said territory shall always be entitled to the benefits of the writ of habeas corpus, and of the trial by jury; of a proportionate representation of the people in the legislature; and of judicial proceedings according to the course of the common law. All persons shall be bailable, unless for capital offences, where the proof shall be evident or the presumption great. All fines shall be moderate; and no cruel or unusual punishments shall be inflicted. No man shall be deprived of his liberty or property, but by the judgment of his peers or the law of the land; and, should the public exigencies make it necessary, for the common preservation, to take any person's property, or to demand his particular services, full compensation shall be made for the same. And, in the just preservation of rights and property, it is understood and declared, that no law ought ever to be made, or have force in the said territory, that shall, in any manner whatever, interfere with or affect private contracts or engagements, bona fide, and without fraud, previously formed. **Art. 3d.** Religion, morality, and knowledge, being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged. The utmost good faith shall always be observed towards the Indians; their lands and property shall never be taken from them without their consent; and, in their property, rights, and liberty, they shall never be invaded or disturbed, unless in just and lawful wars authorized by Congress; but laws founded in justice and humanity, shall, from time to time, be made for preventing wrongs being done to them, and for preserving peace and friendship with them. **Art. 4th.** The said territory, and the States which may be formed therein, shall forever remain a part of this confederacy of the United States of America, subject to the Articles of Confederation, and to such alterations therein as shall be constitutionally made; and to all the acts and ordinances of the United States in Congress assembled, conformable thereto. The inhabitants and settlers in the said territory shall be subject to pay a part of the federal debts contracted or to be contracted, and a proportional part of the expenses of government, to be apportioned on them by Congress according to the same common rule and measure by which apportionments thereof shall be made on the other States; and the taxes, for paying their proportion, shall be laid and levied by the authority and direction of the legislatures of the district or districts, or new States, as in the original States, within the time agreed upon by the United States in Congress assembled. The legislatures of those districts or new States, shall never interfere with the primary disposal of the soil by the United States in Congress assembled, nor with any regulations Congress may find necessary for securing the title in such soil to the bona fide purchasers. No tax shall be imposed on lands the property of the United States; and, in no case, shall non-resident proprietors be taxed higher than residents. The navigable waters leading into the Mississippi and St. Lawrence, and the carrying places between the same, shall be common highways, and forever free, as well to the inhabitants of the said territory as to the citizens of the United States, and those of any other States that may be admitted into the Confederacy, without any tax, impost, or duty, therefor. **Art. 5th.** There shall be formed in the said territory, not less than three nor more than five States; and the boundaries of the States, as soon as Virginia shall alter her act of cession, and consent to the same, shall become fixed and established as follows, to wit: The Western State in the said territory, shall be bounded by the Mississippi, the Ohio, and Wabash rivers; a direct line drawn from the Wabash and Post St. Vincent's, due North, to the territorial line between the United States and Canada; and, by the said territorial line, to the Lake of the Woods and Mississippi. The middle State shall be bounded by the said direct line, the Wabash from Post Vincent's, to the Ohio; by the Ohio, by a direct line, drawn due North from the mouth of the Great Miami, to the said territorial line, and by the said territorial line. The Eastern State shall be bounded by the last mentioned direct line, the Ohio, Pennsylvania, and the said territorial line: Provided, however, and it is further understood and declared, that the boundaries of these three States shall be subject so far to be altered, that, if Congress shall hereafter find it expedient, they shall have authority to form one or two States in that part of the said territory which lies North of an East and West line drawn through the Southerly bend or extreme of lake Michigan. And, whenever any of the said States shall have 60,000 free inhabitants therein, such State shall be admitted, by its delegates, into the Congress of the United States, on an equal footing with the original States in all respects whatever, and shall be at liberty to form a permanent constitution and State government: Provided, the constitution and government so to be formed, shall be republican, and in conformity to the principles contained in these articles; and, so far as it can be consistent with the general interest of the confederacy, such admission shall be allowed at an earlier period, and when there may be a less number of free inhabitants in the State than 60,000. **Art. 6th.** There shall be neither slavery nor involuntary servitude in the said territory, otherwise than in the punishment of crimes, whereof the party shall have been duly convicted: Provided, always, That any person escaping into the same, from whom labor or service is lawfully claimed in any one of the original States, such fugitive may be lawfully reclaimed and conveyed to the person claiming his or her labor or service as aforesaid. Be it ordained by the authority aforesaid, That the resolutions of the 23d of April, 1784, relative to the subject of this ordinance, be, and the same are hereby, repealed and declared null and void. Done by the United States, in Congress assembled, the 13th day of July, in the year of our Lord 1787, and of their sovereignty and independence the twelfth."

A. D. 1788-1802.—Extinguished by divisions.—Creation of the Territory of Indiana and the State of Ohio.—"Arthur St. Clair was appointed governor by the Congress [of the Confederation] February 1, 1788, and Winthrop Sargent secretary. August 7th, 1789, Congress

[under the federal constitution], in view of the new method of appointment of officers as provided in the Constitution, passed an amendatory act to the Ordinance of 1787, providing for the nomination of officers for the Territory by the President. . . . August 8, 1789, President Washington sent to the Senate the names of Arthur St. Clair for governor, Winthrop Sargent for secretary, and Samuel Holden Parsons, John Cleves Symmes, and William Barton, for judges. . . . They were all confirmed. President Washington in this message designated the country as 'The Western Territory.' The supreme court was established at Cincinnati (. . . named by St. Clair in honor of the Society of the Cincinnati, he having been president of the branch society in Pennsylvania). St. Clair remained governor until November 22, 1802. Winthrop Sargent afterwards, in 1798, went to Mississippi as governor of that Territory. William Henry Harrison became secretary in 1797, representing it in Congress in 1799–1800, and he became governor of the Territory of Indiana in 1800. May 7, 1800, Congress, upon petition, divided this [Northwest] Territory into two separate governments. Indiana Territory was created, with its capital at St. Vincennes, and from that portion of the Northwest Territory west of a line beginning opposite the mouth of the Kentucky River in Kentucky, and running north to the Canada line. The eastern portion now became the 'Territory Northwest of the river Ohio,' with its capital at Chillicothe. This portion, Nov. 29, 1802, was admitted into the Union. . . . The territory northwest of the river Ohio ceased to exist as a political division after the admission of the State of Ohio into the Union, Nov. 29, 1802, although in acts of Congress it was frequently referred to and its forms affixed by legislation to other political divisions."—T. Donaldson, *The Public Domain, pp.* 159–160.

Also in: J. Burnet, *Notes on the Settlement of the N. W. Territory, ch.* 14–20.—C. Atwater, *Hist. of Ohio, period* 2.—J. B. Dillon, *Hist. of Indiana, ch.* 19–31.—W. H. Smith, *The St. Clair Papers, v.* 1, *ch.* 6–9.

A. D. 1790-1795.—Indian war.—The disastrous expeditions of Harmar and St. Clair and Wayne's decisive victory.—The Greenville Treaty.—"The Northwestern Indians, at Washington's installation, numbered, according to varying estimates, from 20,000 to 40,000 souls. Of these the Wabash tribes had for years been the scourge of the new Kentucky settlers. So constant, indeed, was bloodshed and retaliation, that the soil of this earliest of States beyond the mountains acquired the name of 'the dark and bloody ground.' A broad river interposed no sufficient barricade to these deadly encounters. . . . What with their own inadmissable claims to territory, and this continuous war to the knife, all the tribes of the Northwestern country were now so maddened against the United States that the first imperative necessity, unless we chose to abandon the Western settlements altogether, was to chastise the Indians into submission. . . . Brigadier-General Harmar, who commanded the small force of United States regulars in the Territory, was . . . a Revolutionary veteran. Our frontier military stations extended as far as Vincennes, on the Wabash, which Major Hamtranck, a Canadian Frenchman, commanded. The British commandant was at Detroit, whence he communicated constantly with the Governor-General of the provinces, Lord Dorchester, by whose instigation the Northwestern Indians at this period were studiously kept at enmity with the United States. . . . A formidable expedition against the Indians was determined upon by the President and St. Clair [Governor of the Northwest Territory]; and in the fall of the year [1790] General Harmar set out from Fort Washington for the Miami country, with a force numbering somewhat less than 1,500, near three-fourths of whom were militia raised in Western Pennsylvania and Kentucky." Successful at first, the campaign ended in a disastrous defeat on the Maumee.—J. Schouler, *Hist. of the U. S., ch.* 2, *sect.* 1 (*v.* 1).—"The remnant of his army which Harmar led back to Cincinnati [Fort Washington] had the unsubdued savages almost continually at their heels. As a rebuke to the hostile tribes the expedition was an utter failure, a fact which was soon made manifest. Indian attacks on the settlers immediately became bolder. . . . Every block house in the territory was soon almost in a state of siege. . . . Washington was authorized to raise an army of 3,000 men for the protection of the Northwest. The command of this army was given to St. Clair. At the same time a corps of Kentucky volunteers was selected and placed under General Charles Scott. The Kentuckians dashed into the Wabash country, scattered the Indians, burned their villages and returned with a crowd of prisoners. The more pretentious expedition of St. Clair was not to be accomplished with so fine a military flourish. Like Harmar's army, that led by St. Clair was feeble in discipline, and disturbed by jealousies. The agents of the Government equipped the expedition in a shameful manner, delivering useless muskets, supplying powder that would scarcely burn, and neglecting entirely a large number of necessary supplies; so that after St. Clair with his 2,300 regulars and 600 militia had marched from Ludlow's Station, north of Cincinnati, he found himself under the necessity of delaying the march to secure supplies. The militia deserted in great numbers. For the purpose of capturing deserters and bringing up belated supplies, one of the best regiments in the army was sent southward. While waiting on one of the branches of the Wabash for the return of this regiment the main force was on the fourth of November, 1791, surrounded and attacked by the lurking Indians. At the first yell of the savages scores of the terrified militia dropped their guns and bolted. St. Clair, who for some days had been too ill to sit upon a horse, now exerted all his strength in an effort to rally the wavering troops. His horses were all killed, and his hat and clothing were ripped by the bullets. But the lines broke, the men scattered and the artillery was captured. Those who stood their ground fell in their tracks till the fields were covered by 600 dead and dying men. At last a retreat was ordered. . . . For many miles, over a track littered with coats, hats, boots and powder horns, the whooping victors chased the routed survivors of St. Clair's army. It was a ghastly defeat. The face of every settler in Ohio blanched at the news. Kentucky was thrown into excitement and even Western Pennsylvania nervously petitioned for protection. St. Clair was criticised and insulted. A committee of Congress found him without blame. But he had been defeated, and no

amount of reasoning could unlink his name from the tragedy of the dark November morning. Every effort was made to win over the Indians before making another use of force. The Government sent peace messengers into the Northwest. In one manner or another nearly every one of the messengers was murdered. The Indians who listened at all would hear of no terms of peace that did not promise the removal of the whites from the northern side of the Ohio. The British urged the tribes to make this extreme demand. Spain also sent mischief-makers into the camps of the exultant red men. . . . More bloodshed became inevitable; and in execution of this last resort came one of the most popular of the Revolutionary chieftains—'Mad Anthony' Wayne. Wayne led his army from Cincinnati in October of 1793. He advanced carefully in the path taken by St. Clair, found and buried the bones of St. Clair's 600 lost, wintered at Greenville, and in the summer of 1794 moved against the foe with strong reinforcements from Kentucky. After a preliminary skirmish between the Indians and the troops, Wayne, in accordance with his instructions, made a last offer of peace. The offer was evasively met, and Wayne pushed on. On the morning of Wednesday the twentieth of August, 1794, the 'legion' came upon the united tribes of Indians encamped on the north bank of the Maumee and there, near the rapids of the Maumee, the Indians were forced to face the most alert and vigorous enemy they had yet encountered. The same daring tactics that had carried Stony Point and made Anthony Wayne historic were here directed against the Indian's timber coverts. . . . Encouraging and marshaling the Indians were painted Canadian white men bearing British arms. Many of these fell in the heaps of dead and some were captured. When Wayne announced his victory he declared that the Indian loss was greater than that incurred by the entire Federal army in the war with Great Britain. Thus ended the Indian reign of terror. After destroying the Indian crops and possessions, in sight of the British fort, Wayne fell back to Greenville and there made the celebrated treaty by which on August 3, 1795, the red men came to a permanent peace with the Thirteen Fires. From Cincinnati to Campus Martius Wayne's victory sent a thrill of relief. The treaty, ceding to the Union two thirds of the present State, guaranteed the safety of all settlers who respected the Indians' rights, and set in motion once more the machinery of immigration." —A. Black, *The Story of Ohio, ch.* 6.

Also in: A. St. Clair, *Narrative of Campaign.* —C. W. Butterfield, *Hist. of the Girtys, ch.* 23–30.—W. H. Smith, *The St. Clair Papers, v.* 2.—W. L. Stone, *Life of Brant, v.* 2, *ch.* 10–12.

A. D. 1811.—Harrison's campaign against Tecumseh and his League.—Battle of Tippecanoe. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1811.

NORTHWESTERN OR OREGON BOUNDARY QUESTION, Settlement of the. See Oregon: A. D. 1844–1846, and Alabama Claims: A. D. 1871.

NORTHWESTERN OR SAN JUAN WATER-BOUNDARY QUESTION. See San Juan Water-Boundary Question.

NORTHWESTERN PROVINCES OF INDIA, English Acquisition of the. See India: A. D. 1798–1805.

NORUMBEGA.—"Norembega, or Norumbega, more properly called Arambec (Hakluyt, III. 167), was, in Ramusio's map, the country embraced within Nova Scotia, southern New Brunswick, and a part of Maine. De Laet confines it to a district about the mouth of the Penobscot. Wytfleit and other early writers say that it had a capital city of the same name; and in several old maps this fabulous metropolis is laid down, with towers and churches, on the river Penobscot. The word is of Indian origin." —F. Parkman, *Pioneers of France in the New World: Champlain, ch.* 1, *foot-note.*—On Gastaldi's map, of New France, made in 1550, "the name 'La Nuova Francia' is written in very large letters, indicating probably that this name is meant for the entire country. The name 'Terra de Nurumbega' is written in smaller letters, and appears to be attached only to the peninsula of Nova Scotia. Crignon, however, the author of the discourse which this map is intended to illustrate, gives to this name a far greater extent. He says: 'Going beyond the cape of the Bretons, there is a country contiguous to this cape, the coast of which trends to the west a quarter southwest to the country of Florida, and runs along for a good 500 leagues; which coast was discovered fifteen years ago by Master Giovanni da Verrazano, in the name of the king of France and of Madame la Regente; and this country is called by many 'La Francese,' and even by the Portuguese themselves; and its end is toward Florida under 78° W., and 38° N. . . . The country is named by the inhabitants 'Nurumbega'; and between it and Brazil is a great gulf, in which are the islands of the West Indies, discovered by the Spaniards. From this it would appear that, at the time of the discourse, the entire east coast of the United States, as far as Florida, was designated by the name of Nurumbega. Afterwards, this name was restricted to New England; and, at a later date, it was applied only to Maine, and still later to the region of the Penobscot. . . . The name 'Norumbega,' or 'Arambec,' in Hakluyt's time, was applied to Maine, and sometimes to the whole of New England."—J. G. Kohl, *Hist. of the Discovery of Maine* (*Maine Hist. Soc. Coll., series* 2, *v.* 1), *pp.* 231 *and* 283.—"The story of Norumbega is invested with the charms of fable and romance. The name is found in the map of Hieronimus da Verrazano of 1529, as 'Aranbega,' being restricted to a definite and apparently unimportant locality. Suddenly, in 1539, Norumbega appears in the narrative of the Dieppe Captain as a vast and opulent region, extending from Cape Breton to the Cape of Florida. About three years later Allefonsce described the 'River of Norumbega,' now identified with the Penobscot, and treated the capital of the country as an important market for the trade in fur. Various maps of the period of Allefonsce confine the name of Norumbega to a distinct spot; but Gastaldi's map, published by Ramusio in 1556,—though modelled after Verrazano's, of which indeed it is substantially an extract,—applies the name to the region lying between Cape Breton and the Jersey coast. From this time until the seventeenth century Norumbega was generally regarded as embracing all New England, and sometimes portions of Canada, though occasionally the country was known by other names. Still, in 1582, Lok seems to have thought that the Penobscot formed the

southern boundary of Norumbega, which he shows on his map as an island; while John Smith, in 1620, speaks of Norumbega as including New England and the region as far south as Virginia. On the other hand Champlain, in 1605, treated Norumbega as lying within the present territory of Maine. He searched for its capital on the banks of the Penobscot, and as late as 1669 Heylin was dreaming of the fair city of Norumbega. Grotius, for a time at least, regarded the name as of Old Northern origin and connected with 'Norbergia.' It was also fancied that a people resembling the Mexicans once lived upon the banks of the Penobscot. Those who have labored to find an Indian derivation for the name say that it means 'the place of a fine city.' At one time the houses of the city were supposed to be very splendid, and to be supported upon pillars of crystal and silver."—B. F. De Costa, *Norumbega and its English Explorers* (*Narrative and Critical Hist. of Am.*, *v.* 3, *ch.* 6).

Also in: J. Winsor, *Cartography of N. E. Coast of Am.* (*N. and C. Hist. of Am.*, *v.* 4, *ch.* 2).

NORWAY. See Scandinavian States.

NOSE MONEY.—A poll-tax levied among the ancient Scandinavians seems to have borne this name because a defaulting tax-payer might suffer the loss of his nose, and the Danes in Ireland are thought to have imposed the same there. —T. Moore, *Hist. of Ireland*, *v.* 2, *ch.* 17.

NOTABLES, The Assembly of the. See France: A. D. 1774–1788.

NOTIUM, Battle of (B. C. 407). See Greece: B. C. 411–407.

NOTTOWAYS, The. See American Aborigines: Iroquois Tribes of the South.

NOVA SCOTIA: The aboriginal inhabitants. See American Aborigines: Abnakis, and Algonquian Family.

A. D. 1000.—Supposed identity with the Markland of Norse sagas. See America: 10–11th Centuries.

16th century.—Embraced in the Norumbega of the old geographers. See Norumbega; also Canada: Names.

A. D. 1603-1608.—The first French settlements, at Port Royal (Annapolis). See Canada: A. D. 1603–1605; and 1606–1608.

A. D. 1604.—Origin of the name Acadia.—In 1604, after the death of De Chastes, who had sent out Champlain on his first voyage to Canada, Pierre du Guast, Sieur de Monts, took the enterprise in hand and "petitioned the king for leave to colonize La Cadie, or Acadie, a region defined as extending from the 40th to the 46th degree of north latitude, or from Philadelphia to beyond Montreal. . . . De Monts gained his point. He was made Lieutenant-General in Acadia. . . . This name is not found in any earlier public document. It was afterwards restricted to the peninsula of Nova Scotia, but the dispute concerning the limits of Acadia was a proximate cause of the war of 1755. The word is said to be derived from the Indian Aquoddiauke, or Aquoddie, supposed to mean the fish called a pollock. The Bay of Passamaquoddy, 'Great Pollock Water,' if we may accept the same authority, derives its name from the same origin. Potter in 'Historical Magazine,' I. 84. This derivation is doubtful. The Micmac word, 'Quoddy,' 'Kady,' or 'Cadie,' means simply a place or region, and is properly used in conjunction with some other noun; as, for example, 'Katakady,' the Place of Eels. . . . Dawson and Rand, in 'Canadian Antiquarian and Numismatic Journal.'"—F. Parkman, *Pioneers of France in the New World: Champlain, ch.* 2, *and foot-note.*

A. D. 1610-1613.—The Port Royal colony revived, but destroyed by the English of Virginia. See Canada: A. D. 1610–1613.

A. D. 1621-1668.—English grant to Sir William Alexander.—Cession to France.—Quarrels of La Tour and D'Aulnay.—English reconquest and recession to France.—"In 1621, Sir William Alexander, a Scotchman of some literary pretensions, had obtained from King James [through the Council for New England, or Plymouth Company—see New England: A. D. 1621–1631] a charter, (dated Sept. 10, 1621) for the lordship and barony of New Scotland, comprising the territory now known as the provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. Under this grant he made several unsuccessful attempts at colonization; and in 1625 he undertook to infuse fresh life into his enterprise by parcelling out the territory into baronetcies. Nothing came of the scheme, and by the treaty of St. Germains, in 1632, Great Britain surrendered to France all the places occupied by the English within these limits. Two years before this, however, Alexander's rights in a part of the territory had been purchased by Claude and Charles de la Tour; and shortly after the peace the Chevalier Razilly was appointed by Louis XIII. governor of the whole of Acadia. He designated as his lieutenants Charles de la Tour for the portion east of the St. Croix, and Charles de Menou, Sieur d'Aulnay-Charnisé, for the portion west of that river. The former established himself on the River St. John, where the city of St. John now stands, and the latter at Castine, on the eastern shore of Penobscot Bay. Shortly after his appointment, La Tour attacked and drove away a small party of Plymouth men who had set up a trading-post at Machias; and in 1635 D'Aulnay treated another party of the Plymouth colonists in a similar way. In retaliation for this attack, Plymouth hired and despatched a vessel commanded by one Girling, in company with their own barque, with 20 men under Miles Standish, to dispossess the French; but the expedition failed to accomplish anything. Subsequently the two French commanders quarrelled, and, engaging in active hostilities, made efforts (not altogether unsuccessful) to enlist Massachusetts in their quarrel. For this purpose La Tour visited Boston in person in the summer of 1643, and was hospitably entertained. He was not able to secure the direct cooperation of Massachusetts; but he was permitted to hire four vessels and a pinnace to aid him in his attack on D'Aulnay. The expedition was so far successful as to destroy a mill and some standing corn belonging to his rival. In the following year La Tour made a second visit to Boston for further help; but he was able only to procure the writing of threatening letters from the Massachusetts authorities to D'Aulnay. Not long after La Tour's departure from Boston, envoys from D'Aulnay arrived here; and after considerable delay a treaty was signed pledging the colonists to neutrality, which was ratified by the Commissioners of the United Colonies in the following year; but it was not until two years later that it

was ratified by new envoys from the crafty Frenchman. In this interval D'Aulnay captured by assault La Tour's fort at St. John, securing booty to a large amount; and a few weeks afterward Madame la Tour, who seems to have been of a not less warlike turn than her husband, and who had bravely defended the fort, died of shame and mortification. La Tour was reduced to the last extremities; but he finally made good his losses, and in 1653 he married the widow of his rival, who had died two or three years before. In 1654, in accordance with secret instructions from Cromwell, the whole of Acadia was subjugated by an English force from Boston under the command of Major Robert Sedgwick, of Charlestown, and Captain John Leverett, of Boston. To the latter the temporary government of the country was intrusted. Ineffectual complaints of this aggression were made to the British government; but by the treaty of Westminster, in the following year, England was left in possession, and the question of title was referred to commissioners. In 1656 it was made a province by Cromwell, who appointed Sir Thomas Temple governor, and granted the whole territory to Temple and to one William Crown and Stephen de la Tour, son of the late governor. The rights of the latter were purchased by the other two proprietors, and Acadia remained in possession of the English until the treaty of Breda, in 1668, when it was ceded to France with undefined limits. Very little was done by the French to settle and improve the country."—C. C. Smith, *Acadia* (*Narrative and Critical Hist. of Am., v. 4, ch. 4*).

A. D. 1690-1692.—Temporary conquest by the Massachusetts colonists.—Recovery by the French. See CANADA: A. D. 1689–1690; and 1692–1697.

A. D. 1710.—Final conquest by the English and change of name. See NEW ENGLAND: A. D. 1702–1710.

A. D. 1713.—Relinquished to Great Britain. See UTRECHT: A. D. 1712–1714; NEWFOUNDLAND: A. D. 1713; and CANADA: A. D. 1711–1713.

A. D. 1713-1730.—Troubles with the French inhabitants—the Acadians.—Their refusal to swear allegiance.—Hostilities with the Indians.—"It was evident from the first that the French intended to interpret the cession of Acadia in as restricted a sense as possible, and that it was their aim to neutralize the power of England in the colony, by confining it within the narrowest limits. The inhabitants numbered some 2,500 at the time of the treaty of Utrecht, divided into three principal settlements at Port Royal, Mines, and Chignecto. The priests at these settlements during the whole period from the treaty of Utrecht to the expulsion of the Acadians were, with scarcely an exception, agents of the French Government, in their pay, and resolute opponents of English rule. The presence of a powerful French establishment at Louisburg, and their constant communications with Canada, gave to the political teachings of those priests a moral influence, which went far towards making the Acadians continue faithful to France. They were taught to believe that they might remain in Acadia, in an attitude of scarcely concealed hostility to the English Government, and hold their lands and possessions as neutrals, on the condition that they should not take up arms either for the French or English. . . . By the 14th article of the treaty of Utrecht, it was stipulated 'that the subjects of the King of France may have liberty to remove themselves within a year to any other place, with all their movable effects. But those who are willing to remain, and to be subject to the King of Great Britain, are to enjoy the free exercise of their religion according to the usages of the church of Rome, as far as the laws of Great Britain do allow the same.' . . . It was never contemplated that the Acadians should establish themselves in the country a colony of enemies of British power, ready at all times to obstruct the authority of the government, and to make the possession of Acadia by England merely nominal. . . . Queen Anne died in August, 1714, and in January, 1715, Messrs. Capoon and Button were commissioned by Governor Nicholson to proceed in the sloop of war Caulfield to Mines, Chignecto, River St. John, Passamaquoddy and Penobscot, to proclaim King George, and to tender and administer the oaths of allegiance to the French inhabitants. The French refused to take the oaths, and some of the people of Mines made the pretence that they intended to withdraw from the colony. . . . A year later the people of Mines notified Caulfield [Lieutenant-Governor] that they intended to remain in the country, and at this period it would seem that most of the few French inhabitants who actually left the Province had returned. Caulfield then summoned the inhabitants of Annapolis, and tendered them the oath of allegiance, but with no better success than his deputies had met at Mines and Chignecto. . . . General Phillips, who became Governor of Nova Scotia in 1717, and who arrived in the Province early in 1720, had no more success than his predecessors in persuading the Acadians to take the oaths. Every refusal on their part only served to make them more bold in defying the British authorities. . . . They held themselves in readiness to take up arms against the English the moment war was declared between the two Crowns, and to restore Acadia to France. But, as there was a peace of thirty years duration between France and England after the treaty of Utrecht, there was no opportunity of carrying this plan into effect. Vaudreuil, Governor of Canada, however, continued to keep the Acadians on the alert by means of his agents, and the Indians were incited to acts of hostility against the English, both in Acadia and Maine. The first difficulty occurred at Canso in 1720, by a party of Indians assailing the English fishermen there. . . . The Indians were incited to this attack by the French of Cape Breton, who were annoyed at one of their vessels being seized at Canso by a British war vessel for illegal fishing. . . . The Indians had indeed some reason to be disquieted, for the progress of the English settlements east of the Kennebec filled them with apprehensions. Unfortunately the English had not been always so just in their dealings with them that they could rely entirely on their forbearance. The Indians claimed their territorial rights in the lands over which the English settlements were spreading; the French encouraged them in this claim, alleging that they had never surrendered this territory to the English. While these questions were in controversy the Massachusetts authorities were guilty of an act which did not tend to allay the distrust of the Indians. This

was nothing less than an attempt to seize the person of Father Ralle, the Jesuit missionary at Norridgewock. He, whether justly or not, was blamed for inciting the Indians to acts of hostility, and was therefore peculiarly obnoxious to the English." The attempt to capture Father Ralle, at Norridgewock, which was made in December, 1721, and which failed, exasperated the Indians, and "in the summer of 1722 a war commenced, in which all the Indian tribes from Cape Canso to the Kennebec were involved. The French could not openly take part in the war, but such encouragement and assistance as they could give the Indians secretly they freely supplied." This war continued until 1725, and cost the lives of many of the colonists of New England and Nova Scotia. Its most serious event was the destruction of Norridgewock and the barbarous murder of Father Ralle, by an expedition from Massachusetts in the summer of 1724. In November, 1725, a treaty of peace was concluded, the Indians acknowledging the sovereignty of King George. After the conclusion of the Indian war, the inhabitants of Annapolis River took a qualified oath of allegiance, with a clause exempting them from bearing arms. At Mines and Chignecto they still persisted in their refusal; and when, on the death of George I. and the accession of George II., the inhabitants of Annapolis were called upon to renew their oath, they also refused again. In 1729 Governor Phillips returned to the province and had great success during the next year in persuading the Acadians, with a few exceptions only throughout the French settlements, to take an oath of allegiance without any condition as to the bearing or not bearing of arms. "The Acadians afterwards maintained that when they took this oath of allegiance, it was with the understanding that a clause was to be inserted, relieving them from bearing arms. The statement was probably accurate, for that was the position they always assumed, but the matter seems to have been lost sight of, and so for the time the question of oaths, which had been such a fertile cause of discord in the Province, appeared to be set at rest."—J. Hannay, *Hist. of Acadia, ch.* 17.

Also in: F. Parkman, *Montcalm and Wolfe, v.* 1, *ch.* 4.—P. H. Smith, *Acadia, pp.* 114–121.

A. D. 1744-1748.—The Third Intercolonial War (King George's War). See New England: A. D. 1744; 1745; and 1745–1748.

A. D. 1749-1755. — Futile discussion of boundary questions.—The Acadian "Neutrals" and their conduct.—The founding of Halifax.—Hostilities renewed.—"During the nominal peace which followed the Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle, the representatives of the two governments were anxiously engaged in attempting to settle by actual occupation the question of boundaries, which was still left open by that treaty. It professed to restore the boundaries as they had been before the war; and before the war the entire basin of the Mississippi, as well as the tract between the St. Lawrence River and Gulf, the Bay of Fundy, and the Kennebec, was claimed by both nations, with some show of reason, as no convention between them had ever defined the rights of each. Names had been given to vast tracts of land whose limits were but partly defined, or at one time defined in one way, at another time in another, and when these names were mentioned in treaties they were understood by each party according to its own interest. The treaty of 1748, therefore, not only left abundant cause for future war, but left occasion for the continuance of petty border hostilities in time of nominal peace. Commissioners were appointed, French and English, to settle the question of the disputed territory, but the differences were too wide to be adjusted by anything but conquest. While the most important question was that of the great extent of territory at the west, and . . . both nations were devising means for establishing their claims to it, Acadia, or Nova Scotia, was the scene of a constant petty warfare. The French were determined to restrict the English province to the peninsula now known by that name. The Governor of Canada sent a few men under Boishebert to the mouth of the St. John's to hold that part of the territory. A little old fort built by the Indians had stood for fifty years on the St. John's at the mouth of the Nerepis, and there the men established themselves. A larger number was sent under La Corne to keep possession of Chignecto, on the isthmus which, according to French claims, formed the northern boundary of English territory. In all the years that England had held nominal rule in Acadia, not a single English settlement had been formed, and apparently not a step of progress had been taken in gaining the loyalty of the inhabitants. A whole generation had grown up during the time; but they were no less devoted to France than their fathers had been. It was said that the king of England had not one truly loyal subject in the peninsula, outside of the fort at Annapolis. . . . Among the schemes suggested for remedying this state of affairs, was one by Governor Shirley [of Massachusetts], to place strong bands of English settlers in all the important towns, in order that the Government might have friends and influence throughout the country. Nothing came of this; but in 1749 Parliament voted £40,000 for the purpose of settling a colony. . . . Twenty-five hundred persons being ready to go in less than two months from the time of the first advertisement, the colony was entrusted to Colonel Edward Cornwallis (uncle of the Cornwallis of the Revolutionary War), and he was made Governor of Nova Scotia. Chebucto was selected as the site of the colony, and the town was named Halifax in honor of the president of the Lords of Trade and Plantations [see, also, Halifax: A. D. 1749]. . . . In July, a council was held at Halifax, when Governor Cornwallis gave the French deputies a paper declaring what the Government would allow to the French subjects, and what would be required of them." They were called upon to take the oath of allegiance, so often refused before. They claimed the privilege of taking a qualified oath, such as had been formerly allowed in certain cases, and which exempted them from bearing arms. "They wished to stand as neutrals, and, indeed, were often called so. Cornwallis replied that nothing less than entire allegiance would be accepted. . . . About a month later the people sent in a declaration with a thousand signatures, stating that they had resolved not to take the oath, but were determined to leave the country. Cornwallis took no steps to coerce them, but wrote to England for instructions." Much of the trouble with the Acadians was attributed to a French missionary, La Loutre, who was also

accused of inciting the Indians to hostilities. In 1750, Major Lawrence was sent to Chignecto, with 400 men, to build a block-house on the little river Messagouche, which the French claimed as their southern boundary. "On the southern bank was a prosperous village called Beaubassin, and La Corne [the French commander] had compelled its inhabitants to take the oath of allegiance to the King of France. When Lawrence arrived, all the inhabitants of Beaubassin, about 1,000, having been persuaded by La Loutre, set fire to their houses, and, leaving behind the fruits of years of industry, turned their backs on their fertile fields, and crossed the river, to put themselves under the protection of La Corne's troops. Many Acadians from other parts of the peninsula also left their homes, and lived in exile and poverty under the French dominion, hoping for a speedy change of masters in Nova Scotia. . . . In the same year a large French fort, Beau Séjour, was built on the northern side of the Messagouche, and a smaller one, Gaspereaux, at Baie Verte. Other stations were also planted, forming a line of fortified posts from the Gulf of St. Lawrence to the mouth of the St. John's. . . . The commission appointed to settle the question of boundaries had broken up without accomplishing any results; and it was resolved by the authorities in Nova Scotia and Massachusetts [1754] that an expedition should be sent against Fort Beau Séjour. . . . Massachusetts . . . raised about 2,000 troops for the contemplated enterprise, who were under the command of Lieutenant-Colonel John Winslow. To this force were added about 300 regulars, and the whole was placed under the command of Lieutenant-Colonel Moncton. They reached Chignecto on the 2d of June," 1755. The French were found unprepared for long resistance, and Beau Séjour was surrendered on the 16th. "After Beau Séjour, the smaller forts were quickly reduced. Some vessels sent to the mouth of the St. John's found the French fort deserted and burned. The name of Beau Séjour was changed to Cumberland."—R. Johnson, *Hist. of the French War, ch.* 10.

Also in: J. G. Palfrey, *Hist. of N. Eng., bk.* 5, *ch.* 11 (*v.* 5).—W. Kingsford, *Hist. of Canada, bk.* 11, *ch.* 3 *and* 6 (*v.* 3).—See, also, Canada: A. D. 1750–1753; and England: A. D. 1754–1755.

A. D. 1755.—Frustrated naval expedition of the French. See Canada: A. D. 1755 (June).

A. D. 1755.—The removal of the Acadians and their dispersion in exile.—"The campaign of the year 1755, which had opened in Nova Scotia with so much success, and which promised a glorious termination, disappointed the expectations and awakened the fears of the Colonists. The melancholy and total defeat of the army under General Braddock, while on his march against Fort du Quesnê, threw a gloom over the British Provinces. Niagara and Crown-point were not only unsubdued, but it was evident that Governor Shirley would have to abandon, for this year at least, the attempt; while Louisburg was reinforced, the savages let loose upon the defenceless settlements of the English, and the tide of war seemed ready to roll back upon the invaders. Amidst this general panic, Governor Lawrence and his Council, aided by Admirals Boscawen and Moystyn, assembled to consider the necessary measures that were to be adopted towards the Acadians, whose character and situation were so peculiar as to distinguish them from every other people who had suffered under the scourge of war. . . . It was finally determined, at this consultation, to remove and disperse this whole people among the British Colonies; where they could not unite in any offensive measures, and where they might be naturalized to the Government and Country. The execution of this unusual and general sentence was allotted chiefly to the New England Forces, the Commander of which [Colonel Winslow], from the humanity and firmness of his character, was well qualified to carry it into effect. It was, without doubt, as he himself declared, disagreeable to his natural make and temper; and his principles of implicit obedience as a soldier were put to a severe test by this ungrateful kind of duty; which required an ungenerous, cunning, and subtle severity. . . . They were kept entirely ignorant of their destiny until the moment of their captivity, and were overawed, or allured, to labour at the gathering in of their harvest, which was secretly allotted to the use of their conquerors."—T. C. Haliburton, *Account of Nova Scotia, v.* 1, *pp.* 170–175.—"Winslow prepared for the embarkation. The Acadian prisoners and their families were divided into groups answering to their several villages, in order that those of the same village might, as far as possible, go in the same vessel. It was also provided that the members of each family should remain together; and notice was given them to hold themselves in readiness. 'But even now,' he writes, 'I could not persuade the people I was in earnest.' Their doubts were soon ended. The first embarkation took place on the 8th of October [1755]. . . . When all, or nearly all, had been sent off from the various points of departure, such of the houses and barns as remained standing were burned, in obedience to the orders of Lawrence, that those who had escaped might be forced to come in and surrender themselves. The whole number removed from the province, men, women, and children, was a little above 6,000. Many remained behind; and while some of these withdrew to Canada, Isle St. Jean, and other distant retreats, the rest lurked in the woods, or returned to their old haunts, whence they waged for several years a guerilla warfare against the English. Yet their strength was broken, and they were no longer a danger to the province. Of their exiled countrymen, one party overpowered the crew of the vessel that carried them, ran her ashore at the mouth of the St. John, and escaped. The rest were distributed among the colonies from Massachusetts to Georgia, the master of each transport having been provided with a letter from Lawrence addressed to the Governor of the province to which he was bound, and desiring him to receive the unwelcome strangers. The provincials were vexed at the burden imposed upon them; and though the Acadians were not in general ill-treated, their lot was a hard one. Still more so was that of those among them who escaped to Canada. . . . Many of the exiles eventually reached Louisiana, where their descendants now form a numerous and distinct population. Some, after incredible hardship, made their way back to Acadia, where, after the peace, they remained unmolested. . . . In one particular the authors of the deportation were disappointed in its results. They had hoped to substitute a loyal population for a disaffected

one; but they failed for some time to find settlers for the vacated lands. . . . New England humanitarianism, melting into sentimentality at a tale of woe, has been unjust to its own. Whatever judgment may be passed on the cruel measure of wholesale expatriation, it was not put in execution till every resource of patience and persuasion had been tried in vain."—F. Parkman, *Montcalm and Wolfe, v.* 1, *ch.* 8.—"The removal of the French Acadians from their homes was one of the saddest episodes in modern history, and no one now will attempt to justify it; but it should be added that the genius of our great poet [Longfellow in 'Evangeline'] has thrown a somewhat false and distorted light over the character of the victims. They were not the peaceful and simple-hearted people they are commonly supposed to have been; and their houses, as we learn from contemporary evidence, were by no means the picturesque, vine-clad, and strongly built cottages described by the poet. The people were notably quarrelsome among themselves, and to the last degree superstitious. They were wholly under the influence of priests appointed by the French bishops. . . . Even in periods when France and England were at peace, the French Acadians were a source of perpetual danger to the English colonists. Their claim to a qualified allegiance was one which no nation then or now could sanction. But all this does not justify their expulsion in the manner in which it was executed."—C. C. Smith, *The Wars on the Seaboard* (*Narrative and Critical Hist. of Am., v.* 5, *ch.* 7).—"We defy all past history to produce a parallel case, in which an unarmed and peaceable people have suffered to such an extent as did the French Neutrals of Acadia at the hands of the New England troops."—P. H. Smith, *Acadia, p.* 216.

Also in: W. B. Reed, *The Acadian Exiles in Pennsylvania* (*Penn. Hist. Soc. Memoirs, v.* 6, *pp.* 283–316).

A. D. 1763.—Cession by France to England confirmed in the Treaty of Paris. See Seven Years War: The Treaties.

A. D. 1763.—Cape Breton added to the government. See Canada: A. D. 1763–1774.

A. D. 1782-1784.—Influx of Refugee Loyalists from the United States. See Tories of the American Revolution.

A. D. 1820-1837.—The Family Compact. See Canada: A. D. 1820–1837.

A. D. 1854-1866.—The Reciprocity Treaty with the United States. See Tariff Legislation (United States and Canada): A. D. 1854–1866.

A. D. 1867.—Embraced in the Confederation of the Dominion of Canada. See Canada: A. D. 1867.

A. D. 1871.—The Treaty of Washington. See Alabama Claims: A. D. 1871.

A. D. 1877-1888.—The Halifax Fishery Award.—Termination of the Fishery Articles of the Treaty of Washington.—Renewed Fishery disputes. See Fisheries, North American: A. D. 1877–1888.

NOVANTÆ, The.—A tribe which, in Roman times, occupied the modern counties of Kirkcudbright and Wigtown, Scotland. See Britain: Celtic Tribes.

NOVARA, Battle of (1513). See Italy: A. D. 1510–1513.....**Battle of (1821).** See Italy: A. D. 1820–1821.....**Battle of (1849).** See Italy: A. D. 1848–1849.

NOVELS OF JUSTINIAN. See Corpus Juris Civilis.

NOVEMBER FIFTH. See Guy Fawkes' Day.

NOVGOROD: Origin. See Russia.—Russians: A. D. 862.

11th Century.—Rise of the Commonwealth. See Russia: A. D. 1054–1237.

A. D. 1237-1478.—Prosperity and greatness of the city as a commercial republic. See Russia: A. D. 1237–1480.

14-15th Centuries.—In the Hanseatic League. See Hansa Towns.

NOVI, Battle of. See France: A. D. 1799 (April—September).

NOVIOMAGUS.—Modern Nimeguen. See Batavians.

NOYADES. See France: A. D. 1793–1794 (October—April).

NOYON, Treaty of. See France: A. D. 1516–1517.

NUBIANS, The. See Africa: The inhabiting races.

NUITHONES, The. See Aviones.

NULLIFICATION: First assertion of the doctrine in the United States of Am. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1798.

Doctrine and Ordinance in South Carolina. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1828–1833.

NUMANTIAN WAR, The.—"In 143 B. C. the Celtiberians again appeared in the field [resisting the Romans in Spain]; and when, on the death of Viriathus, D. Junius Brutus had pushed the legions to the Atlantic in 137 B. C., and practically subdued Lusitania, the dying spirit of Spanish independence still held out in the Celtiberian fortress city of Numantia. Perched on a precipitous hill by the banks of the upper Douro, occupied only by eight thousand men, this little place defied the power of Rome as long as Troy defied the Greeks. . . . In 137 B. C. the consul, C. Hostilius Mancinus, was actually hemmed in by a sortie of the garrison, and forced to surrender. He granted conditions of peace to obtain his liberty; but the senate would not ratify them, though the young quæstor, Tiberius Gracchus, who had put his hand to the treaty, pleaded for faith and honour. Mancinus, stripped and with manacles on his hands, was handed over to the Numantines, who, like the Samnite Pontius, after the Caudine Forks, refused to accept him. In 134 B. C. the patience of the Romans was exhausted; Scipio was sent. . . . The mighty destroyer of Carthage drew circumvallations five miles in length around the stubborn rock, and waited for the result. The Virgilian picture of the fall of Troy is not more moving than are the brave and ghastly facts of the fall of Numantia. The market-place was turned into a funeral pyre for the gaunt, famine-stricken citizens to leap upon. . . . When the surrender was made only a handful of men marched out."—R. F. Horton, *Hist. of the Romans, ch.* 18.

Also in: G. Long, *Decline of the Roman Republic, ch.* 6–7.—See, also, Lusitania; and Spain: B. C. 218–25.

NUMERIANUS, Roman Emperor, A. D. 283–284.

NUMIDIA: The Country and People. See NUMIDIANS.

B. C. 204.—Alliance with Carthage.—Subjection to Rome. See PUNIC WAR, THE SECOND.

B. C. 118-104.—The Jugurthine War.—The Numidian kingdom, over which the Romans, at the end of the second Punic War, had settled their friend Masinissa, passed at his death to his son Micipsa. In 118 B. C. Micipsa died, leaving two young sons, and also a bastard nephew, Jugurtha, whom he feared. He divided the kingdom between these three, hoping to secure the fidelity of Jugurtha to his sons. It was a policy that failed. Jugurtha made sure of what was given to him, and then grasped at the rest. One of his young cousins was soon cleared from his path by assassination; on the other he opened war. This latter, Adherbal by name, appealed to Rome, but Jugurtha despatched agents with money to bribe the senate, and a commission sent over to divide Numidia gave him the western and better half. The commissioners were no sooner out of Africa than he began war upon Adherbal afresh, shut him up in his strong capital, Cirta [B. C. 112], and placed the city under siege. The Romans again interfered, but, he captured Cirta, notwithstanding, and tortured Adherbal to death. The corrupt party at Rome which Jugurtha kept in his pay made every effort to stifle discussion of his nefarious doings; but one bold tribune, C. Memmius, roused the people on the subject and forced the senate to declare war against him. Jugurtha's gold, however, was still effectual, and it paralyzed the armies sent to Africa, by corrupting the venial officers who commanded them. Once, Jugurtha went to Rome, under a safe conduct, invited to testify as a witness against the men whom he had bribed, but really expecting to be able to further his own cause in the city. He found the people furious against him and he only saved himself from being forced to criminate his Roman senatorial mercenaries by buying a tribune, who brazenly vetoed the examination of the Numidian king. Jugurtha being, then, ordered out of Rome, the war proceeded again, and in 109 B. C. the command passed to an honest general, Q. Metellus, who took with him Caius Marius, the most capable soldier of Rome, whose capability was at that time not half understood. Under Metellus the Romans penetrated Numidia to Zama, but failed to take the town, and narrowly escaped a great disaster on the Muthul, where a serious battle was fought. In 107 B. C. Metellus was superseded by Marius, chosen consul for that year and now really beginning his remarkable career. Meantime Jugurtha had gained an ally in Bocchus, king of Mauretania, and Marius, after two campaigns of doubtful result, found more to hope from diplomacy than from war. With the help of Sulla,—his future great rival—who had lately been sent over to his army, in command of a troop of horse, he persuaded the Mauretanian king to betray Jugurtha into his hands. The dreaded Numidian was taken to Rome [B. C. 104], exhibited in the triumph of Marius, and then brutally thrust into the black dungeon called the Tullianum to die of slow starvation. Bocchus was rewarded for his treachery by the cession to him of part of Numidia; Marius, intoxicated with the plaudits of Rome, first saved it from the Cimbri and then stabbed it with his own sword; Sulla, inexplicable harbinger of the coming Cæsars, bided his time.—W. Ihne, *Hist. of Rome, bk.* 7, *ch.* 8.

ALSO IN: G. Long, *Decline of the Roman Republic, v.* 1, *ch.* 26–29.—Sallust, *Jugurthine War.*

B. C. 46.—The kingdom extinguished by Cæsar and annexed to Rome. See ROME: B. C. 47–46.

A. D. 374-398.—Revolts of Firmus and Gildo. See ROME: A. D. 396–398.

NUMIDIANS AND MAURI, The.—"The union of the Aryan invaders [of North Africa] with the ancient populations of the coast sprung from Phut gave birth to the Mauri, or Maurusii, whose primitive name it has been asserted was Medes, probably an alteration of the word Amazigh. The alliance of the same invaders with the Getulians beyond the Atlas produced the Numidians. The Mauri were agriculturists, and of settled habits; the Numidians, as their Greek appellation indicates, led a nomadic life."—F. Lenormant, *Manual of Ancient Hist. of the East, bk.* 6, *ch.* 5 (*v.* 2).—In northern Africa, "on the south and west of the immediate territory of the Carthaginian republic, lived various races of native Libyans who are commonly known by the name of Numidians. But these were in no way, as their Greek name ('Nomads') would seem to imply, exclusively pastoral races. Several districts in their possession, especially in the modern Algeria, were admirably suited for agriculture. Hence they had not only fixed and permanent abodes, but a number of not unimportant cities, of which Hippo and Cirta, the residences of the chief Numidian princes, were the most considerable."—W. Ihne, *Hist. of Rome, bk.* 4, *ch.* 1 (*v.* 2).—The various peoples of North Africa known anciently and modernly as Libyans, Numidians, or Nomades, Mauri, Mauritanians or Moors, Gaetulians and Berbers, belong ethnographically to one family of men, distinguished alike from the negroes and the Egyptians.—T. Mommsen, *Hist. of Rome, bk.* 8, *ch.* 13.—See, also, LIBYANS; CARTHAGE: B. C. 146; PUNIC WAR, THE SECOND; and NUMIDIA: B. C. 118–104.

NUNCOMAR AND WARREN HASTINGS. See INDIA: A. D. 1773–1785.

NUR MAHAL, OR NUR JAHAN, Empress of India. See INDIA: A. D. 1605–1658.

NUREMBERG.—"Nuremberg (Nürnberg) (Norimberga) is situated on the Regnitz, in the centre of Middle Franconia, about 90 miles northwest of Munich, to which it is second in size and importance, with a population of about 90,000. The name is said to be derived from the ancient inhabitants of Noricum, who migrated hither about the year 451, on being driven from their early settlements on the Danube by the Huns. Here they distinguished themselves by their skill in the working of metals, which abound in the neighbouring mountains. Before the eleventh century the history of Nuremberg is enveloped in a mist of impenetrable obscurity, from which it does not emerge until the time of the Emperor Henry III., who issued an edict, dated July 16, 1050, 'ad castrum Noremberc,' a proof that it was a place of considerable impor-

tance even at this early period. Nuremberg afterwards became the favourite residence of the Emperor Henry IV."—W. J. Wyatt, *Hist. of Prussia, v.* 2, *p.* 456.

A. D. 1417.—Office of Burgrave bought by the city. See BRANDENBURG: A. D. 1417–1640.

A. D. 1522-1524.—The two diets, and their recesses in favor of the Reformation. See PAPACY: A. D. 1522–1525.

A. D. 1525.—Formal establishment of the Reformed Religion. See PAPACY: A. D. 1522–1525.

A. D. 1529.—Joined in the Protest which gave rise to the name Protestants. See PAPACY: A. D. 1525–1529.

A. D. 1532.—Pacification of Charles V. with the Protestants. See GERMANY: A. D. 1530–1532.

A. D. 1632.—Welcome to Gustavus Adolphus of Sweden.—Siege by Wallenstein.—Battle on the Fürth. See GERMANY: A. D. 1631–1632.

A. D. 1801-1803.—One of six free cities which survived the Peace of Luneville. See GERMANY: A. D. 1801–1803.

A. D. 1806.—Loss of municipal freedom.—Absorption in the kingdom of Bavaria. See GERMANY: A. D. 1805–1806.

NUYS, The Siege of.—In 1474 Charles the Bold, Duke of Burgundy, ambitious to extend his dominions along the left bank of the Rhine, down to the Netherlands, took advantage of a quarrel between the citizens of Cologne and their prince-archbishop, to ally himself with the latter. The citizens of Cologne had appointed Herman of Hesse to be protector of the see, and he had fortified himself at Nuys. Charles, with 60,000 men, laid siege to the place, expecting to reduce it speedily. On the contrary, he wasted months in the fruitless endeavor, and became involved in the quarrel with the Swiss (see BURGUNDY: A. D. 1476–1477) which brought about his downfall. The abortive siege of Nuys was the beginning of his disasters.—C. M. Davies, *Hist. of Holland, pt.* 2, *ch.* 2.

NYANTICS, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: ALGONQUIAN FAMILY.

NYSTAD, Peace of. See SCANDINAVIAN STATES (SWEDEN): A. D. 1719–1721.

O.

O. S.—Old Style. See GREGORIAN CALENDAR.

OAK BOYS. See IRELAND: A. D. 1760–1798.

OATES, Titus, and the "Popish Plot." See ENGLAND: A. D. 1678–1679.

OBELISKS, Egyptian. See EGYPT: ABOUT B. C. 1700–1400.

OBERPFALZ. See FRANCONIA: THE DUCHY AND THE CIRCLE.

OBES, The. See GERUSIA; and SPARTA: THE CONSTITUTION, &c.

OBLATES, The.—"The Oblates, or Volunteers, established by St. Charles Borromeo in 1578, are a congregation of secular priests. . . . Their special aim was to give edification to the diocese, and to maintain the integrity of religion by the purity of their lives, by teaching, and by zealously discharging the duties committed to them by their bishop. These devoted ecclesiastics were much loved by St. Charles. . . . Strange to say, they do not seem to have been much appreciated elsewhere."—J. Alzog, *Manual of Universal Church Hist., v.* 3, *p.* 456.

OBNUNTIATIO. See ÆLIAN AND FUFIAN LAWS.

OBOLLA. See MAHOMETAN CONQUEST: A. D. 632–651.

OBOLUS. See TALENT.

OBOTRITES, The. See SAXONY: A. D. 1178–1183.

OBRENOVITCH DYNASTY, The. See BALKAN AND DANUBIAN STATES: 14–19TH CENTURIES (SERVIA).

OC, Langue d'. See LANGUE D'OC.

OCANA, Battle of. See SPAIN: A. D. 1809 (AUGUST—NOVEMBER).

OCCASIONAL CONFORMITY BILL. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1711–1714.

OCEAN STEAM NAVIGATION, The beginnings of. See STEAM NAVIGATION: ON THE OCEAN.

OCHLOCRACY.—This term was applied by the Greeks to an unlimited democracy, where rights were made conditional on no gradations of property, and where "provisions were made, not so much that only a proved and worthy citizen should be elected, as that every one, without distinction, should be eligible for everything."—G. Schömann, *Antiq. of Greece: The State, pt.* 1, *ch.* 3.

O'CONNELL, Daniel, The political agitations of. See IRELAND: A. D. 1811–1829, to 1841–1848.

OCTAETĒRIS, The. See METON, THE YEAR OF.

OCTAVIUS, Caius (afterwards called Augustus), and the founding of the Roman Empire. See ROME: B. C. 44, after Cæsar's death, to B. C. 31—A. D. 14.

OCTOBER CLUB, The. See CLUBS.

ODD FELLOWS. See INSURANCE.

ODAL. See ADEL.

ODELSRET. See CONSTITUTION OF NORWAY, TITLE V., ART. 16.

ODELSTHING. See CONSTITUTION OF NORWAY.

ODENATHUS, The rule at Palmyra of. See PALMYRA: THE RISE AND THE FALL OF.

ODEUM AT ATHENS, The.—"Pericles built, at the south-eastern base of the citadel, the Odeum, which differed from the neighbouring theatre in this, that the former was a covered space, in which musical performances took place before a less numerous public. The roof, shaped like a tent, was accounted an imitation of the gorgeous tent pitched of old by Xerxes upon the soil of Attica."—E. Curtius, *Hist. of Greece, bk.* 3, *ch.* 3.

ODOACER, and the end of the line of Roman Emperors in the West. See ROME: A. D. 455–476; and 488–526.

ODYSSEY, The. See HOMER.

ŒA. See LEPTIS MAGNA.

ŒCUMENICAL, OR ECUMENICAL, COUNCIL.—A general or universal council of the entire Christian Church. Twenty such councils are recognized by the Roman Catholic Church. See COUNCILS OF THE CHURCH.

ŒKIST.—The chief-founder of a Greek colonial city,—the leader of a colonizing settlement,—was so entitled.—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece, pt.* 2, *ch.* 47.

ŒLAND, Naval battle of (1713). See Scandinavian States (Sweden): A. D. 1707–1718.

ŒNOË, Battle of.—A battle of some importance in the Corinthian War, fought about B. C. 388, in the valley of the Charander, on the road from Argos to Mantinea. The Lacedæmonians were defeated by the Argives and Athenians.—E. Curtius, *Hist. of Greece, bk.* 5, *ch.* 4.

ŒNOPHYTA, Battle of (B. C. 456). See Greece: B. C. 458–456.

ŒNOTRIANS, The.—"The territory [in Italy] known to Greek writers of the fifth century B. C. by the names of Œnotria on the coast of the Mediterranean, and Italia on that of the Gulfs of Tarentum and Squillace, included all that lies south of a line drawn across the breadth of the country, from the Gulf of Poseidonia (Pæstum) and the river Silarus on the Mediterranean Sea, to the north-west corner of the Gulf of Tarentum. It was bounded northwards by the Iapygians and Messapians, who occupied the Salentine peninsula and the country immediately adjoining to Tarentum, and by the Peuketians on the Ionic Gulf. . . . This Œnotrian or Pelasgian race were the population whom the Greek colonists found there on their arrival. They were known apparently under other names, such as the Sikels [Sicels], (mentioned even in the Odyssey, though their exact locality in that poem cannot be ascertained) the Italians, or Itali, properly so called—the Morgetes,—and the Chaones,—all of them names of tribes either cognate or subdivisional. The Chaones or Chaonians are also found, not only in Italy, but in Epirus, as one of the most considerable of the Epirotic tribes. . . . From hence, and from some other similarities of name, it has been imagined that Epirots, Œnotrians, Sikels, &c., were all names of cognate people, and all entitled to be comprehended under the generic appellation of Pelasgi. That they belonged to the same ethnical kindred there seems fair reason to presume, and also that in point of language, manners, and character, they were not very widely separated from the ruder branches of the Hellenic race. It would appear, too (as far as any judgment can be formed on a point essentially obscure) that the Œnotrians were ethnically akin to the primitive population of Rome and Latium on one side, as they were to the Epirots on the other; and that tribes of this race, comprising Sikels and Itali properly so called, as sections, had at one time occupied most of the territory from the left bank of the river Tiber southward between the Appenines and the Mediterranean."—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece, pt.* 2, *ch.* 22.

OESTERREICH. See Austria.

ŒTA. See Thessaly.

OFEN, Sieges and capture of (1684-1686). See Hungary: A. D. 1683–1699.

OFFA, King of Mercia, A. D. 758–794.

OFFA'S DYKE.—An earthern rampart which King Offa, of Mercia, in the eighth century, built from the mouth of the Wye to the mouth of the Tee, to divide his kingdom from Wales and protect it from Welsh incursions. A few remains of it are still to be seen.—J. Rhys, *Celtic Britain.*

OGALALAS, The. See American Aborigines: Siouan Family.

OGAM. See Ogham.

OGDEN TRACT, The. See New York: A. D. 1786–1799.

OGHAM INSCRIPTIONS.—"In the south and south-western counties of Ireland are to be found, in considerable numbers, a class of inscribed monuments, to which the attention of Irish archæologists has been from time to time directed, but with comparatively little result. . . . They [the inscriptions] are found engraved on pillar stones in that archaic character known to Irish philologists as the Ogham, properly pronounced Oum, and in an ancient dialect of the Gaedhelic (Gaelic). These monuments are almost exclusively found in the counties of Kerry, Cork, and Waterford, numbering, as far as I have been able to ascertain, 147; the rest of Ireland supplies 13. . . . Again it is worthy of remark, that while 29 Irish counties cannot boast of an Ogham monument, they have been found in England, Wales, and Scotland. In Devonshire, at Fardel, a stone has been discovered bearing not only a fine and well-preserved Ogham inscription, but also one in Romano-British letters. It is now deposited in the British Museum. . . . The Ogham letters, as found on Megalithic monuments, are formed by certain combinations of a simple short line, placed in reference to one continuous line, called the fleasg, or stem line; these combinations range from one to five, and their values depend upon their being placed above, across, or below the stem line; there are five consonants above, five consonants below, and five consonants across the line, two of which, NG and ST are double, and scarcely ever used. The vowels are represented by oval dots, or very short lines across the stem line. . . . The characters in general use on the monuments are 18 in number. . . . It may be expected from me that I should offer some conjecture as to the probable age of this mode of writing. This, I honestly acknowledge, I am unable to do, even approximately. . . . I am however decided in one view, and it is this, that the Ogham was introduced into Ireland long anterior to Christianity, by a powerful colony who landed on the south-west coast, who spread themselves along the southern and round the eastern shores, who ultimately conquered or settled the whole island, imposing their language upon the aborigines, if such preceded them."—R. R. Brash, *Trans. Int. Cong. of Prehistoric Archæology*, 1868.

Also in: Same, *Ogam Inscribed Monuments.*

OGLETHORPE'S GEORGIA COLONY. See Georgia: A. D. 1732–1739.

OGULNIAN LAW, The. See Rome: B. C. 300.

OGYGIA. See Ireland: The Name.

OHIO: The Name.—"The words Ohio, Ontario, and Onontio (or Yonnondio)—which should properly be pronounced as if written 'Oheeyo,' 'Ontareeyo,' and 'Ononteeyo'—are commonly rendered 'Beautiful River,' 'Beautiful Lake,' 'Beautiful Mountain.' This, doubtless, is the meaning which each of the words conveys to an Iroquois of the present day, unless he belongs to the Tuscarora tribe. But there can be no doubt that the termination 'io' (otherwise written 'iyo,' 'iio,' 'eeyo,' etc.) had originally

the sense, not of 'beautiful,' but of 'great.' . . . Ontario is derived from the Huron 'yontare,' or 'ontare,' lake (Iroquois, 'oniatare'), with this termination. . . . Ohio, in like manner, is derived, as M. Cuoq in the valuable notes to his Lexicon (p. 159) informs us, from the obsolete 'ohia,' river, now only used in the compound form 'ohionha.'"—H. Hale, *The Iroquois Book of Rites, app., note B.*

(Valley): The aboriginal inhabitants. See AMERICA, PREHISTORIC; AMERICAN ABORIGINES: ALGONQUIAN FAMILY, ALLEGHANS, DELAWARES, SHAWANESE.

(Valley): A. D. 1700-1735.—The beginnings of French Occupation. See CANADA: A. D. 1700–1735.

(Valley): A. D. 1748-1754.—The first movements of the struggle of French and English for possession.—"The close of King George's War was marked by an extraordinary development of interest in the Western country. The Pennsylvanians and Virginians had worked their way well up to the eastern foot-hills of the last range of mountains separating them from the interior. Even the Connecticut men were ready to overleap the province of New York and take possession of the Susquehanna. The time for the English colonists to attempt the Great Mountains in force had been long in coming, but it had plainly arrived. In 1748 the Ingles-Draper settlement, the first regular settlement of English-speaking men on the Western waters, was made at 'Draper's Meadow,' on the New River, a branch of the Kanawha. The same year Dr. Thomas Walker, accompanied by a number of Virginia gentlemen and a party of hunters, made their way by Southwestern Virginia into Kentucky and Tennessee. . . . The same year the Ohio company, consisting of thirteen prominent Virginians and Marylanders, and one London merchant, was formed. Its avowed objects were to speculate in Western lands, and to carry on trade on an extensive scale with the Indians. It does not appear to have contemplated the settlement of a new colony. The company obtained from the crown a conditional grant of 500,000 acres of land in the Ohio Valley, to be located mainly between the Monongahela and Kanawha Rivers, and it ordered large shipments of goods for the Indian trade from London. . . . In 1750 the company sent Christopher Gist, a veteran woodsman and trader living on the Yadkin, down the northern side of the Ohio, with instructions, as Mr. Bancroft summarizes them, 'to examine the Western country as far as the Falls of the Ohio; to look for a large tract of good level land; to mark the passes in the mountains; to trace the courses of the rivers; to count the falls; to observe the strength of the Indian nations.' Under these instructions, Gist made the first English exploration of Southern Ohio of which we have any report. The next year he made a similar exploration of the country south of the Ohio, as far as the Great Kanawha. . . . Gist's reports of his explorations added to the growing interest in the over-mountain country. At that time the Ohio Valley was waste and unoccupied, save by the savages, but adventurous traders, mostly Scotch-Irish, and commonly men of reckless character and loose morals, made trading excursions as far as the River Miami. The Indian town of Pickawillany, on the upper waters of that stream, became a great centre of English trade and influence. Another evidence of the growing interest in the West is the fact that the colonial authorities, in every direction, were seeking to obtain Indian titles to the Western lands, and to bind the Indians to the English by treaties. The Iroquois had long claimed, by right of conquest, the country from the Cumberland Mountains to the Lower Lakes and the Mississippi, and for many years the authorities of New York had been steadily seeking to gain a firm treaty-hold of that country. In 1684, the Iroquois, at Albany, placed themselves under the protection of King Charles and the Duke of York [see NEW YORK: A. D. 1684]; in 1726, they conveyed all their lands in trust to England [see NEW YORK: A. D. 1726], to be protected and defended by his Majesty to and for the use of the grantors and their heirs, which was an acknowledgment by the Indians of what the French had acknowledged thirteen years before at Utrecht. In 1744, the very year that King George's War began, the deputies of the Iroquois at Lancaster, Pa., confirmed to Maryland the lands within that province, and made to Virginia a deed that covered the whole West as effectually as the Virginian interpretation of the charter of 1609 [see VIRGINIA: A. D. 1744]. . . . This treaty is of the greatest importance in subsequent history; it is the starting-point of later negotiations with the Indians concerning Western lands. It gave the English their first real treaty-hold upon the West; and it stands in all the statements of the English claim to the Western country, side by side with the Cabot voyages. . . . There was, indeed, no small amount of dissension among the colonies, and it must not be supposed that they were all working together to effect a common purpose. The royal governors could not agree. There were bitter dissensions between governors and assemblies. Colony was jealous of colony. . . . Fortunately, the cause of England and the colonies was not abandoned to politicians. The time had come for the Anglo-Saxon column, that had been so long in reaching them, to pass the Endless Mountains; and the logic of events swept everything into the Westward current. In the years following the treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle the French were not idle. Galissonière, the governor of Canada, thoroughly comprehended what was at stake. In 1749 he sent Cèloron de Bienville into the Ohio Valley, with a suitable escort of whites and savages, to take formal possession of the valley in the name of the King of France, to propitiate the Indians, and in all ways short of actual warfare to thwart the English plans. Bienville crossed the portage from Lake Erie to Lake Chautauqua, the easternmost of the portages from the Lakes to the southern streams ever used by the French, and made his way by the Alleghany River and the Ohio as far as the Miami, and returned by the Maumee and Lake Erie to Montreal. His report to the governor was anything but reassuring. He found the English traders swarming in the valley, and the Indians generally well disposed to the English. Nor did French interests improve the two or three succeeding years. The Marquis Duquesne, who succeeded Galissonière, soon discovered the drift of events. He saw the necessity of action; he was clothed with power to act, and he was a man of action. And so, early in the year 1753, while the English governors and assemblies were still hesitating and disputing, he sent a strong

force by Lake Ontario and Niagara to seize and hold the northeastern branches of the Ohio. This was a master stroke: unless recalled, it would lead to war; and Duquesne was not the man to recall it. This force, passing over the portage between Presque Isle and French Creek, constructed Forts Le Bœuf and Venango, the second at the confluence of French Creek and the Alleghany River."—B. A. Hinsdale, *The Old Northwest, ch.* 5.

Also in: J. H. Perkins, *Annals of the West, ch.* 2.—B. Fernow, *The Ohio Valley in Colonial Days, ch.* 5.—See, also, Canada: A. D. 1750–1753.—O. H. Marshall, *De Celoron's Expedition to the Ohio in* 1749 (*Hist. Writings, pp.* 237–274).—N. B. Craig, *The Olden Time, v.* 1, *pp.* 1–10.

(Valley): A. D. 1754.—The opening battle.—Washington's first campaign.—The planting of the French at Forts Le Bœuf and Venango "put them during high water in easy communication by boat with the Alleghany River. French tact conciliated the Indians, and where that failed arrogance was sufficient, and the expedition would have pushed on to found new forts, but sickness weakened the men, and Marin, the commander, now dying, saw it was all he could do to hold the two forts, while he sent the rest of his force back to Montreal to recuperate. Late in the autumn Legardeur de Saint-Pierre arrived at Le Bœuf, as the successor of Marin. He had not been long there when on the 11th of December [1753] a messenger from Governor Dinwiddie, of Virginia, with a small escort, presented himself at the fort. The guide of the party was Christopher Gist; the messenger was George Washington, then adjutant-general of the Virginia militia. Their business was to inform the French commander that he was building forts on English territory, and that he would do well to depart peaceably. . . . At Le Bœuf Washington tarried three days, during which Saint-Pierre framed his reply, which was in effect that he must hold his post, while Dinwiddie's letter was sent to the French commander at Quebec. It was the middle of February, 1754, when Washington reached Williamsburg on his return, and made his report to Dinwiddie. The result was that Dinwiddie drafted 200 men from the Virginia militia, and despatched them under Washington to build a fort at the forks of the Ohio. The Virginia assembly, forgetting for the moment its quarrel with the governor, voted £10,000 to be expended, but only under the direction of a committee of its own. Dinwiddie found difficulty in getting the other colonies to assist, and the Quaker element in Pennsylvania prevented that colony from being the immediate helper which it might, from its position, have become. Meanwhile some backwoodsmen had been pushed over the mountains and had set to work on a fort at the forks. A much larger French force under Contrecœur soon summoned them, and the English retired. The French immediately began the erection of Fort Duquesne [on the site now covered by the city of Pittsburgh]. While this was doing, Dinwiddie was toiling with tardy assemblies and their agents to organize a regiment to support the backwoodsmen. Joshua Fry was to be its colonel, with Washington as second in command. The latter, with a portion of the men, had already pushed forward to Will's Creek, the present Cumberland. Later he advanced with 150 men to Great Meadows, where he learned that the French, who had been reinforced, had sent out a party from their new fort, marching towards him. Again he got word from an Indian — who, from his tributary character towards the Iroquois, was called Half-King, and who had been Washington's companion on his trip to Le Bœuf — that this chieftain with some followers had tracked two men to a dark glen, where he believed the French party were lurking. Washington started with forty men to join Half-King, and under his guidance they approached the glen and found the French. Shots were exchanged. The French leader, Jumonville, was killed, and all but one of his followers were taken or slain. The mission of Jumonville was to scour for English, by order of Contrecœur, now in command of Duquesne, and to bear a summons to any he could find, warning them to retire from French territory. The precipitancy of Washington's attack gave the French the chance to impute to Washington the crime of assassination; but it seems to have been a pretence on the part of the French to cover a purpose which Jumonville had of summoning aid from Duquesne, while his concealment was intended to shield him till its arrival. Rash or otherwise, this onset of the youthful Washington began the war. The English returned to Great Meadows, and while waiting for reinforcements from Fry, Washington threw up some entrenchments, which he called Fort Necessity. The men from Fry came without their leader, who had sickened and died, and Washington, succeeding to the command of the regiment, found himself at the head of 300 men, increased soon by an independent company from South Carolina. Washington again advanced toward Gist's settlement, when, fearing an attack, he sent back for Mackay, whom he had left with a company of regulars at Fort Necessity. Rumors thickening of an advance of the French, the English leader again fell back to Great Meadows, resolved to fight there. It was now the first of July, 1754. Coulon de Villiers, a brother of Jumonville, was now advancing from Duquesne. The attack was made on a rainy day, and for much of the time a thick mist hung between the combatants. After dark a parley resulted in Washington's accepting terms offered by the French, and the English marched out with the honors of war. The young Virginian now led his weary followers back to Will's Creek. . . . Thus they turned their backs upon the great valley, in which not an English flag now waved."—J. Winsor, *The Struggle for the Great Valleys of N. Am.* (*Narrative and Critical Hist. of Am., v.* 5, *ch.* 8).

Also in: W. Irving, *Life of Washington, v.* 1, *ch.* 7–12.—H. C. Lodge, *George Washington, v.* 1, *ch.* 3.—N. B. Craig, *The Olden Time, v.* 1, *pp.* 10–62.

(Valley): A. D. 1755.—Braddock's defeat.—The French possess the West and devastate the English frontiers.—"Now the English Government awoke to the necessity of vigorous measures to rescue the endangered Valley of the Ohio. A campaign was planned which was to expel the French from Ohio, and wrest from them some portions of their Canadian territory. The execution of this great design was intrusted to General Braddock, with a force which it was deemed would overbear all resistance. Braddock was a veteran who had seen the wars of

forty years. . . . He was a brave and experienced soldier, and a likely man, it was thought, to do the work assigned to him. But that proved a sad miscalculation. Braddock had learned the rules of war; but he had no capacity to comprehend its principles. In the pathless forests of America he could do nothing better than strive to give literal effect to those maxims which he had found applicable in the well-trodden battle-grounds of Europe. The failure of Washington in his first campaign had not deprived him of public confidence. Braddock heard such accounts of his efficiency that he invited him to join his staff. Washington, eager to efface the memory of his defeat, gladly accepted the offer. The troops disembarked at Alexandria. . . . After some delay, the army, with such reinforcements as the province afforded, began its march. Braddock's object was to reach Fort Du Quesne, the great centre of French influence on the Ohio. . . . Fort Du Quesne had been built [or begun] by the English, and taken from them by the French. It stood at the confluence of the Alleghany and Monongahela; which rivers, by their union at this point, form the Ohio. It was a rude piece of fortification, but the circumstances admitted of no better. . . . Braddock had no doubt that the fort would yield to him directly he showed himself before it. Benjamin Franklin looked at the project with his shrewd, cynical eye. He told Braddock that he would assuredly take the fort if he could only reach it; but that the long slender line which his army must form in its march 'would be cut like thread into several pieces' by the hostile Indians. Braddock 'smiled at his ignorance.' Benjamin offered no further opinion. It was his duty to collect horses and carriages for the use of the expedition, and he did what was required of him in silence. The expedition crept slowly forward, never achieving more than three or four miles in a day; stopping, as Washington said, 'to level every mole-hill, to erect a bridge over every brook.' It left Alexandria on the 20th April. On the 9th July Braddock, with half his army, was near the fort. There was yet no evidence that resistance was intended. No enemy had been seen; the troops marched on as to assured victory. So confident was their chief that he refused to employ scouts, and did not deign to inquire what enemy might be lurking near. The march was along a road twelve feet wide, in a ravine, with high ground in front and on both sides. Suddenly the Indian war-whoop burst from the woods. A murderous fire smote down the troops. The provincials, not unused to this description of warfare, sheltered themselves behind trees and fought with steady courage. Braddock, clinging to his old rules, strove to maintain his order of battle on the open ground. A carnage, most grim and lamentable, was the result. His undefended soldiers were shot down by an unseen foe. For three hours the struggle lasted; then the men broke and fled in utter rout and panic. Braddock, vainly fighting, fell mortally wounded, and was carried off the field by some of his soldiers. The poor pedantic man never got over his astonishment at a defeat so inconsistent with the established rules of war. 'Who would have thought it?' he murmured, as they bore him from the field. He scarcely spoke again, and died in two or three days. Nearly 800 men, killed and wounded, were lost in this disastrous encounter —about one-half of the entire force engaged. All the while England and France were nominally at peace. But now war was declared."—R. Mackenzie, *America: a history, bk.* 2, *ch.* 3. —"The news of the defeat caused a great revulsion of feeling. The highest hopes had been built on Braddock's expedition. . . . From this height of expectation men were suddenly plunged into the yawning gulf of gloom and alarm. The whole frontier lay exposed to the hatchet and the torch of the remorseless red man. . . . The apprehensions of the border settlers were soon fully justified. Dumas, who shortly succeeded de Contrecœur in the command at Fort Duquesne, set vigorously to work to put the Indians on the war-path against the defenceless settlements. 'M. de Contrecœur had not been gone a week,' he writes, 'before I had six or seven different war parties in the field at once, always accompanied by Frenchmen. Thus far, we have lost only two officers and a few soldiers; but the Indian villages are full of prisoners of every age and sex. The enemy has lost far more since the battle than on the day of his defeat.' All along the frontier the murderous work went on."—T. J. Chapman, *The French in the Allegheny Valley, pp.* 71–73.

Also in: F. Parkman, *Montcalm and Wolfe, v.* 1, *ch.* 7 *and* 10.—W. Sargent, *Hist. of Braddock's Expedition* (*Penn. Hist. Soc. Mem's, v.* 5).—N. B. Craig, *The Olden Time, v.* 1, *pp.* 64–133.

(Valley): A. D. 1758.—Retirement of the French.—Abandonment of Fort Duquesne. See Canada: A. D. 1758.

(Valley): A. D. 1763.—Relinquishment to Great Britain by the Treaty of Paris. See Seven Years War: The Treaties.

(Valley): A. D. 1763.—The king's proclamation excluding settlers. See Northwest Territory: A. D. 1763.

(Valley): A. D. 1763-1764.—Pontiac's War. See Pontiac's War.

(Valley): A. D. 1765-1768.—Indian Treaties of German Flats and Fort Stanwix.—Pretended cession of lands south of the Ohio.—The Walpole Company and its proposed Vandalia settlement. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1765–1768.

(Valley): A. D. 1772-1782.—The Moravian settlement and mission on the Muskingum. See Moravian Brethren.

(Valley): A. D. 1774.—Lord Dunmore's War with the Indians.—The territorial claims of Virginia.—The wrongs of Logan and his famous speech.—"On the eve of the Revolution, in 1774, the frontiersmen had planted themselves firmly among the Alleghanies. Directly west of them lay the untenanted wilderness, traversed only by the war parties of the red men, and the hunting parties of both reds and whites. No settlers had yet penetrated it, and until they did so there could be within its borders no chance of race warfare. . . . But in the southwest and the northwest alike, the area of settlement already touched the home lands of the tribes. . . . It was in the northwest that the danger of collision was most imminent; for there the whites and Indians had wronged one another for a generation, and their interests were, at the time, clashing more directly than ever. Much the greater part of the western frontier was held or claimed by Virginia, whose royal governor was, at the time, Lord Dunmore. . . . The

short but fierce and eventful struggle that now broke out was fought wholly by Virginians, and was generally known by the name of Lord Dunmore's war. Virginia, under her charter, claimed that her boundaries ran across to the South Seas, to the Pacific Ocean. The king of Britain had graciously granted her the right to take so much of the continent as lay within these lines, provided she could win it from the Indians, French, and Spaniards. . . . A number of grants had been made with the like large liberality, and it was found that they sometimes conflicted with one another. The consequence was that while the boundaries were well marked near the coast, where they separated Virginia from the long-settled regions of Maryland and North Carolina, they became exceeding vague and indefinite the moment they touched the mountains. Even at the south this produced confusion, . . . but at the north the effect was still more confusing, and nearly resulted in bringing about an intercolonial war between Pennsylvania and Virginia. The Virginians claimed all of extreme western Pennsylvania, especially Fort Pitt and the valley of the Monongahela, and, in 1774, proceeded boldly to exercise jurisdiction therein. Indeed a strong party among the settlers favored the Virginian claim. . . . The interests of the Virginians and Pennsylvanians not only conflicted in respect to the ownership of the land, but also in respect to the policy to be pursued regarding the Indians. The former were armed colonists, whose interest it was to get actual possession of the soil; whereas in Pennsylvania the Indian trade was very important and lucrative. . . . The interests of the white trader from Pennsylvania and of the white settler from Virginia were so far from being identical that they were usually diametrically opposite. The northwestern Indians had been nominally at peace with the whites for ten years, since the close of Bouquet's campaign. . . . Each of the ten years of nominal peace saw plenty of bloodshed. Recently they had been seriously alarmed by the tendency of the whites to encroach on the great hunting-grounds south of the Ohio. . . . The cession by the Iroquois of the same hunting-grounds, at the treaty of Fort Stanwix [see UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1765–1768], while it gave the whites a colorable title, merely angered the northwestern Indians. Half a century earlier they would hardly have dared dispute the power of the Six Nations to do what they chose with any land that could be reached by their war parties; but in 1774 they felt quite able to hold their own against their old oppressors. . . . The savages grew continually more hostile, and in the fall of 1773 their attacks became so frequent that it was evident a general outbreak was at hand. . . . The Shawnees were the leaders in all these outrages; but the outlaw bands, such as the Mingos and Cherokees, were as bad, and parties of Wyandots and Delawares, as well as of the various Miami and Wabash tribes, joined them. Thus the spring of 1774 opened with everything ripe for an explosion. . . . The borderers were anxious for a war; and Lord Dunmore was not inclined to baulk them. . . . Unfortunately the first stroke fell on friendly Indians." Dunmore's agent or lieutenant in the country, one Dr. Conolly, issued an open letter in April which was received by the backwoodsmen as a declaration and authorization of war. One band of these, led by a Maryland borderer, Michael Cresap, proceeded to hostilities at once by ambushing and shooting down some friendly Shawnees who were engaged in trade. This same party then set out to attack the camp of the famous chief Logan, whose family and followers were then dwelling at Yellow Creek, some 50 miles away. Logan was "an Iroquois warrior, who lived at that time away from the bulk of his people, but who was a man of note . . . among the outlying parties of Senecas and Mingos, and the fragments of broken tribes that dwelt along the upper Ohio. . . . He was greatly liked and respected by all the white hunters and frontiersmen whose friendship and respect were worth having; they admired him for his dexterity and prowess, and they loved him for his straightforward honesty, and his noble loyalty to his friends." Cresap's party, after going some miles toward Logan's camp, "began to feel ashamed of their mission; calling a halt, they discussed the fact that the camp they were preparing to attack consisted exclusively of friendly Indians, and mainly of women and children; and forthwith abandoned their proposed trip and returned home. . . . But Logan's people did not profit by Cresap's change of heart. On the last day of April a small party of men, women, and children, including almost all of Logan's kin, left his camp and crossed the river to visit Greathouse [another borderer, of a more brutal type], as had been their custom; for he made a trade of selling rum to the savages, though Cresap had notified him to stop. The whole party were plied with liquor, and became helplessly drunk, in which condition Greathouse and his associated criminals fell on and massacred them, nine souls in all. . . . At once the frontier was in a blaze, and the Indians girded themselves for revenge. . . . They confused the two massacres, attributing both to Cresap, whom they well knew as a warrior. . . . Soon all the back country was involved in the unspeakable horrors of a bloody Indian war," which lasted, however, only till the following October. Governor Dunmore, during the summer, collected some 3,000 men, one division of which he led personally to Fort Pitt and thence down the Ohio, accomplishing nothing of importance. The other division, composed exclusively of backwoodsmen, under General Andrew Lewis, marched to the mouth of the Kanawha River, and there, at Point Pleasant, the cape of land jutting out between the Ohio and the Kanawha, they fought, on the 10th of October, a great battle with the Indians which practically ended the war. This is sometimes called the battle of Point Pleasant, and sometimes the battle of the Great Kanawha. "It was the most closely contested of any battle ever fought with the northwestern Indians; and it was the only victory gained over a large body of them by a force but slightly superior in numbers. . . . Its results were most important. It kept the northwestern tribes quiet for the first two years of the Revolutionary struggle; and above all it rendered possible the settlement of Kentucky, and therefore the winning of the West. Had it not been for Lord Dunmore's War, it is more than likely that when the colonies achieved their freedom they would have found their western boundary fixed at the Alleghany Mountains." For some time after peace had been made with the

other chiefs Logan would not join in it. When he did yield a sullen assent, Lord Dunmore "was obliged to communicate with him through a messenger, a frontier veteran named John Gibson. . . . To this messenger Logan was willing to talk. Taking him aside, he suddenly addressed him in a speech that will always retain its place as perhaps the finest outburst of savage eloquence of which we have any authentic record. The messenger took it down in writing, translating it literally." The authenticity of this famous speech of Logan has been much questioned, but apparently with no good ground.—T. Roosevelt, *The Winning of the West, v.* 1, *ch.* 8–9.

ALSO IN: J. H. Perkins, *Annals of the West, ch.* 5.—J. G. M. Ramsey, *Annals of Tenn., p.* 112.—V. A. Lewis, *Hist. of W. Va., ch.* 9.—J. R. Gilmore (E. Kirke), *The Rear-guard of the Rev., ch.* 4.

(Valley): A. D. 1774.—Embraced in the Province of Quebec. See CANADA: A. D. 1763–1774.

(Valley): A. D. 1778-1779.—Conquest of the Northwest from the British by the Virginia General Clark, and its annexation to the Kentucky District of Virginia. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1778–1779 CLARK'S CONQUEST.

(Valley): A. D. 1781-1786.—Conflicting territorial claims of Virginia, New York and Connecticut.—Their cession to the United States, except the Western Reserve of Connecticut. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1781–1786.

(Valley): A. D. 1784.—Included in the proposed States of Metropotamia, Washington, Saratoga and Pelisipia. See NORTHWEST TERRITORY: A. D. 1784.

(Valley): A. D. 1786-1788.—The Ohio Company of Revolutionary soldiers and their settlement at Marietta. See NORTHWEST TERRITORY: A. D. 1786–1788.

(Valley): A. D. 1786-1796.—Western Reserve of Connecticut.—Founding of Cleveland.—In September, 1786, Connecticut ceded to Congress the western territory which she claimed under her charter (see UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1781–1786; and PENNSYLVANIA: A. D. 1753–1799), reserving, however, from the cession a tract "bounded north by the line of 42° 2′, or, rather, the international line, east by the western boundary of Pennsylvania, south by the 41st parallel, and west by a line parallel with the eastern boundary and distant from it 120 miles—supposed, at the time, to be equal in extent to the Susquehanna tract given to Pennsylvania, 1782. . . . This territory Connecticut was said 'to reserve,' and it soon came to be called 'The Connecticut Western Reserve,' 'The Western Reserve,' etc. . . . On May 11, 1792, the General Assembly quit-claimed to the inhabitants of several Connecticut towns who had lost property in consequence of the incursions into the State made by the British troops in the Revolution, or their legal representatives when they were dead, and to their heirs and assigns, forever, 500,000 acres lying across the western end of the reserve, bounded north by the lake shore. . . . The total number of sufferers, as reported, was 1,870, and the aggregate losses, £161,548, 11s., 6½d. The grant was of the soil only. These lands are known in Connecticut history as 'The Sufferers' Lands,' in Ohio history as 'The Fire Lands.' In 1796 the Sufferers were incorporated in Connecticut, and in 1803 in Ohio, under the title 'The Proprietors of the Half-million Acres of Land lying south of Lake Erie.' . . . In May, 1793, the Connecticut Assembly offered the remaining part of the Reserve for sale." In September, 1795, the whole tract was sold, without survey or measurement, for $1,200,000, and the Connecticut School Fund, which amounts to something more than two millions of dollars, consists wholly of the proceeds of that sale, with capitalized interest. "The purchasers of the Reserve, most of them belonging to Connecticut, but some to Massachusetts and New York, were men desirous of trying their fortunes in Western lands. Oliver Phelps, perhaps the greatest land-speculator of the time, was at their head. September 5, 1795, they adopted articles of agreement and association, constituting themselves the Connecticut Land Company. The company was never incorporated, but was what is called to-day a 'syndicate.'" In the spring of 1796 the company sent out a party of surveyors, in charge of its agent, General Moses Cleaveland, who reached "the mouth of the Cuyahoga River, July 22d, from which day there have always been white men on the site of the city that takes its name from him." In 1830 the spelling of the name of the infant city was changed from Cleaveland to Cleveland by the printer of its first newspaper, who found that the superfluous "a" made a heading too long for his form, and therefore dropped it out.—B. A. Hinsdale, *The Old Northwest, ch.* 19, *with foot-notes.*

ALSO IN: C. Whittlesey, *Early Hist. of Cleveland, p.* 145, *and after.*—H. Rice, *Pioneers of the Western Reserve, ch.* 6–7.—R. King, *Ohio, ch.* 7–8.

(Valley): A. D. 1787.—The Ordinance for the government of the Northwest Territory.—Perpetual exclusion of Slavery. See NORTHWEST TERRITORY: A. D. 1787.

(Valley): A. D. 1788.—The founding of Cincinnati. See CINCINNATI: A. D. 1788.

(Valley): A. D. 1790-1795.—Indian war.—Disastrous expeditions of Harmar and St. Clair, and Wayne's decisive victory.—The Greenville Treaty. See NORTHWEST TERRITORY: A. D. 1790–1795.

(Territory and State): A. D. 1800-1802.—Organized as a separate Territory and admitted to the Union as a State. See NORTHWEST TERRITORY: A. D. 1788–1802.

A. D. 1812-1813.—Harrison's campaign for the recovery of Detroit.—Winchester's defeat.—Perry's naval victory. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1812–1813.

A. D. 1835.—Settlement of Boundary dispute with Michigan. See MICHIGAN: A. D. 1837.

A. D. 1863.—John Morgan's Rebel Raid. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1863 (JULY: KENTUCKY).

OHOD, Battle of. See MAHOMETAN CONQUEST: A. D. 609–632.

OJIBWAS, OR CHIPPEWAS, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: OJIBWAS; also, ALGONQUIAN FAMILY.

OKLAHOMA, The opening of. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1889–1890.

OL., OR OLYMP. See OLYMPIADS.

OLAF II., King of Denmark, A. D. 1086–1095.....Olaf III., King of Denmark, 1376–

1387; and VII. of Norway, 1380–1387.....Olaf III. (Tryggveson), King of Norway, 995–1000. ....Olaf IV. (called The Saint), King of Norway, 1000–1030.....Olaf V., King of Norway, 1069–1093.... Olaf VI., King of Norway, 1103–1116.

OLBIA. See BORYSTHENES.

OLD CATHOLIC MOVEMENT, The. See PAPACY: A. D. 1869–1870.

OLD COLONY, The. See MASSACHUSETTS: A. D. 1623–1629.

OLD DOMINION, The. See VIRGINIA: A. D. 1650–1660.

OLD IRONSIDES.—This name was popularly given to the "Constitution," the most famous of the American frigates in the War of 1812–14 with Great Britain. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1812–1813; and 1814.

OLD LEAGUE OF HIGH GERMANY, The. See SWITZERLAND: A. D. 1332–1460.

OLD MAN OF THE MOUNTAIN, The. See ASSASSINS.

OLD POINT COMFORT: Origin of its Name. See VIRGINIA: A. D. 1606–1607.

OLD SARUM: Origin. See SORBIODUNUM.

A Rotten Borough. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1830.

OLD SOUTH CHURCH, The founding of the. See BOSTON: A. D. 1657–1669.

OLD STYLE. See CALENDAR, GREGORIAN.

OLDENBURG: The duchy annexed to France by Napoleon. See FRANCE: A. D. 1810 (FEBRUARY—DECEMBER).

OLERON, The Laws of.—"The famous maritime laws of Oleron (which is an island adjacent to the coast of France) are usually ascribed to Richard I, though none of the many writers, who have had occasion to mention them, have been able to find any contemporary authority, or even any antient satisfactory warrant for affixing his name to them. They consist of forty-seven short regulations for average, salvage, wreck, &c. copied from the antient Rhodian maritime laws, or perhaps more immediately from those of Barcelona."—D. Macpherson, *Annals of Commerce*, *v.* 1, *p.* 358.

OLIGARCHY. See ARISTOCRACY.

OLISIPO.—The ancient name of Lisbon. See PORTUGAL: EARLY HISTORY.

OLIVA, Treaty of (1660). See BRANDENBURG: A. D. 1640–1688; and SCANDINAVIAN STATES (SWEDEN): A. D. 1644–1697.

OLIVETANS, The.—"The Order of Olivetans, or Brethren of St. Mary of Mount Olivet, . . . was founded in 1313, by John Tolomei of Siena, a distinguished professor of philosophy in his native city, in gratitude for the miraculous restoration of his sight. In company with a few companions, he established himself in a solitary olive-orchard, near Siena, obtained the approbation of John XXII. for his congregation, and, at the command of the latter, adopted the Rule of St. Benedict."—J. Alzog, *Manual of Universal Church Hist.*, *v.* 3, *p.* 149.

OLLAMHS.—The Bards (see FILI) of the ancient Irish.

OLMÜTZ, Abortive siege of. See GERMANY: A. D. 1758.

OLNEY, Treaty of.—A treaty between Edmund Ironsides and Canute, or Cnut, dividing the English kingdom between them, A. D. 1016. The conference was held on an island in the Severn, called Olney.

OLPÆ, Battle of.—A victory won, in the Peloponnesian War (B. C. 426–5) by the Acarnanians and Messenians, under the Athenian general Demosthenes, over the Peloponnesians and Ambraciotes, on the shore of the Ambracian gulf.—E. Curtius, *Hist. of Greece, bk.* 4, *ch.* 2.

OLUSTEE, Battle of. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1864 (JANUARY—FEBRUARY: FLORIDA).

OLYBRIUS, Roman Emperor (Western), A. D. 472.

OLYMPIA, Battle of (B. C. 365). See GREECE: B. C. 371–362.

OLYMPIADS, The Era of the.—"The Era of the Olympiads, so called from its having originated from the Olympic games, which occurred every fifth year at Olympia, a city in Elis, is the most ancient and celebrated method of computing time. It was first instituted in the 776th year before the birth of our Saviour, and consisted of a revolution of four years. The first year of Jesus Christ is usually considered to correspond with the first year of the 195th olympiad; but as the years of the olympiads commenced at the full moon next after the summer solstice, i. e., about the first of July, . . . it must be understood that it corresponds only with the six last months of the 195th olympiad. . . . Each year of an olympiad was luni-solar, and contained 12 or 13 months, the names of which varied in the different states of Greece. The months consisted of 30 and 29 days alternately; and the short year consequently contained 354 days, while the intercalary year had 384. The computation by olympiads . . . ceased after the 364th olympiad, in the year of Christ 440."—Sir H. Nicolas, *Chronology of History, pp.* 1–2.

OLYMPIC GAMES.—"The character of a national institution, which the Amphictyonic council affected, but never really acquired, more truly belonged to the public festivals, which, though celebrated within certain districts, were not peculiar to any tribe, but were open and common to all who could prove their Hellenic blood. The most important of these festivals was that which was solemnized every fifth year on the banks of the Alpheus, in the territory of Elis; it lasted four days, and, from Olympia, the scene of its celebration, derived the name of the Olympic contest, or games, and the period itself which intervened between its returns was called an olympiad. The origin of this institution is involved in some obscurity, partly by the lapse of time, and partly by the ambition of the Eleans to exaggerate its antiquity and sanctity. . . . Though, however, the legends fabricated or adopted by the Eleans to magnify the antiquity and glory of the games deserve little attention, there can be no doubt that, from very early times, Olympia had been a site hallowed by religion, and it is highly probable that festivals of a nature similar to that which afterwards became permanent had been occasionally celebrated in the sanctuary of Jupiter. . . . Olympia, not so much a town as a precinct occupied by a great number of sacred and public buildings, originally lay in the territory of Pisa, which, for two centuries after the beginning of the olympiads, was never completely subject to Elis, and occasionally appeared as her rival, and excluded her from all share in the presidency of the games.

. . . It is probable that the northern Greeks were not at first either consulted or expected to take any share in the festival; and that, though never expressly confined to certain tribes, in the manner of an Amphictyonic congress, it gradually enlarged the sphere of its fame and attraction till it came to embrace the whole nation. The sacred truce was proclaimed by officers sent round by the Eleans: it put a stop to warfare, from the time of the proclamation, for a period sufficient to enable strangers to return home in safety. During this period the territory of Elis itself was of course regarded as inviolable, and no armed force could traverse it without incurring the penalty of sacrilege. . . . It [the festival] was very early frequented by spectators, not only from all parts of Greece itself, but from the Greek colonies in Europe, Africa, and Asia; and this assemblage was not brought together by the mere fortuitous impulse of private interest or curiosity, but was in part composed of deputations which were sent by most cities as to a religious solemnity, and were considered as guests of the Olympian god. The immediate object of the meeting was the exhibition of various trials of strength and skill, which, from time to time, were multiplied so as to include almost every mode of displaying bodily activity. They included races on foot and with horses and chariots; contests in leaping, throwing, wrestling, and boxing; and some in which several of the exercises were combined; but no combats with any kind of weapon. The equestrian contests, particularly that of the four-horsed chariots, were, by their nature, confined to the wealthy; and princes and nobles vied with each other in such demonstrations of their opulence. But the greater part were open to the poorest Greek, and were not on that account the lower in public estimation. . . . In the games described by Homer valuable prizes were proposed, and this practice was once universal; but, after the seventh olympiad, a simple garland, of leaves of the wild olive, was substituted at Olympia, as the only meed of victory. The main spring of emulation was undoubtedly the celebrity of the festival and the presence of so vast a multitude of spectators, who were soon to spread the fame of the successful athletes to the extremity of the Grecian world. . . . The Altis, as the ground consecrated to the games was called at Olympia, was adorned with numberless statues of the victors, erected, with the permission of the Eleans, by themselves or their families, or at the expense of their fellow citizens. It was also usual to celebrate the joyful event, both at Olympia and at the victor's home, by a triumphal procession, in which his praises were sung, and were commonly associated with the glory of his ancestors and his country. The most eminent poets willingly lent their aid on such occasions, especially to the rich and great. And thus it happened that sports, not essentially different from those of our village greens, gave birth to masterpieces of sculpture, and called forth the sublimest strains of the lyric muse. . . . Viewed merely as a spectacle designed for public amusement, and indicating the taste of the people, the Olympic games might justly claim to be ranked far above all similar exhibitions of other nations. It could only be for the sake of a contrast, by which their general purity, innocence, and humanity would be placed in the strongest light, that they could be compared with the bloody sports of a Roman or a Spanish amphitheatre, and the tournaments of our chivalrous ancestors, examined by their side, would appear little better than barbarous shows."—C. Thirlwall, *Hist. of Greece, ch.* 10.

OLYMPIUM AT ATHENS, The.—The building of a great temple to Jupiter Olympius was begun at Athens by Peisistratus as early as 530 B. C. Republican Athens refused to carry on a work which would be associated with the hateful memory of the tyrant, and it stood untouched until B. C. 174, when Antiochus Epiphanes employed a Roman architect to proceed with it. He, in turn, left it still unfinished, to be afterwards resumed by Augustus, and completed at last by Hadrian, 650 years after the foundations were laid.—W. M. Leake, *Topography of Athens, v.* 1, *app.* 10.

OLYMPUS.—The name Olympus was given by the Greeks to a number of mountains and mountain ranges; but the one Olympus which impressed itself most upon their imaginations, and which seemed to be the home of their gods, was the lofty height that terminates the Cambunian range of mountains at the east and forms part of the boundary between Thessaly and Macedonia. Its elevation is nearly 10,000 feet above the level of the sea and all travelers have seemed to be affected by the peculiar grandeur of its aspect. Other mountains called Olympus were in Elis, near Olympia, where the great games were celebrated, and in Laconia, near Sellasia. There was also an Olympus in the island of Cyprus, and two in Asia Minor, one in Lycia, and a range in Mysia, separating Bithynia from Galatia and Phrygia. See Thessaly, and Dorians and Ionians.

OLYNTHIAC ORATIONS, The. See Greece: B. C. 351–348.

OLYNTHUS: B. C. 383-379.—The Confederacy overthrown by Sparta. See Greece: B. C. 383–379.

B. C. 351-348.—War with Philip of Macedon.—Destruction of the city. See Greece: B. C. 351–348.

OMAGUAS, The. See El Dorado.

OMAHAS, The. See American Aborigines: Pawnee (Caddoan) Family, and Siouan Family.

OMAR I., Caliph, A. D. 634–643.....Omar II., Caliph, 717–720.

OMER, OR GOMER, The. See Ephah.

OMMIADES, OR OMEYYADES, The. See Mahometan Conquest: A. D. 661; 680; 715–750, and 756–1031.

OMNIBUS BILL, The. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1850.

ON.—"A solitary obelisk of red granite, set up at least 4,000 years ago, alone marks the site of On, also called the City of the Sun, in Hebrew Beth-shemesh, in Greek Heliopolis. Nothing else can be seen of the splendid shrine and the renowned university which were the former glories of the place. . . . The university to which the wise men of Greece resorted perished when a new centre of knowledge was founded in the Greek city of Alexandria. . . . It was during the temporary independence of the country under native kings, after the first Persian rule, that Plato the philosopher and Eudoxus

the mathematician studied at Heliopolis. . . . The civil name of the town was An, the Hebrew On, the sacred name Pe-Ra, the 'Abode of the Sun.'"—R. S. Poole, *Cities of Egypt, ch.* 9.—The site of On, or Heliopolis, is near Cairo. There was another city in Upper Egypt called An by the Egyptians, but Hermonthis by the Greeks.

ONEIDAS, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: IROQUOIS CONFEDERACY.

O'NEILS, The wars and the flight of the. See IRELAND: A. D. 1559–1603; and 1607–1611.

ONONDAGAS, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: IROQUOIS CONFEDERACY.

ONTARIO: The Name. See OHIO: THE NAME.

ONTARIO, Lake, The Discovery of. See CANADA: A. D. 1611–1616.

ONTARIO, The Province.—The western division of Canada, formerly called Upper Canada, received the name of Ontario when the Confederation of the Dominion of Canada was formed. See CANADA: A. D. 1867.

ONTARIO SCHOOL SYSTEM. See EDUCATION, MODERN: AMERICA: A. D. 1844–1876.

OODEYPOOR. See RAJPOOTS.

OPEQUAN CREEK, OR WINCHESTER, Battle of. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1864 (AUGUST—OCTOBER: VIRGINIA).

OPHIR, Land of.—The geographical situation of the land called Ophir in the Bible has been the subject of much controversy. Many recent historians accept, as "conclusively demonstrated," the opinion reached by Lassen in his Indische Alterthumskunde, that the true Ophir of antiquity was the country of Abhira, near the mouths of the Indus, not far from the present province of Guzerat. But some who accept Abhira as being the original Ophir conjecture that the name was extended in use to southern Arabia, where the products of the Indian Ophir were marketed.

OPIUM WAR, The. See CHINA: A. D. 1839–1842.

OPORTO: Early history.—Its name given to Portugal. See PORTUGAL: EARLY HISTORY.

A. D. 1832.—Siege by Dom Miguel. See PORTUGAL: A. D. 1824–1889.

OPPIAN LAW, The.—A law passed at Rome during the second Punic War (3d century, B. C.), forbidding any woman to wear a gay-colored dress, or more than half an ounce of gold ornament, and prohibiting the use of a car drawn by horses within a mile of any city or town. It was repealed B. C. 194.—H. G. Liddell, *Hist. of Rome, bk.* 4, *ch.* 3 (*v.* 1).

ALSO IN: R. F. Horton, *Hist. of the Romans, ch.* 16.

OPPIDUM.—Among the Gauls and the Britons a town, or a fortified place, was called an oppidum. As Cæsar explained the term, speaking of the oppidum of Cassivellaunus, in Britain, it signified a "stockade or enclosed space in the midst of a forest, where they took refuge with their flocks and herds in case of an invasion."—E. H. Bunbury, *Hist. of Ancient Geog., ch.* 19, *note E* (*v.* 2).

ALSO IN: Cæsar, *Gallic War, bk.* 5, *ch.* 21.

OPTIMATES.—"New names came into fashion [in Rome], but it is difficult to say when they were first used. We may probably refer the origin of them to the time of the Gracchi [B. C. 133–121]. One party was designated by the name of Optimates, 'the class of the best.' The name shows that it must have been invented by the 'best,' for the people would certainly not have given it to them. We may easily guess who were the Optimates. They were the rich and powerful, who ruled by intimidation, intrigue, and bribery, who bought the votes of the people and sold their interests. . . . Opposed to the Optimates were the Populares."—G. Long, *Decline of the Roman Republic, v.* 1, *ch.* 20.—See ROME: B. C. 159–133.

ORACLES OF THE GREEKS.—"Wherever the worship of Apollo had fixed its roots, there were sibyls and prophets; for Apollo is nowhere conceivable without the beneficent light of prophecy streaming out from his abode. The happy situation and moral significance of leading colleges of priests procured a peculiar authority for individual oracles. Among these are the Lycian Patara, the Thymbræan oracle near Troja (to which belongs Cassandra, the most famed of Apollo's prophetesses), the Gryneum on Lesbos, the Clarian oracle near Colophon, and finally the most important of all the oracles of Asia Minor, the Didymæum near Miletus, where the family of the Branchidæ held the prophetic office as a hereditary honorary right. Delos connects the Apolline stations on the two opposite sides of the water: here, too, was a primitive oracle, where Anius, the son of Apollo, was celebrated as the founder of a priestly family of soothsayers. . . . The sanctuaries of Ismenian Apollo in Thebes were founded, the Ptoïum on the hill which separates the Hylian plain of the sea from the Copæic, and in Phocis the oracle of Abæ. The reason why the fame of all these celebrated seats of Apollo was obscured by that of Delphi lies in a series of exceptional and extraordinary circumstances by which this place was qualified to become a centre, not only of the lands in its immediate neighbourhood, like the other oracles, but of the whole nation. . . . With all the more important sanctuaries there was connected a comprehensive financial administration, it being the duty of the priests, by shrewd management, by sharing in profitable undertakings, by advantageous leases, by lending money, to increase the annual revenues. . . . There were no places of greater security, and they were, therefore, used by States as well as by private persons as places of deposit for their valuable documents, such as wills, compacts, bonds, or ready money. By this means the sanctuary entered into business relations with all parts of the Greek world, which brought it gain and influence. The oracles became money-institutions, which took the place of public banks. . . . It was by their acquiring, in addition to the authority of religious holiness, and the superior weight of mental culture, that power which was attainable by means of personal relations of the most comprehensive sort, as well as through great pecuniary means and national credit, that it was possible for the oracle-priests to gain so comprehensive an influence upon all Grecian affairs. . . . With the extension of colonies the priests' knowledge of the world increased, and with this the commanding eminence of the oracle-god. . . . The oracles were in every respect not only the provident eye, not only the religious conscience, of the Greek nation, but they were also its memory."—E. Curtius, *Hist. of Greece, bk.* 2, *ch.* 4.—"The

sites selected for these oracles were generally marked by some physical property, which fitted them to be the scenes of such miraculous manifestations. They were in a volcanic region, where gas escaping from a fissure in the earth might be inhaled, and the consequent exhilaration or ecstacy, partly real and partly imaginary, was a divine inspiration. At the Pythian oracle in Delphi there was thought to be such an exhalation. Others have supposed that the priests possessed the secret of manufacturing an exhilarating gas. . . . In each of the oracular temples of Apollo, the officiating functionary was a woman, probably chosen on account of her nervous temperament; — at first young, but, a love affair having happened, it was decided that no one under fifty should be eligible to the office. The priestess sat upon a tripod, placed over the chasm in the centre of the temple."—C. C. Felton, *Greece, Ancient and Modern, c. 2, lect. 9.*

ORAN: A. D. 1505.—Conquest by Cardinal Ximenes. See BARBARY STATES: A. D. 1505–1510.

A. D. 1563.—Siege, and repulse of the Moors. See BARBARY STATES: A. D. 1563–1565.

ORANGE, The Prince of: Assassination. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1581–1584, and 1584–1585.

ORANGE, The Principality.—"The little, but wealthy and delicious, tract of land, of which Orange is the capital, being about four miles in length and as many in breadth, lies in the Comté Venaissin, bordering upon that of Avignon, within a small distance of the Rhone; and made no inconsiderable part of that ancient and famous Kingdom of Arles which was established by Boso towards the end of the 9th century [see BURGUNDY: A. D. 888–1032; and 1032]. . . . In the beginning of the 9th century, historians tell us of one William, sirnamed Cornet, of uncertain extraction, sovereign of this State, and highly esteemed by the great Emperor Charlemagne, whose vassal he then was. Upon failure of the male descendants of this prince in the person of Rambald IV., who died in the 13th century, his lands devolved to Tiburga, great aunt to the said Rambald, who brought them in marriage to Bertrand II. of the illustrious house of Baux. These were common ancestors to Raymond V., father to Mary, with whom John IV. of Chalon contracted an alliance in 1386; and it was from them that descended in a direct male line the brave Philibert of Chalon, who, after many signal services rendered the Emperor Charles V., as at the taking of Rome more particularly, had the misfortune to be slain, leaving behind him no issue, in a little skirmish at Pistoya, while he had the command of the siege before Florence. Philibert had one only sister, named Claudia, whose education was at the French court," where, in 1515, she married Henry, of Nassau, whereby the principality passed to that house which was made most illustrious, in the next generation, by William the Silent, Prince of Orange. The Dutch stadtholders retained the title of Princes of Orange until William III. Louis XIV. seized the principality in 1672, but it was restored to the House of Nassau by the Peace of Ryswick (see FRANCE: A. D. 1697). On the death of William III. it was declared to be forfeited to the French crown, and was bestowed on the Prince of Conti; but the king of Prussia, who claimed it, was permitted, under the Treaty of Utrecht, to bear the title, without possession of the domain (see UTRECHT: A. D. 1712–1714).—J. Breval, *Hist. of the House of Nassau.*

ALSO IN: E. A. Freeman, *Orange* (*Hist. Essays, v. 4*).—See, also, NASSAU.

ORANGE, The town: Roman origin. See ARAUSIO.

ORANGE FREE STATE. See SOUTH AFRICA: A. D. 1806–1881.

ORANGE SOCIETY, The formation of the. See IRELAND: A. D. 1795–1796.

ORARIANS, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: ESKIMAUAN FAMILY.

ORATIONES, Roman Imperial. See CORPUS JURIS CIVILIS.

ORATORY, Congregation of the. See CONGREGATION OF THE ORATORY.

ORBITELLO, Siege of (1646). See ITALY: A. D. 1646–1654.

ORCHA, Battle of. See RUSSIA: A. D. 1812 (JUNE—SEPTEMBER).

ORCHAN, Ottoman Turkish Sultan, A. D. 1325–1359.

ORCHIAN, FANNIAN, DIDIAN LAWS.—"In the year 181 B. C. [Rome] a law (the Lex Orchia) was designed to restrain extravagance in private banquets, and to limit the number of guests. This law proved ineffectual, and as early as 161 B. C. a far stricter law was introduced by the consul, C. Fannius (the Lex Fannia) which prescribed how much might be spent on festive banquets and common family meals. . . . The law, moreover, prohibited certain kinds of food and drink. By a law in the year 143 B. C. (the Lex Didia) this regulation was extended over the whole of Italy."—W. Ihne, *Hist. of Rome, bk. 6, ch. 12 (v. 4).*

ORCHOMENOS. See MINYI, THE.

ORCHOMENOS, Battle of (B. C. 85). See MITHRIDATIC WARS.

ORCYNIAN FOREST, The. See HERCYNIAN.

ORDAINERS, The. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1310–1311.

ORDEAL, The.—"During the full fervor of the belief that the Divine interposition could at all times be had for the asking, almost any form of procedure, conducted under priestly observances, could assume the position and influence of an ordeal. As early as 592, we find Gregory the Great alluding to a simple purgatorial oath, taken by a Bishop on the relics of St. Peter, in terms which convey evidently the idea that the accused, if guilty, had exposed himself to imminent danger, and that by performing the ceremony unharmed he had sufficiently proved his innocence. But such unsubstantial refinements were not sufficient for the vulgar, who craved the evidence of their senses, and desired material proof to rebut material accusations. In ordinary practice, therefore, the principal modes by which the will of Heaven was ascertained were the ordeal of fire, whether administered directly, or through the agency of boiling water or red-hot iron; that of cold water; of bread or cheese; of the Eucharist; of the cross; the lot; and the touching of the body of the victim in cases of murder. Some of these, it will be seen, required a miraculous interposition to save the accused;

others to condemn; some depended altogether on volition, others on the purest chance; while others, again, derived their power from the influence exerted on the mind of the patient. They were all accompanied with solemn religious observances. . . . The ordeal of boiling water ('æneum,' 'judicium aquæ ferventis,' 'cacabus,' 'caldaria') is probably the oldest form in which the application of fire was judicially administered in Europe as a mode of proof. . . . A caldron of water was brought to the boiling point, and the accused was obliged with his naked hand to find a small stone or ring thrown into it; sometimes the latter portion was omitted, and the hand was simply inserted, in trivial cases to the wrist, in crimes of magnitude to the elbow, the former being termed the single, the latter the triple ordeal. . . . The cold-water ordeal ('judicium aquæ frigidæ') differed from most of its congeners in requiring a miracle to convict the accused, as in the natural order of things he escaped. . . . The basis of this ordeal was the superstitious belief that the pure element would not receive into its bosom any one stained with the crime of a false oath."—H. C. Lea, *Superstition and Force, ch.* 3.—See, also, Law, Criminal: A. D. 1198–1199.

ORDERS, Monastic. See Austin Canons; Benedictine Orders; Capuchins; Carmelite Friars; Carthusian Order; Cistercian Order; Clairvaux; Clugny; Mendicant Orders; Recollects; Servites; Theatines; and Trappists.

ORDERS IN COUNCIL, Blockade by British. See France: A. D. 1806–1810; and United States of Am.: A. D. 1804–1809.

ORDERS OF KNIGHTHOOD. See Knighthood.

ORDINANCE OF 1787. See Northwest Territory: A. D. 1787.

ORDINANCES OF SECESSION. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1860 (November—December); 1861 (January—February).

ORDINANCES OF 1311. See England: A. D. 1310–1311.

ORDOÑO I., King of Leon and the Asturias, or Oviedo, A. D. 850–866.....**Ordoño II., King of Leon and the Asturias, or Oviedo,** 914–923.....**Ordoño III., King of Leon and the Asturias, or Oviedo,** 950–955.

ORDOVICES, The.—One of the tribes of ancient Wales. See Britain, Celtic Tribes.

OREGON: The aboriginal inhabitants. See American Aborigines: Chinookan Family, and Shoshonean Family.

A. D. 1803.—Was it embraced in the Louisiana Purchase?—Grounds of American possession. See Louisiana: A. D. 1798–1803.

A. D. 1805.—Lewis and Clark's exploring expedition. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1804–1805.

A. D. 1844-1846.—The Boundary dispute with Great Britain and its settlement.—"The territory along the Pacific coast lying between California on the south and Alaska on the north — Oregon as it was comprehensively called — had been a source of dispute for some time between the United States and Great Britain. After some negotiations both had agreed with Russia to recognize the line of 54° 40′ as the southern boundary of the latter's possessions; and Mexico's undisputed possession of California gave an equally well marked southern limit, at the 42d parallel. All between was in dispute. The British had trading posts at the mouth of the Columbia, which they emphatically asserted to be theirs; we, on the other hand, claimed an absolutely clear title up to the 49th parallel, a couple of hundred miles north of the mouth of the Columbia, and asserted that for all the balance of the territory up to the Russian possessions our title was at any rate better than that of the British. In 1818 a treaty had been made providing for the joint occupation of the territory by the two powers, as neither was willing to give up its claim to the whole, or at the time at all understood the value of the possession, then entirely unpeopled. This treaty of joint occupancy had remained in force ever since. Under it the British had built great trading stations, and used the whole country in the interests of certain fur companies. The Americans, in spite of some vain efforts, were unable to compete with them in this line; but, what was infinitely more important, had begun, even prior to 1840, to establish actual settlers along the banks of the rivers, some missionaries being the first to come in. . . . The aspect of affairs was totally changed when in 1842 [1843] a huge caravan of over 1000 Americans made the journey from the frontiers of Missouri [under the lead of Dr. Marcus Whitman, a missionary and physician who had braved the perils and hardships of a winter journey from the Columbia River to Washington, in order to waken the country to a sense of the danger of losing Oregon, if settlers were not pushed forward without delay to occupy it]. . . . The next year 2000 more settlers of the same sort in their turn crossed the vast plains, wound their way among the Rocky Mountains, through the pass explored by Fremont, . . . and descended the western slope of the great water-shed to join their fellows by the banks of the Columbia. When American settlers were once in actual possession of the disputed territory, it became evident that the period of Great Britain's undisputed sway was over. . . . Tyler's administration did not wish to embroil itself with England; so it refused any aid to the settlers, and declined to give them grants of land, as under the joint occupancy treaty that would have given England offense and cause for complaint. But Benton and the other Westerners were perfectly willing to offend England, if by so doing they could help America to obtain Oregon, and were too rash and headstrong to count the cost of their actions. Accordingly, a bill was introduced providing for the settlement of Oregon, and giving each settler 640 acres, and additional land if he had a family. . . . It passed the Senate by a close vote, but failed in the House. . . . The unsuccessful attempts made by Benton and his supporters, to persuade the Senate to pass a resolution, requiring that notice of the termination of the joint occupancy treaty should forthwith be given, were certainly ill-advised. However, even Benton was not willing to go to the length to which certain Western men went, who insisted upon all or nothing. . . . He sympathized with the effort made by Calhoun while secretary of state to get the British to accept the line of 49° as the frontier; but the British government then rejected this proposition. In 1844 the Democrats made their campaign upon the issue of 'fifty-four forty or fight'; and Polk, when elected, felt

obliged to insist upon this campaign boundary. To this, however, Great Britain naturally would not consent; it was, indeed, idle to expect her to do so, unless things should be kept as they were until a fairly large American population had grown up along the Pacific coast, and had thus put her in a position where she could hardly do anything else. Polk's administration was neither capable nor warlike, however well disposed to bluster; and the secretary of state, the timid, shifty, and selfish politician, Buchanan, naturally fond of facing both ways, was the last man to wish to force a quarrel on a high-spirited and determined antagonist like England. Accordingly, he made up his mind to back down and try for the line of 49°, as proposed by Calhoun, when in Tyler's cabinet; and the English, for all their affected indifference, had been so much impressed by the warlike demonstrations in the United States, that they in turn were delighted . . . ; accordingly they withdrew their former pretensions to the Columbia River and accepted [June 15, 1846] the offered compromise."—T. Roosevelt, *Life of Thomas H. Benton, ch.* 12.

Also in: T. H. Benton, *Thirty Years' View, v.* 2, *ch.* 143, *and* 156–159.—*Treaties and Conv's between the U. S. and other countries* (*ed. of* 1889), *p.* 438.—W. Barrows, *Oregon.*

A. D. 1859.—Admission into the Union, with a constitution excluding free people of color.—"The fact that the barbarism of slavery was not confined to the slave States had many illustrations. Among them, that afforded by Oregon was a signal example. In 1857 she formed a constitution, and applied for admission into the Union. Though the constitution was in form free, it was very thoroughly imbued with the spirit of slavery; and though four fifths of the votes cast were for the rejection of slavery, there were seven eighths for an article excluding entirely free people of color. As their leaders were mainly proslavery, it is probable that the reason why they excluded slavery from the constitution was their fear of defeat in their application for admission. . . . On the 11th of February, 1859, Mr. Stephens reported from the Committee on Territories a bill for the admission of Oregon as a State. A minority report, signed by Grow, Granger, and Knapp, was also presented, protesting against its admission with a constitution so discriminating against color. The proposition led to an earnest debate;" but the bill admitting Oregon prevailed, by a vote of 114 to 103 in the House and 35 to 17 in the Senate.—H. Wilson, *Hist. of the Rise and Fall of the Slave Power, v.* 2, *ch.* 49.

O'REILLY, Cruel. See Louisiana: A. D. 1769.

OREJONES, The. See American Aborigines: Pampas Tribes.

ORELLANA. See Amazons River.

ORIENTAL CHURCH, The. See Christianity: A. D. 330–1054; Iconoclastic Controversy; and Filioque Controversy.

ORIFLAMME, The.—"The Oriflamme was originally the Banner of the Abbey of St. Denis, and was received by the Counts of the Vexin, as 'Avoués' of that Monastery, whenever they engaged in any military expedition. On the union of the Vexin with the Crown effected by Philip I., a similar connexion with the Abbey was supposed to be contracted by the Kings; and accordingly Louis the Fat received the Banner, with the customary solemnities, on his knees, bare-headed, and ungirt. The Banner was a square Gonfalon of flame-coloured silk, unblazoned, with the lower edge cut into three swallow-tails."—E. Smedley, *Hist. of France, pt.* 1, *ch.* 3, *foot-note.*—"The Oriflamme was a flame-red banner of silk; three-pointed on its lower side, and tipped with green. It was fastened to a gilt spear."—G. W. Kitchin, *Hist. of France, v.* 1, *bk.* 3, *ch.* 5, *foot-note.*

ORIK, OR OURIQUE, Battle of (1139). See Portugal: A. D. 1095–1325.

ORISKANY, Battle of. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1777 (July—October).

ORKNEYS: 8-14th Centuries.—The Norse Jarls. See Normans: 8–9th Centuries; and 10–13th Centuries.

ORLEANISTS. See Legitimists.

ORLEANS, The Duke of: Regency. See France: A. D. 1715–1723.

ORLEANS, The House of: Origin. See Bourbon, The House of.

A. D. 1447.—Origin of claims to the duchy of Milan. See Milan: A. D. 1447–1454.

ORLEANS, The City: Origin and name.—"The Loire, flowing first northwards, then westwards, protects, by its broad sickle of waters, this portion of Gaul, and the Loire itself is commanded at its most northerly point by that city which, known in Caesar's day as Genabum, had taken the name Aureliani from the great Emperor, the conqueror of Zenobia, and is now called Orleans."—T. Hodgkin, *Italy and Her Invaders, bk.* 2, *ch.* 3 (*v.* 2).—See, also, Genabum.

Early history. See Gaul: B. C. 58–51.

A. D. 451.—Siege by Attila. See Huns: A. D. 451.

A. D. 511-752.—A Merovingian capital. See Franks: A. D. 511–752.

A. D. 1429.—Deliverance by Joan of Arc.—In the summer of 1428 the English, under the Duke of Bedford, having maintained and extended the conquests of Henry V., were masters of nearly the whole of France north of the Loire. The city of Orleans, however, on the north bank of that river, was still held by the French, and its reduction was determined upon. The siege began in October, and after some months of vigorous operations there seemed to be no doubt that the hard-pressed city must succumb. It was then that Joan of Arc, known afterwards as the Maid of Orleans, appeared, and by the confidence she inspired drove the English from the field. They raised the siege on the 12th of May, 1429, and lost ground in France from that day.—Monstrelet, *Chronicles, bk.* 2, *ch.* 52–60.—See France: A. D. 1429–1431.

A. D. 1870.—Taken by the Germans.—Recovered by the French.—Again lost.—Repeated battles. See France: A. D. 1870 (September—October); and 1870–1871.

ORLEANS, The Territory of. See Louisiana: A. D. 1804–1812; and 1812.

ORMÉE OF BORDEAUX, The. See Bordeaux: A. D. 1652–1653.

OROPUS, Naval Battle at.—The Athenians suffered a defeat at the hands of the Spartans in a sea fight at Oropus, B. C. 411, as a consequence of which they lost the island of Eubœa.

It was one of the most disastrous in the later period of the Peloponnesian War.—Thucydides, *History, bk.* 8, *sect.* 95.

ORPHANS, The. See BOHEMIA: A. D. 1419–1434.

ORSINI, OR URSINI, The. See ROME: 13–14TH CENTURIES.

ORTHAGORIDÆ, The. See SICYON.

ORTHES, Battle of (1814). See SPAIN: A. D. 1812–1814.

ORTHODOX, OR GREEK CHURCH, The. See CHRISTIANITY: A. D. 330–1054; also, ICONOCLASTIC CONTROVERSY, and FILIOQUE CONTROVERSY.

ORTOSPANA.—The ancient name of the city of Cabul.

ORTYGIA. See SYRACUSE.

OSAGES, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: PAWNEE (CADDOAN) FAMILY, and SIOUAN FAMILY.

OSCANS, The.—"The Oscan or Opican race was at one time very widely spread over the south [of Italy]. The Auruncans of Lower Latium belonged to this race, as also the Ausonians, who once gave name to Central Italy, and probably also the Volscians and the Æquians. In Campania the Oscan language was preserved to a late period in Roman history, and inscriptions still remain which can be interpreted by those familiar with Latin."—H. G. Liddell, *Hist. of Rome, introd., sect.* 2.—See, also, ITALY: ANCIENT.

OSCAR I., King of Sweden, A. D. 1844–1859.....Oscar II., King of Sweden, 1872–.

OSI, The. See ARAVISCI; also, GOTHINI.

OSISMI, The. See VENETI OF WESTERN GAUL.

OSMAN.—OSMANLI. See OTHMAN.

OSMANLIS. See TURKS (OTTOMANS): A. D. 1240–1326.

OSNABRÜCK: A. D. 1644-1648.—Negotiation of the Peace of Westphalia. See GERMANY: A. D. 1648.

OSRHOËNE, OR OSROËNE.—A small principality or petty kingdom surrounding the city of Edessa, its capital, in northwestern Mesopotamia. It appears to have acquired its name and some little importance during the period of Parthian supremacy. It was a prince of Osrhoëne who betrayed the ill-fated army of Crassus to the Parthians at Carrhæ. In the reign of Caracalla Osrhoëne was made a Roman province. Edessa, the capital, claimed great antiquity, but is believed to have been really founded by Seleucus. During the first ten or eleven centuries of the Christian era Edessa was a city of superior importance in the eastern world, under dependent kings or princes of its own. It was especially noted for its schools of theology.—G. Rawlinson, *Sixth Great Oriental Monarchy, ch.* 11.

ALSO IN: T. Mommsen, *Hist. of Rome, bk.* 5, *ch.* 2.—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, ch.* 8 *and* 47.—P. Smith, *Hist. of the World, v.* 3 (*Am. ed.*), *p.* 151.

OSSA AND PELION. See THESSALY.

OSTEND: A. D. 1602-1604.—Siege and capture by the Spaniards. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1594–1609.

A. D. 1706.—Besieged and reduced by the Allies. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1706–1707.

A. D. 1722-1731.—The obnoxious Company. See SPAIN: A. D. 1713–1725; and 1726–1731.

A. D. 1745-1748.—Taken by the French, and restored. See NETHERLANDS (AUSTRIAN PROVINCES): A. D. 1745; and AIX-LA-CHAPELLE: THE CONGRESS.

OSTEND MANIFESTO, The. See CUBA: A. D. 1845–1860.

OSTIA.—Ostia, the ancient port of Rome, at the mouth of the Tiber, was regarded as a suburb of the city and had no independent existence. Its inhabitants were Roman citizens. In time, the maintaining of a harbor at Ostia was found to be impracticable, owing to deposits of silt from the Tiber, and artificial harbors were constructed by the emperors Claudius, Nero and Trajan, about two miles to the north of Ostia. They were known by the names Portus Augusti and Portus Trajani. In the 12th century the port and channel of Ostia were partially restored, for a time, but only to be abandoned again. The ancient city is now represented by a small hamlet, about two miles from the sea shore.—R. Burn, *Rome and the Campagna, ch.* 14.

OSTMEN. See NORMANS: 10–13TH CENTURIES.

OSTRACH, Battle of (1799). See FRANCE: A. D. 1798–1799 (AUGUST—APRIL).

OSTRACISM.—"The state [Athens] required means of legally removing persons who, by an excess of influence and adherents, virtually put an end to the equality among the citizens established by law, and thus threatened the state with a revival of party-rule. For this purpose, in the days of Clisthenes, and probably under his influence, the institution of ostracism, or judgment by potsherds, was established. By virtue of it the people were themselves to protect civic equality, and by a public vote remove from among them whoever seemed dangerous to them. For such a sentence, however, besides a public preliminary discussion, the unanimous vote of six thousand citizens was required. The honour and property of the exile remained untouched, and the banishment itself was only pronounced for a term of ten years."—E. Curtius, *Hist. of Greece, bk.* 2, *ch.* 2 (*v.* 1).—"The procedure [in ostracism] was as follows: —Every year, in the sixth or seventh Prytany, the question was put to the people whether it desired ostracism to be put in force or not. Hereupon of course orators came forward to support or oppose the proposal. The former they could only do by designating particular persons as sources of impending danger to freedom, or of confusion and injury to the commonwealth; in opposition to them, on the other side, the persons thus designated, and any one besides who desired it, were of course free to deny the danger, and to show that the anxiety was unfounded. If the people decided in favour of putting the ostracism in force, a day was appointed on which it was to take place. On this day the people assembled at the market, where an enclosure was erected with ten different entrances and accordingly, it is probable, the same number of divisions for the several Phylæ. Every citizen entitled to a vote wrote the name of the person he desired to have banished from the state upon a potsherd. . . . At one of the ten entrances the potsherds were put into the hands

of the magistrates posted there, the Prytanes and the nine Archons, and when the voting was completed were counted one by one. The man whose name was found written on at least six thousand potsherds was obliged to leave the country within ten days at latest."—G. F. Schömann, *Antiquities of Greece, pt.* 3, *ch.* 3.

OSTROGOTHS. See Goths.

OSTROLENKA, Battle of (1831). See Poland: A. D. 1830–1832.

OSTROVNO, Battle of. See Russia: A. D. 1812 (June—September).

OSWALD, King of Northumbria, A. D. 635–642.

OSWEGO: A. D. 1722.—Fort built by the English. See Canada: A. D. 1700–1735.

A. D. 1755.—English position strengthened. See Canada: A. D. 1755 (August—October).

A. D. 1756.—The three forts taken by the French. See Canada: A. D. 1756–1757.

A. D. 1759.—Reoccupied by the English. See Canada: A. D. 1759.

A. D. 1783-1796.—Retained by the English after peace with the United States.—Final surrender. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1783–1796; and 1794–1795.

OSWI, King of Northumbria, A. D. 655–670.

OTADENI, OR OTTEDENI, The.—One of the tribes in Britain whose territory lay between the Roman wall and the Firth of Forth. Mr. Skene thinks they were the same people who are mentioned in the 4th century as the "Attacotti."—W. F. Skene, *Celtic Scotland, v.* 1.—See Britain, Celtic Tribes.

OTCHAKOF, Siege of (1737). See Russia: A. D. 1725–1739.

OTFORD, Battle of.—Won by Edmund Ironsides, A. D. 1016, over Cnut, or Canute, the Danish claimant of the English crown.

OTHMAN, Caliph, A. D. 643–655.....Othman, or Osman, founder of the Ottoman or Osmanli dynasty of Turkish Sultans, 1307–1325.....Othman II., Turkish Sultan, 1618–1622.....Othman III., Turkish Sultan, 1754–1757.

OTHO, Roman Emperor, A. D. 69.....Otho (of Bavaria), King of Hungary, 1305–1307..... Otho, or Otto I. (called the Great), King of the East Franks (Germany), 936–973; King of Lombardy, and Emperor, 962–973.....Otho II., King of the East Franks (Germany), King of Italy, and Emperor, 967–983.....Otho III., King of the East Franks (Germany), 983–1002; King of Italy and Emperor, 996–1002.....Otho IV., King of Germany, 1208–1212; Emperor, 1209–1212.

OTHRYS. See Thessaly.

OTIS, James, The speech of, against Writs of Assistance. See Massachusetts: A. D. 1761.

OTOES, OR OTTOES, The. See American Aborigines: Pawnee (Caddoan) Family, and Siouan Family.

OTOMIS, The. See American Aborigines: Otomis.

OTRANTO: Taken by the Turks (1480). See Turks: A. D. 1451–1481.

OTTAWA, Canada: The founding of the City.—"In 1826 the village of Bytown, now Ottawa, the capital of the Dominion of Canada, was founded. The origin of this beautiful city was this: Colonel By, an officer of the Royal Engineers, came to survey the country with a view of making a canal to connect the tidal waters of the St. Lawrence with the great lakes of Canada. After various explorations, an inland route up the Ottawa to the Rideau affluent, and thence by a ship canal to Kingston on Lake Ontario, was chosen. Colonel By made his headquarters where the proposed canal was to descend, by eight locks, a steep declivity of 90 feet to the Ottawa River. 'The spot itself was wonderfully beautiful.' . . . It was the centre of a vast lumber-trade, and had expanded by 1858 to a large town."—W. P. Greswell, *Hist. of the Dominion of Canada, p.* 168.

OTTAWAS, The. See American Aborigines: Algonquian Family, and Ojibwas; also Pontiac's War.

OTTERBURN, Battle of.—This famous battle was fought, August 19, 1388, between a small force of Scots, harrying the border, under Earl Douglas and a hastily assembled body of English led by Sir Henry Percy, the famous Hotspur. The English, making a night attack on the Scottish camp, not far from Newcastle, were terribly beaten, and Hotspur was taken prisoner; but Douglas fell mortally wounded. The battle was a renowned encounter of knightly warriors, and greatly interested the historians of the age. It is narrated in Froissart's chronicles (v. 3, ch. 126), and is believed to be the action sung of in the famous old ballad of Chevy Chase, or the "Hunting of the Cheviot."—J. H. Burton, *Hist. of Scotland, ch.* 26 (*v.* 3).

OTTIMATI, The. See Florence: A. D. 1498–1500.

OTTO. See Otho.

OTTOCAR, OR OTOKAR, King of Bohemia, A. D. 1253–1278.

OTTOMAN EMPIRE. See Turks (Ottomans): A. D. 1240–1326, and after.

OTTOMAN GOVERNMENT. See Sublime Porte.

OTUMBA, Battle of. See Mexico: A. D. 1520–1521.

OTZAKOF: Storming, capture, and massacre of inhabitants by the Russians (1788). See Turks: A. D. 1776–1792.

OUAR KHOUNI, The. See Avars.

OUDE, OR OUDH.—"Before the British settler had established himself on the peninsula of India, Oude was a province of the Mogul Empire. When that empire was distracted and weakened by the invasion of Nadir Shah [see India: A. D. 1662–1748], the treachery of the servant was turned against the master, and little by little the Governor began to govern for himself. But holding only an official, though an hereditary title, he still acknowledged his vassalage; and long after the Great Mogul had shrivelled into a pensioner and pageant, the Newab-Wuzeer of Oude was nominally his minister. Of the earliest history of British connexion with the Court of the Wuzeer, it is not necessary to write in detail. There is nothing less creditable in the annals of the rise and progress of the British power in the East. The Newab had territory; the Newab had subjects; the Newab had neighbours; more than all, the Newab had money. But although he possessed in abundance the raw material of soldiers, he had not been able to organise an army sufficient for all the external and

internal requirements of the State, and so he was fain to avail himself of the superior military skill and discipline of the white men, and to hire British battalions to do his work. . . . In truth it was a vicious system, one that can hardly be too severely condemned. By it we established a Double Government of the worst kind. The Political and Military government was in the hands of the Company; the internal administration of the Oude territories still rested with the Newab-Wuzeer. In other words, hedged in and protected by the British battalions, a bad race of Eastern Princes were suffered to do, or not to do, what they liked. . . . Every new year saw the unhappy country lapsing into worse disorder, with less disposition, as time advanced, on the part of the local Government to remedy the evils beneath which it was groaning. Advice, protestation, remonstrance were in vain. Lord Cornwallis advised, protested, remonstrated: Sir John Shore advised, protested, remonstrated. At last a statesman of a very different temper appeared upon the scene. Lord Wellesley was a despot in every pulse of his heart. But he was a despot of the right kind; for he was a man of consummate vigour and ability, and he seldom made a mistake. The condition of Oude soon attracted his attention; not because its government was bad and its people were wretched, but because that country might either be a bulwark of safety to our own dominions, or a sea of danger which might overflow and destroy us. . . . It was sound policy to render Oude powerful for good and powerless for evil. To the accomplishment of this it was necessary that large bodies of ill-disciplined and irregularly paid native troops in the service of the Newab-Wuzeer — lawless bands that had been a terror alike to him and to his people — should be forthwith disbanded, and that British troops should occupy their place. . . . The additional burden to be imposed upon Oude was little less than half a million of money, and the unfortunate Wuzeer, whose resources had been strained to the utmost to pay the previous subsidy, declared his inability to meet any further demands on his treasury. This was what Lord Wellesley expected — nay, more, it was what he wanted. If the Wuzeer could not pay in money, he could pay in money's worth. He had rich lands that might be ceded in perpetuity to the Company for the punctual payment of the subsidy. So the Governor-General prepared a treaty ceding the required provinces, and with a formidable array of British troops at his call, dragooned the Wuzeer into sullen submission to the will of the English Sultan. The new treaty was signed; and districts then yielding a million and a half of money, and now nearly double that amount of annual revenue, passed under the administration of the British Government. Now, this treaty — the last ever ratified between the two Governments — bound the Newab-Wuzeer to 'establish in his reserved dominions such a system of administration, to be carried on by his own officers, as should be conducive to the prosperity of his subjects, and be calculated to secure the lives and properties of the inhabitants,' and he undertook at the same time 'always to advise with and to act in conformity to the counsels of the officers of the East India Company.' But the English ruler knew well that there was small hope of these conditions being fulfilled. . . . Whilst the counsels of our British officers did nothing for the people, the bayonets of our British soldiers restrained them from doing anything for themselves. Thus matters grew from bad to worse, and from worse to worst. One Governor-General followed another; one Resident followed another; one Wuzeer followed another; but still the great tide of evil increased in volume, in darkness, and in depth. But, although the Newab-Wuzeers of Oude were, doubtless, bad rulers and bad men, it must be admitted that they were good allies. . . . They supplied our armies, in time of war, with grain; they supplied us with carriage-cattle; better still, they supplied us with cash. There was money in the Treasury of Lucknow, when there was none in the Treasury of Calcutta; and the time came when the Wuzeer's cash was needed by the British ruler. Engaged in an extensive and costly war, Lord Hastings wanted more millions for the prosecution of his great enterprises. They were forthcoming at the right time; and the British Government were not unwilling in exchange to bestow both titles and territories on the Wuzeer. The times were propitious. The successful close of the Nepaul war placed at our disposal an unhealthy and impracticable tract of country at the foot of the Hills. This 'terai' ceded to us by the Nepaulese was sold for a million of money to the Wuzeer, to whose domains it was contiguous, and he himself expanded and bloomed into a King under the fostering sun of British favour and affection."— J. W. Kaye, *Hist. of the Sepoy War in India, ch.* 3 (*v.* 1).—"By Lord Wellesley's treaty with the then Nawab-Vizier of Oude, that prince had agreed to introduce into his then remaining territories, such a system of administration as should be conducive to the prosperity of his subjects, and to the security of the lives and property of the inhabitants; and always to advise with, and act in conformity to the counsel of, the officers of the Company's Government. Advantage had been taken of this clause, from time to time, to remonstrate with the Oude princes on their misgovernment. I have no doubt that the charges to this effect were in great measure correct. The house of Oude has never been remarkable for peculiar beneficence as governors. A work lately published, the 'Private Life of an Eastern King,' affords, I suppose, a true picture of what they may have been as men. Still, the charges against them came, for the most part, from interested lips. . . . Certain it is that all disinterested English observers — Bishop Heber, for instance — entering Oude fresh from Calcutta, and with their ears full of the current English talk about its miseries, were surprised to find a well-cultivated country, a manly and independent people. . . . Under Lord Dalhousie's rule, however, and after the proclamation of his annexation policy, complaints of Oude misgovernment became — at Calcutta — louder and louder. Within Oude itself, these complaints were met, and in part justified, by a rising Moslem fanaticism. Towards the middle of 1855, a sanguinary affray took place at Lucknow" between Hindoos and Mussulmans, "in which the King took part with his co-religionists, against the advice of Colonel Outram, the then Resident. Already British troops near Lucknow were held in readiness to act; already the newspapers were openly speculating on immediate annexation. . . . At Fyzabad, new disturbances broke out between Hindoos and Moslems. The

former were victorious. A Moolavee, or doctor, of high repute, named Ameer Alee, proclaimed the holy war. Troops were ordered against him. . . . The talk of annexation grew riper and riper. The Indian Government assembled 16,000 men at Cawnpore. For months the Indian papers had been computing what revenue Oude yielded to its native prince — what revenue it might yield under the Company's management. Lord Dalhousie's successor, Lord Canning, was already at Bombay. But the former seems to have been anxious to secure for himself the glory of this step. The plea — the sole plea — for annexation, was maltreatment of their people by the Kings of Oude. . . . The King had been warned by Lord William Bentinck, by Lord Hardinge. He had declined to sign a new treaty, vesting the government of his country exclusively in the East India Company. He was now to be deposed; and all who withheld obedience to the Governor-General's mandate were to be rebels (7th February, 1856). The King followed the example of Pertaub Shean of Sattara — withdrew his guns, disarmed his troops, shut up his palace. Thus we entered into possession of 24,000 square miles of territory, with 3,000,000 to 4,000,000 inhabitants; yielding £1,000,000 of revenue. But it was expected by officials that it could be made to yield £1,500,000 of surplus. Can you wonder that it was annexed?"— J. M. Ludlow, *British India, pt.* 2, *lect.* 15 (*v.* 2).

Also in: E. Arnold, *The Marquis of Dalhousie's Administration of British India, ch.* 25 (*v.* 2).— Sir W. W. Hunter, *The Marquess of Dalhousie, ch.* 8.— W. M. Torrens, *Empire in Asia: How we came by it, ch.* 26.

A. D. 1763-1765.—English war with the Nawab. See India: A. D. 1757–1772.

OUDE, The Begums of, and Warren Hastings. See India: A. D. 1773–1785.

OUDENARDE: A. D. 1582.—Siege and capture by the Spaniards. See Netherlands: A. D. 1581–1584.

A. D. 1659.—Taken by the French and restored to Spain. See France: A. D. 1659–1661.

A. D. 1667.—Taken by the French. See Netherlands (The Spanish Provinces): A. D. 1667.

A. D. 1668.—Ceded to France. See Netherlands (Holland): A. D. 1668.

A. D. 1679.—Restored to Spain. See Nimeguen, The Peace of.

A. D. 1706.—Surrendered to Marlborough and the Allies. See Netherlands: A. D. 1706–1707.

A. D. 1708.—Marlborough's victory. See Netherlands: A. D. 1708–1709.

A. D. 1745-1748.—Taken by the French, and restored. See Netherlands (Austrian Provinces): A. D. 1745; and Aix-la-Chapelle: The Congress.

OUDH. See Oude.

OUIARS, OR OUIGOURS, The. See Avars.

OUMAS, OR HUMAS, The. See American Aborigines: Muskogean Family.

OUR LADY OF MONTESA, The Order of.—This was an order of knighthood founded by King Jayme II., of Aragon, in 1317.—S. A. Dunham, *Hist. of Spain and Portugal, v.* 4, *p.* 238 (*Am. ed.*).

OURIQUE, Battle of (1139). See Portugal: A. D. 1095–1325.

OVATION, The Roman. See Triumph.

OVIEDO, Origin of the kingdom of. See Spain: A. D. 713–737.

OVILIA. See Campus Martius.

OXENSTIERN, Axel: His leadership in Germany. See Germany: A. D. 1632–1634.

OXFORD, The Headquarters of King Charles. See England: A. D. 1642 (October—December).

OXFORD, Provisions of.—A system or constitution of government secured in 1258 by the English barons, under the lead of Earl Simon de Montfort. The king, Henry III., "was again and again forced to swear to it, and to proclaim it throughout the country. The special grievances of the barons were met by a set of ordinances called the Provisions of Westminster, which were produced after some trouble in October 1259."—W. Stubbs, *The Early Plantagenets, p.* 190.— The new constitution was nominally in force for nearly six years, repeatedly violated and repeatedly sworn to afresh by the king, civil war being constantly imminent. At length both sides agreed to submit the question of maintaining the Provisions of Oxford to the arbitration of Louis IX. of France, and his decision, called the Mise of Amiens, annulled them completely. De Montfort's party thereupon repudiated the award and the civil war called the "Barons' War" ensued.—C. H. Pearson, *Hist. of Eng. in the Early and Middle Ages, v.* 2, *ch.* 8.

Also in: W. Stubbs, *Select Charters, pt.* 6.— See England: A. D. 1216–1274.

OXFORD, OR TRACTARIAN MOVEMENT, The.—"Never was religion in England so uninteresting as it was in the earlier part of the 19th century. Never was a time when thought was so active, criticism so keen, taste so fastidious; and which so plainly demanded a religion intellectual, sympathetic, and attractive. This want the Tractarian, or Oxford movement, as it is called, attempted to supply. . . . But the Tractarians put before themselves an aim far higher than that. They attempted nothing less than to develope and place on a firm and imperishable basis what Laud and the Non-Jurors had tried tentatively to do; namely, to vindicate the Church of England from all complicity with foreign Protestantism, to establish her essential identity with the Church of the Apostles and Fathers through the mediæval Church, and to place her for the first time since the Reformation in her true position with regard to the Church in the East and the West. . . . Naturally the first work undertaken was the explanation of doctrine. The 'Tracts for the Times,' mainly written by Dr. Newman and Dr. Pusey, put before men what the writers believed to be the doctrine of the Church of England, with a boldness and precision of statement hitherto unexampled. The divine Authority of the Church. Her essential unity in all parts of the world. The effectiveness of regeneration in Holy Baptism. The reality of the presence of our Lord in Holy Communion. The sacrificial character of Holy Communion. The reality of the power to absolve sin committed by our Lord to the priesthood. Such were the doctrines

maintained in the Tractarian writings. . . . They were, of course, directly opposed to the popular Protestantism of the day, as held by the Evangelical party. They were equally opposed to the Latitudinarianism of the Broad Church party, who — true descendants of Tillotson and Burnet — were under the leadership of men like Arnold and Stanley, endeavouring to unite all men against the wickedness of the time on the basis of a common Christian morality under the guardianship of the State, unhampered by distinctive creeds or definite doctrines. No two methods could be more opposite."—H. O. Wakeman, *Hist. of Religion in Eng., ch.* 11.—"The two tasks . . . which the Tractarians set themselves, were to establish first that the authority of the primitive Church resided in the Church of England, and second, that the doctrines of the English Church were really identical with those of pre-Tridentine Christianity. . . . The Tractarians' second object is chiefly recollected because it produced the Tract which brought their series to an abrupt conclusion [1841]. Tract XC. is an elaborate attempt to prove that the articles of the English Church are not inconsistent with the doctrines of mediæval Christianity; that they may be subscribed by those who aim at being Catholic in heart and doctrine. . . . Few books published in the present century have made so great a sensation as this famous Tract. . . . Bagot, Bishop of Oxford, Mr. Newman's own diocesan, asked the author to suppress it. The request placed the author in a singular dilemma. The double object which he had set himself to accomplish became at once impossible. He had laboured to prove that authority resided in the English Church, and authority, in the person of his own diocesan, objected to his interpretation of the articles. For the moment Mr. Newman resolved on a compromise. He did not withdraw Tract XC., but he discontinued the series. . . . The discontinuance of the Tracts, however, did not alter the position of authority. The bishops, one after another, 'began to charge against' the author. Authority, the authority which Mr. Newman had laboured to establish, was shaking off the dust of its feet against him. The attacks of the bishops made Mr. Newman's continuance in the Church of England difficult. But, long before the attack was made, he had regarded his own position with dissatisfaction." It became intolerable to him when, in 1841, a Protestant bishop of Jerusalem was appointed, who exercised authority over both Lutherans and Anglicans. "A communion with Lutherans, Calvinists, and even Monophysites seemed to him an abominable thing, which tended to separate the English Church further and further from Rome. . . . From the hour that the see was established, his own lot was practically decided. For a few years longer he remained in the fold in which he had been reared, but he felt like a dying man. He gradually withdrew from his pastoral duties, and finally [in 1845] entered into communion with Rome. . . . A great movement never perishes for want of a leader. After the secession of Mr. Newman, the control of the movement fell into the hands of Dr. Pusey." —S. Walpole, *Hist. of Eng. from* 1815, *ch.* 21 (*v.* 4).

Also in: J. H. Newman, *Hist. of my Religious Opinions* (*Apologia pro Vita Sua*).—The same, *Letters and Corr. to* 1845.—R. W. Church, *The Oxford Movement.*—W. Palmer, *Narrative of Events Connected with the Tracts for the Times.*—T. Mozley, *Reminiscences.*—Sir J. T. Coleridge, *Life of John Keble.*

OXFORD UNIVERSITY. See Education, Mediæval: England, and after.

OXGANG. See Bovate.

OXUS, The.—Now called the Amoo, or Jihon River, in Russian Central Asia.

OYER AND TERMINER, Courts of. See Law, Criminal: A. D. 1285.

P.

PACAGUARA, The. See American Aborigines: Andesians.

PACAMORA, The. See American Aborigines: Andesians.

PACHA. See Bey.

PACIFIC OCEAN: Its Discovery and its Name.—The first European to reach the shores of the Pacific Ocean was Vasco Nuñez de Balboa, who saw it, from "a peak in Darien" on the 25th of September, 1513 (see America: A. D. 1513–1517). "It was not for some years after this discovery that the name Pacific was applied to any part of the ocean; and for a long time after parts only of it were so termed, this part of it retained the original name of South Sea, so called because it lay to the south of its discoverer. The lettering of the early maps is here significant. All along from this time to the middle of the 17th century, the larger part of the Pacific was labeled 'Oceanus Indicus Orientalis,' or 'Mar del Sur,' the Atlantic, opposite the Isthmus, being called 'Mar del Norte.' Sometimes the reporters called the South Sea 'La Otra Mar,' in contradistinction to the 'Mare Oceanus' of Juan de la Cosa, or the 'Oceanus Occidentalis' of Ptolemy, as the Atlantic was then called. Indeed, the Atlantic was not generally known by that name for some time yet. Schöner, in 1520, terms it, as does Ptolemy in 1513, 'Oceanus Occidentalis'; Grynæus, in 1532, 'Oceanus Magnus'; Apianus, appearing in the Cosmography of 1575, although thought to have been drawn in 1520, 'Mar Atlicum.' Robert Thorne, 1527, in Hakluyt's Voy., writes 'Oceanus Occiden.'; Bordone, 1528, 'Mare Occidentale'; Ptolemy, 1530, 'Occean Occidentalis'; Ramusio, 1565, Viaggi, iii. 455, off Central America, 'Mar del Nort,' and in the great ocean, both north and south, 'Mar Ociano'; Mercator, 1569, north of the tropic of cancer, 'Oceanius Atlanticvs'; Hondius, 1595, 'Mar del Nort'; West-Indische Spieghel, 1624, 'Mar del Nort'; De Laet, 1633, 'Mar del Norte'; Jacob Colon, 1663, 'Mar del Nort'; Ogilby, 1671, 'Oceanus Atlanticum,' 'Mar del Norte,' and 'Oceanus Æthiopicus'; Dampier, 1699, 'the North or Atlantick Sea.' The Portuguese map of 1518, Munich Atlas, iv., is the first upon which I have seen a name applied to the Pacific; and there it is given . . . as 'Mar visto pelos Castelhanos,' Sea seen by the Spaniards. . . . On the globe of Johann Schöner, 1520, the two continents of America are represented with a strait dividing them at the Isthmus. The great island of Zipangri, or Japan, lies about midway

between North America and Asia. North of this island . . . are the words 'Orientalis Oceanus,' and to the same ocean south of the equator the words 'Oceanus Orientalis Indicus' are applied. Diego Homem, 1558, marks out upon his map a large body of water to the north-west of 'Terra de Florida,' and west of Canada, and labels it 'Mare leparamantium.'. . . Colon and Ribero call the South Sea 'Mar del Svr.' In Hakluyt's Voy. we find that Robert Thorne, in 1527, wrote 'Mare Australe.' Ptolemy, in 1530, places near the Straits of Magellan, 'Mare pacificum.' Ramusio, 1565, Viaggi, iii. 455, off Central America, places 'Mar del Sur,' and off the Straits of Magellan, 'Mar Oceano.' Mercator places in his atlas of 1569 plainly, near the Straits of Magellan, 'El Mar Pacifico,' and in the great sea off Central America 'Mar del Zur.' On the map of Hondius, about 1595, in Drake's 'World Encompassed,' the general term 'Mare Pacificvm' is applied to the Pacific Ocean, the words being in large letters extending across the ocean opposite Central America, while under it in smaller letters is 'Mar del Sur.' This clearly restricts the name South Sea to a narrow locality, even at this date. In Hondius' Map, 'Purchas, His Pilgrimes,' iv. 857, the south Pacific is called 'Mare Pacificum,' and the central Pacific 'Mar del Sur.'"—H. H. Bancroft, *Hist. of the Pacific States, v.* 1, *pp.* 373–374, *foot-note.*

PACTA CONVENTA, The Polish. See Poland: A. D. 1573.

PACTOLUS, Battle of the (B. C. 395). See Greece: B. C. 399–387.

PADISCHAH. See Bey; also Cral.

PADUA: Origin. See Veneti of Cisalpine Gaul.

A. D. 452.—Destruction by the Huns. See Huns: A. D. 452; also Venice: A. D. 452.

11-12th Centuries.—Rise and acquisition of Republican independence. See Italy: A. D. 1056–1152.

A. D. 1237-1256.—The tyranny of Eccelino di Romano.—The Crusade against him.—Capture and pillage of the city by its deliverers. See Verona: A. D. 1236–1259.

A. D. 1328-1338.—Submission to Can' Grande della Scala.—Recovery from his successor.—The founding of the sovereignty of the Carrara family. See Verona: A. D. 1260–1338.

A. D. 1388.—Yielded to the Visconti of Milan. See Milan: A. D. 1277–1447.

A. D. 1402.—Struggle of Francesco Carrara with Visconti of Milan. See Milan: A. D. 1277–1447; and Florence: A. D. 1390–1406.

A. D. 1405.—Added to the dominion of Venice. See Italy: A. D. 1402–1406.

A. D. 1509-1513.—In the War of the League of Cambrai.—Siege by the Emperor Maximilian. See Italy: A. D. 1510–1513.

PADUCAH: Repulse of Forrest. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1864 (April: Tennessee).

PADUS, The.—The name by which the river Po was known to the Romans. Dividing Cisalpine Gaul, as the river did, into two parts, they called the northern part Transpadane and the southern part Cispadane Gaul.

PÆANS.—"The pæans [among the ancient Greeks] were songs of which the tune and words expressed courage and confidence. 'All sounds of lamentation,'. . . says Callimachus, 'cease when the Ie Pæan, Ie Pæan, is heard.'. . . Pæans were sung, not only when there was a hope of being able, by the help of the gods, to overcome a great and imminent danger, but when the danger was happily past; they were songs of hope and confidence as well as of thanksgiving for victory and safety."—K. O. Müller, *Hist. of the Literature of Ancient Greece, v.* 1, *p.* 27.

PÆONIANS, The.—"The Pæonians, a numerous and much-divided race, seemingly neither Thracian nor Macedonian nor Illyrian, but professing to be descended from the Teukri of Troy, . . . occupied both banks of the Strymon, from the neighbourhood of Mount Skomius, in which that river rises, down to the lake near its mouth. . . . The Pæonians, in their north-western tribes, thus bordered upon the Macedonian Pelagonia, —in their northern tribes upon the Illyrian Dardani and Autariatæ, —in the eastern, southern and south-eastern tribes, upon the Thracians and Pierians."—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece, pt.* 2, *ch.* 25.—Darius, king of Persia, is said to have caused a great part of the Pæonians to be transported to a district in Phrygia, but they escaped and returned home.

PAGANISM: Suppressed in the Roman Empire. See Rome: A. D. 391–395.

PAGE. See Chivalry.

PAGUS. See Gens, Roman; also, Hundred.

PAIDONOMUS, The.—The title of an officer who was charged with the general direction of the education and discipline of the young in ancient Sparta.—G. Schömann, *Antiq. of Greece: The State, pt.* 3, *ch.* 1.

PAINE, Thomas, and the American Revolution. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1776 (January—June) King George's War Measures.

PAINTED CHAMBER. See Westminster Palace.

PAINTSVILLE, Battle of. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1862 (January—February: Kentucky—Tennessee).

PAIONIANS, The. See Albanians.

PAIRS, Legislative. See Whips, Party.

PAITA: A. D. 1740.—Destroyed by Commodore Anson. See England: A. D. 1739–1741.

PAITA, The. See Caste System of India.

PALACE, Origin of the name.—The house of the first of the Roman Emperors, Augustus, was on the Palatine Hill, which had been appropriated by the nobility for their residence from the earliest age of the republic. The residence of Augustus was a quite ordinary mansion until A. U. C. 748 (B. C. 6) when it was destroyed by fire. It was then rebuilt on a grander scale, the people contributing, in small individual sums—a kind of popular testimonial—to the cost. Augustus affected to consider it public property, and gave up a large part of it to the recreation of the citizens. His successors added to it, and built more and more edifices connected with it; so that, naturally, it appropriated to itself the name of the hill and came to be known as the Palatium, or Palace.—C. Merivale, *Hist. of the Romans, ch.* 40.

PALÆOLITHIC PERIOD. See Stone Age.

PALÆOLOGI, The.—The family which occupied the Greek imperial throne, at Nicæa and at Constantinople, from 1260, when Michael Palæologus seized the crown, until the Empire was extinguished by the Turks in 1453.—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, ch.* 62 (*Genealogical table*).

Also in: Sir J. E. Tennant, *Hist. of Modern Greece.*

PALÆOPOLIS, OR PALÆPOLIS. See Neapolis.

PALÆSTRA, The. See Gymnasia, Greek.

PALAIS ROYAL, The. See France: A. D. 1642–1643.

PALATINATE OF THE RHINE.—PALATINE ELECTORATE.—The Palatine Electorate or Palatinate (Pfalz in German), arose in the breaking up of the old Duchy of Franconia. See Franconia; also Palatine Counts, and Germany: A. D. 1125–1152.

A. D. 1214.—Acquisition by the Wittelsbach or Bavarian House.—The House of Wittelsbach (or Wisselbach), which acquired the Duchy of Bavaria in 1180, came also into possession of the Palatinate of the Rhine in 1214 (see Bavaria: A. D. 1180–1356). In the next century the two possessions were divided. "Rudolph, the elder brother of Louis III. [the emperor, known as Louis the Bavarian] inherited the County Palatine, and formed a distinct line from that of Bavaria for many generations. The electoral dignity was attached to the Palatine branch."—Sir A. Halliday, *Annals of the House of Hanover, v.* 1, *p.* 424.

A. D. 1518-1572.—The Protestant Reformation.—Ascendancy of Calvinism.—"The Electors Palatine of the Rhine might be justly regarded, during the whole course of the 16th century, as more powerful princes than those of Brandenburg. The lower Palatine, of which Heidelberg was then the capital, formed a considerable tract of country, situate on the banks of the Rhine and the Neckar, in a fertile, beautiful, and commercial part of Germany. . . . The upper Palatinate, a detached and distant province situated between Bohemia, Franconia, and Bavaria, which constituted a part of the Electoral dominions, added greatly to their political weight, as members of the Germanic body. . . . Under Louis V., Luther began to disseminate his doctrines at Heidelberg, which were eagerly and generally imbibed; the moderate character of the Elector, by a felicity rare in that age, permitting the utmost freedom of religious opinion, though he continued, himself, to profess the Catholic faith. His successors, who withdrew from the Romish see, openly declared their adherence to Lutheranism; but, on the accession of Frederic III., a new ecclesiastical revolution took place. He was the first among the Protestant German princes who introduced and professed the reformed religion denominated Calvinism. As the toleration accorded by the 'Peace of religion' to those who embraced the 'Confession of Augsburg,' did not in a strict and legal sense extend to or include the followers of Calvin, Frederic might have been proscribed and put to the Ban of the Empire: nor did he owe his escape so much to the lenity or friendship of the Lutherans, as to the mild generosity of Maximilian II., who then filled the Imperial throne, and who was an enemy to every species of persecution. Frederic III., animated with zeal for the support of the Protestant cause, took an active part in the wars which desolated the kingdom of France under Charles IX.; protected all the French exiles who fled to his court or dominions; and twice sent succours, under the command of his son John Casimir, to Louis, Prince of Condé, then in arms, at the head of the Hugonots."—Sir N. W. Wraxall, *Hist. of France,* 1574–1610, *v.* 2, *pp.* 163–165.

A. D. 1608.—The Elector at the head of the Evangelical Union. See Germany: A. D. 1608–1618.

A. D. 1619-1620.—Acceptance of the crown of Bohemia by the Elector. See Germany: A. D. 1618–1620.

A. D. 1621-1623.—The Elector placed under the ban of the empire.—Devastation and conquest of his dominions.—The electoral dignity transferred to the Duke of Bavaria. See Germany: A. D. 1621–1623.

A. D. 1631-1632.—Temporary recovery by Gustavus Adolphus.—Obstinate bigotry of the Elector. See Germany: A. D. 1631–1632.

A. D. 1632.—Death of Frederick V.—Treaty with the Swedes.—Nominal restoration of the young Elector. See Germany: A. D. 1632–1634.

A. D. 1648.—Division in the Peace of Westphalia.—Restoration of the Lower Palatinate to the old Electoral Family.—Annexation of the Upper to Bavaria.—The recreated electorate. See Germany: A. D. 1648.

A. D. 1674.—In the Coalition against Louis XIV.—Ravaged by Turenne. See Netherlands (Holland): A. D. 1672–1674; and 1674–1678.

A. D. 1679-1680.—Encroachments by France upon the territory of the Elector. See France: A. D. 1679–1680.

A. D. 1686.—The claims of Louis XIV. in the name of the Duchess of Orleans. See Germany: A. D. 1686.

A. D. 1690.—The second devastation and the War of the League of Augsburg. See France: A. D. 1689–1690, and after.

A. D. 1697.—The Peace of Ryswick.—Restitutions by France. See France: A. D. 1697.

A. D. 1705.—The Upper Palatinate restored to the Elector. See Germany: A. D. 1705.

A. D. 1709-1710.—Emigration of inhabitants to England, thence to Ireland and America. See Palatines.

A. D. 1714.—The Upper Palatinate ceded to the Elector of Bavaria in exchange for Sardinia. See Utrecht: A. D. 1712–1714.

A. D. 1801-1803.—Transferred in great part to Baden. See Germany: A. D. 1801–1803.

A. D. 1849.—Revolution suppressed by Prussian troops. See Germany: A. D. 1848–1850.

PALATINATES, American. See Maryland: A. D. 1632; New Albion; Maine: A. D. 1639; Newfoundland: A. D. 1610–1655; North Carolina: A. D. 1669–1693.

PALATINE, Counts.—In Germany, under the early emperors, after the dissolution of the dominion of Charlemagne, an office came into existence called that of the 'comes palatii'—Count Palatine. This office was created in the interest of the sovereign, as a means of diminishing the power of the local rulers. The Counts

Palatine were appointed as their coadjutors, often with a concurrent and sometimes with a sole jurisdiction. Their "functions were more extensive than those of the ancient 'missi dominici.' Yet the office was different. Under the Carlovingian emperors there had been one dignitary with that title, who received appeals from all the secular tribunals of the empire. The missi dominici were more than his mere colleagues, since they could convoke any cause pending before the ordinary judges and take cognisance of more serious cases even in the first instance. As the missi were disused, and as the empire became split among the immediate descendants of Louis le Debonnaire, the count palatine (comes palatii) was found inadequate to his numerous duties; and coadjutors were provided him for Saxony, Bavaria, and Swabia. After the elevation of Arnulf, however, most of these dignities ceased; and we read of one count palatine only — the count or duke of Franconia or Rhenish France. Though we have reason to believe that this high functionary continued to receive appeals from the tribunals of each duchy, he certainly could not exercise over them a sufficient control; nor, if his authority were undisputed, could he be equal to his judicial duties. Yet to restrain the absolute jurisdiction of his princely vassals was no less the interest of the people than the sovereign; and in this view Otho I. restored, with even increased powers, the provincial counts palatine. He gave them not only the appellant jurisdiction of the ancient comes palatii, but the primary one of the missi dominici. . . . They had each a castle, the wardenship of which was intrusted to officers named burgraves, dependent on the count palatine of the province. In the sequel, some of these burgraves became princes of the empire."—S. A. Dunham, *Hist. of the Germanic Empire, v.* 1, *pp.* 120–121.

PALATINE, The Elector. See GERMANY: A. D. 1125–1152; and PALATINATE OF THE RHINE.

PALATINE, The English Counties. — "The policy of the Norman kings stripped the earls of their official character. They ceased to have local jurisdiction or authority. Their dignity was of a personal nature, and they must be regarded rather as the foremost of the barons, and as their peers, than as a distinct order in the state. . . . An exception to the general policy of William [the Conqueror] as to earldoms was made in those governments which, in the next century, were called palatine. These were founded in Cheshire, and perhaps in Shropshire, against the Welsh, and in the bishopric of Durham both to oppose the Scots, and to restrain the turbulence of the northern people, who slew Walcher, the first earl-bishop, for his ill government. An earl palatine had royal jurisdiction within his earldom. So it was said of Hugh, earl of Chester, that he held his earldom in right of his sword, as the king held all England in right of his crown. All tenants-in-chief held of him; he had his own courts, took the whole proceeds of jurisdiction, and appointed his own sheriff. The statement that Bishop Odo had palatine jurisdiction in Kent may be explained by the functions which he exercised as justiciary."— W. Hunt, *Norman Britain, pp.* 118–119.—"The earldom of Chester has belonged to the eldest son of the sovereign since 1396; the palatinate jurisdiction of Durham was transferred to the crown in 1836 by act of Parliament, 6 Will. IV, c. 19."—W. Stubbs, *Const. Hist. of Eng., ch.* 9, *sect.* 98, *footnote* (*v.* 1). — See, also, PALATINE, THE IRISH COUNTIES.

PALATINE, The Hungarian. See HUNGARY: A. D. 1301–1442.

PALATINE, The Irish Counties. — "The franchise of a county palatine gave a right of exclusive civil and criminal jurisdiction; so that the king's writ should not run, nor his judges come within it, though judgment in its courts might be reversed by writ of error in the king's bench. The lord might enfeoff tenants to hold by knights' service of himself; he had almost all regalian rights; the lands of those attainted for treason escheated to him; he acted in every thing rather as one of the great feudatories of France or Germany than a subject of the English crown. Such had been the earl of Chester, and only Chester, in England; but in Ireland this dangerous independence was permitted to Strongbow in Leinster, to Lacy in Meath, and at a later time to the Butlers and Geraldines in parts of Munster. Strongbow's vast inheritance soon fell to five sisters, who took to their shares, with the same palatine rights, the counties of Carlow, Wexford, Kilkenny, Kildare, and the district of Leix, since called the Queen's County. In all these palatinates, forming by far the greater portion of the English territories, the king's process had its course only within the lands belonging to the church."—H. Hallam, *Const. Hist. of Eng., ch.* 18 (*v.* 3).

PALATINE HILL, The. — The Palatine City.—The Seven Mounts.—"The town which in the course of centuries grew up as Rome, in its original form embraced according to trustworthy testimony only the Palatine, or 'square Rome' (Roma quadrata), as it was called in later times from the irregularly quadrangular form of the Palatine hill. The gates and walls that enclosed this original city remained visible down to the period of the empire. . . . Many traces indicate that this was the centre and original seat of the urban settlement. . . . The 'festival of the Seven Mounts' ('septimontium'), again, preserved the memory of the more extended settlement which gradually formed round the Palatine. Suburbs grew up one after another, each protected by its own separate though weaker circumvallation and joined to the original ring-wall of the Palatine. . . . The 'Seven Rings' were, the Palatine itself; the cermalus, the slope of the Palatine in the direction of the morass that in the earliest times extended between it and the Capitoline (velabrum); the Velia, the ridge which connected the Palatine with the Esquiline, but in subsequent times was almost wholly obliterated by the buildings of the empire; the Fagutal, the Oppius, and the Cispius, the three summits of the Esquiline; lastly, the Sucusa, or Subura, a fortress constructed outside of the earthern rampart which protected the new town on the Carinae, in the low ground between the Esquiline and the Quirinal, beneath S. Pietro in Vincoli. These additions, manifestly the results of a gradual growth, clearly reveal to a certain extent the earliest history of the Palatine Rome. . . . The Palatine city of the Seven Mounts may have had a history of its own; no other tradition of it has survived than simply that of its having once existed. But as the leaves of the forest make room for the new growth of spring, although

they fall unseen by human eyes, so has this unknown city of the Seven Mounts made room for the Rome of history."—T. Mommsen, *Hist. of Rome, bk.* 1, *ch.* 4 (*v.* 1). —See, also, QUIRINAL; and SEVEN HILLS OF ROME.

PALATINES: A. D. 1709-1710.—Migration to Ireland and America.—"The citizens of London [England] were astonished to learn, in May and June, 1709, that 5,000 men, women and children, Germans from the Rhine, were under tents in the suburbs. By October the number had increased to 13,000, and comprised husbandmen, tradesmen, school teachers and ministers. These emigrants had deserted the Palatinate, owing to French oppression and the persecution by their prince, the elector John William, of the House of Newburgh, who had become a devoted Romanist, though his subjects were mainly Lutherans and Calvinists. Professor Henry A. Homes, in a paper treating of this emigration, read before the Albany Institute in 1871, holds that the movement was due not altogether to unbearable persecutions, but largely to suggestions made to the Palatines in their own country by agents of companies who were anxious to obtain settlers for the British colonies in America, and thus give value to the company's lands. The emigrants were certainly seized with the idea that by going to England its government would transport them to the provinces of New York, the Carolinas, and Pennsylvania. Of the latter province they knew much, as many Germans were already there. . . . Great efforts were made to prevent suffering among these poor people; thousands of pounds were collected for their maintenance from churches and individuals all over England; they were lodged in warehouses, empty dwellings and in barns, and the Queen had a thousand tents pitched for them back of Greenwich, on Blackheath. . . . Notwithstanding the great efforts made by the English people, very much distress followed this unhappy hegira. . . . Numbers of the younger men enlisted in the British army serving in Portugal, and some made their own way to Pennsylvania. . . . The Lord Lieutenant of Ireland petitioned the Queen that some of the people might be sent to him, and by February, 1710, 3,800 had been located across the Irish Sea, in the province of Munster, near Limerick. . . . Professor Homes recites in his monograph that they 'now number about 12,000 souls, and, under the name of Palatinates, continue to impress a peculiar character upon the whole district they inhabit.' . . . According to 'Luttrell's Diary,' about one-tenth of the whole number that reached England were returned by the Crown to Germany." A Swiss land company, which had bought 10,000 acres of land from the Lords Proprietors of Carolina, "covenanted with the English authorities for the transfer of about 700 of these poor Heidelberg refugees to the colony. Before the end of the year they had arrived with them at a point in North Carolina where the rivers Neuse and Trent join. Here they established a town, calling it New-Berne, in honor of Berne, Switzerland. . . . It has not been found possible to properly account for all the 13,000 Palatines who reached England. Queen Anne sent some of them to Virginia, settling them above the falls of the Rappahanock, in Spottsylvania County, from whence they spread into several adjoining counties, and into North Carolina. . . . After the Irish transportation, the largest number that was moved in one body, and probably the final one under government auspices, was the fleet-load that in the spring of 1710 was despatched to New York. . . . A fleet of ten ships set sail with Governor Hunter in March, having on board, as is variously estimated, between 3,000 and 4,000 Germans. . . . The immigrants were encamped on Nut, now Governor's Island, for about three months, when a tract of 6,000 acres of the Livingston patent was purchased for them, 100 miles up the Hudson, the locality now being embraced in Germantown, Columbia County. Eight hundred acres were also acquired on the opposite side of the river at the present location of Saugerties, in Ulster County. To these two points most of the immigrants were removed." But dissatisfaction with their treatment and difficulties concerning land titles impelled many of these Germans to move off, first into Schoharie County, and afterwards to Palatine Bridge, Montgomery County and German Flats, Herkimer County, N. Y., to both of which places they have affixed the names. Others went into Pennsylvania, which was for many years the favorite colony among German immigrants.—A. D. Mellick, Jr., *The Story of an Old Farm, ch.* 4.

ALSO IN: C. B. Todd, *Robert Hunter and the Settlement of the Palatines* (*Memorial Hist. of the City of N. Y., v.* 2, *ch.* 4).

PALE, The English.—"That territory within which the English retreated and fortified themselves when a reaction began to set in after their first success [under Henry II.] in Ireland," acquired the name of the Pale or the English Pale. But "that term did not really come into use until about the beginning of the 16th century. In earlier times this territory was called the English Land. It is generally called Galldacht, or the 'foreigner's territory,' in the Irish annals, where the term Galls comes to be applied to the descendants of the early adventurers, and that of Saxons to Englishmen newly arrived. The formation of the Pale is generally considered to date from the reign of Edward I. About the period of which we are now treating [reign of Henry IV.— beginning of 15th century] it began to be limited to the four counties of Louth, Meath, Kildare, and Dublin, which formed its utmost extent in the reign of Henry VIII. Beyond this the authority of the king of England was a nullity."—M. Haverty, *Hist. of Ireland, pp.* 313-314, *foot-note.*—See IRELAND: A. D. 1169-1175; and 1515.

PALE, The Jewish, in Russia. See JEWS: A. D. 1727-1880, and 19TH CENTURY.

PALE FACES, The (Ku-Klux Klan). See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1866-1871.

PALENQUE, Ruins of. See MEXICO, ANCIENT; and AMERICAN ABORIGINES: MAYAS.

PALERMO: Origin. See PANORMUS; also SICILY: EARLY INHABITANTS.

A. D. 1146.—Introduction of silk culture. See BYZANTINE EMPIRE: A. D. 1146.

A. D. 1282.—The Sicilian Vespers. See ITALY (SOUTHERN): A. D. 1282-1300.

A. D. 1848-1849.—Expulsion of the Neapolitan garrison.—Surrender to King "Bomba." See ITALY: A. D. 1848-1849.

A. D. 1860.—Capture by Garibaldi and his volunteers.—Bombardment by the Neapolitans. See ITALY: A. D. 1859-1861.

PALESTINE: Early inhabitants. See AMALEKITES; AMMONITES; AMORITES; HITTITES; JEWS: EARLY HEBREW HISTORY; MOABITES; PHILISTINES; PHŒNICIANS.

Name.—After the suppression of the revolt of the Jews in A. D. 130, by Hadrian, the name of their province was changed from Judæa to Syria Palæstina, or Syria of the Philistines, as it had been called by Herodotus six centuries before. Hence the modern name, Palestine. See JEWS: A. D. 130–134.

History. See EGYPT: about B. C. 1500–1400; JEWS; JERUSALEM; SYRIA; CHRISTIANITY; MAHOMETAN CONQUEST AND EMPIRE; and CRUSADES.

PALESTRO, Battle of (1859). See ITALY: A. D. 1856–1859.

PALFREYS, OR PALAFRENI. See DESTRIERS.

PALI.—"The earlier form of the ancient spoken language [of the Aryan race in India], called Pali or Magadhi, . . . was introduced into Ceylon by Buddhist missionaries from Magadha when Buddhism began to spread, and is now the sacred language of Ceylon and Burmah, in which all their Buddhist literature is written." The Pali language is thought to represent one of the stages in the development of the Prakrit, or common speech of the Hindus, as separated from the Sanskrit, or language of the learned. See SANSKRIT.—M. Williams, *Indian Wisdom, introd., pp. xxix–xxx, foot-note.*

PALILIA, Festival of the.—"The festival named Palilia [at Rome] was celebrated on the Palatine every year on the 21st April, in honour of Pales, the tutelary divinity of the shepherds, who dwelt on the Palatine. This day was held sacred as an anniversary of the day on which Romulus commenced the building of the city."—H. M. Westropp, *Early and Imperial Rome, p.* 40.

PALLA, The. See STOLA.

PALLADIUM, The.—"The Palladium, kept in the temple of Vesta at Rome, was a small figure of Pallas, roughly carved out of wood, about three feet high. Ilos, King of Troy, grandfather of Priam, after building the city asked Zeus to give him a visible sign that he would take it under his special protection. During the night the Palladium fell down from heaven, and was found the next morning outside his tent. The king built a temple for it, and from that time the Trojans firmly believed that as long as they could keep this figure their town would be safe; but if at any time it should be lost or stolen, some dreadful calamity would overtake them. The story further relates that, at the siege of Troy, its whereabouts was betrayed to Diomed, and he and the wily Ulysses climbed the wall at night and carried it off. The Palladium, enraged at finding itself in the Grecian camp, sprang three times in the air, its eyes flashing wildly, while drops of sweat stood on its brow. The Greeks, however, would not give it up, and Troy, robbed of her guardian, was soon after conquered by the Greeks. But an oracle having warned Diomed not to keep it, he, on landing in Italy, gave it to one of Æneas' companions, by whom it was brought into the neighbourhood of the future site of Rome. Another legend relates that Æneas saved it after the destruction of Troy, and fled with it to Italy, where it was afterwards placed by his descendants in the Temple of Vesta, in Rome. Here the inner and most sacred place in the Temple was reserved for it, and no man, not even the chief priest, was allowed to see it except when it was shown on the occasion of any high festival. The Vestals had strict orders to guard it carefully, and to save it in case of fire, as the welfare of Rome depended on its preservation."—F. Nösselt, *Mythology, Greek and Roman, p.* 3.

PALLESCHI, The. See FLORENCE: A. D. 1498–1500.

PALLIUM, The.—"The pallium, or mantle of the Greeks, from its being less cumbersome and trailing than the toga of the Romans, by degrees superseded the latter in the country and in the camp. When worn over armour, and fastened on the right shoulder with a clasp or button, this cloak assumed the name of paludamentum."—T. Hope, *Costume of the Ancients, v.* 1, *p.* 37.

PALM, The Execution of. See GERMANY: A. D. 1806 (JANUARY—AUGUST).

PALMERSTON MINISTRIES. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1855: 1858–1859.

PALMI. See FOOT, THE ROMAN.

PALMYRA, Earliest knowledge of.—"The outlying city of Palmyra—the name of which is first mentioned during the wars of M. Antony in Syria [B. C. 41]—was certainly at this period [of Augustus, B. C. 31—A. D. 14] independent and preserved a position of neutrality between the Romans and Parthians, while it carried on trade with both. It does not appear however to have as yet risen to a place of great importance, as its name is not mentioned by Strabo. The period of its prosperity dates only from the time of Hadrian."—E. H. Bunbury, *Hist. of Ancient Geog., ch.* 20, *sect.* 1 (*v.* 2).

Rise and fall.—"Amidst the barren deserts of Arabia a few cultivated spots rise like islands out of the sandy ocean. Even the name of Tadmor, or Palmyra, by its signification in the Syriac as well as in the Latin language, denoted the multitude of palm-trees which afforded shade and verdure to that temperate region. The air was pure, and the soil, watered by some invaluable springs, was capable of producing fruits as well as corn. A place possessed of such singular advantages, and situated at a convenient distance between the gulf of Persia and the Mediterranean, was soon frequented by the caravans which conveyed to the nations of Europe a considerable part of the rich commodities of India. [It has been the opinion of some writers that Tadmor was founded by Solomon as a commercial station, but the opinion is little credited at present.] Palmyra insensibly increased into an opulent and independent city, and, connecting the Roman and the Parthian monarchies by the mutual benefits of commerce, was suffered to observe an humble neutrality, till at length, after the victories of Trajan, the little republic sunk into the bosom of Rome, and flourished more than one hundred and fifty years in the subordinate though honourable rank of a colony." On the occasion of the invasion of Syria by the Persian king, Sapor, when the Emperor Valerian was defeated and taken prisoner (A. D. 260–261), the only effectual resistance opposed to him was organized and led by a wealthy senator of Palmyra, Odenathus (some ancient writers call him a Saracen prince), who founded, by his exploits at that time, a substantial military power. Aided and

seconded by his famous wife, Zenobia, who is one of the great heroines of history, he extended his authority over the Roman East and defeated the Persian king in several campaigns. On his death, by assassination, in 267, Zenobia ascended the Palmyrenian throne and ruled with masculine firmness of character. Her dominions were extended from the Euphrates and the frontiers of Bithynia to Egypt, and are said, with some doubtfulness, to have included even that rich province, for a time. But the Romans, who had acquiesced in the rule of Odenathus, and recognized it, in the day of their weakness, now resented the presumption and the power of his widowed queen. Perhaps they had reason to fear her ambition and her success. Refusing to submit to the demands that were made upon her, she boldly challenged the attack of the warlike emperor, Aurelian, and suffered defeat in two great battles, fought A. D. 272 or 273, near Antioch and near Emesa. A vain attempt to hold Palmyra against the besieging force of the Roman, an unsuccessful flight and a capture by pursuing horsemen, ended the political career of the brilliant 'Queen of the East.' She saved her life somewhat ignobly by giving up her counsellors to Aurelian's vengeance. The philosopher Longinus was one who perished. Zenobia was sent to Rome and figured among the captives in Aurelian's triumph. She was then given for her residence a splendid villa at Tibur (Tivoli) twenty miles from Rome, and lived quietly through the remainder of her days, connecting herself, by the marriage of her daughters, with the noble families of Rome. Palmyra, which had been spared on its surrender, rashly rose in revolt quickly after Aurelian had left its gates. The enraged emperor returned and inflicted on the fated city a chastisement from which it never rose."—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, ch.* 10–11.

PALMYRÊNÉ, The.—"Palmyrêné, or the Syrian Desert—the tract lying between Cœle-Syria on the one hand and the valley of the middle Euphrates on the other, and abutting towards the south on the great Arabian Desert, to which it is sometimes regarded as belonging. It is for the most part a hard sandy, or gravelly plain, intersected by low rocky ranges, and either barren or productive only of some sapless shrubs and of a low thin grass. Occasionally, however, there are oases, where the fertility is considerable. Such an oasis is the region about Palmyra itself, which derived its name from the palm groves in the vicinity; here the soil is good, and a large tract is even now under cultivation. . . . Though large armies can never have traversed the desert even in this upper region, where it is comparatively narrow, trade in ancient times found it expedient to avoid the long 'détour' by the Orontes valley, Aleppo, and Bambuk and to proceed directly from Damascus by way of Palmyra to Thapsacus on the Euphrates."—G. Rawlinson, *Five Great Monarchies: Babylonia, ch.* 1.

PALO ALTO, Battle of. See Mexico: A. D. 1846–1847.

PALSGRAVE.—An Anglicized form of Pfalzgraf, Palatine Count, which see.

PALUDAMENTUM, The.—"As soon as the [Roman] consul entered upon his military career, he assumed certain symbols of command. The cloak of scarlet or purple which the imperator threw over his corslet was named the paludamentum, and this, which became in later times the imperial robe, he never wore except on actual service."—C. Merivale, *Hist. of the Romans, ch.* 31.—See, also, Pallium.

PALUS MÆOTIS, OR MÆOTIS PALUS.—The ancient Greek name of the Sea of Azov.

PAMLICOS. See American Aborigines: Algonquian Family.

PAMPAS.—LLANOS.—"In the southern continent [of America], the regions which correspond with the prairies of the United States are the 'pampas' of the La Plata and the 'llanos' of Columbia [both 'pampa' and 'llano' having in Spanish the signification of 'a plain']. . . . The llanos of Venezuela and New Granada have an area estimated at 154,000 square miles, nearly equal to that of France. The Argentine pampas, which are situated at the other extremity of the continent, have a much more considerable extent, probably exceeding 500,000 square miles. This great central plain . . . stretches its immense and nearly horizontal surface over a length of at least 1,900 miles, from the burning regions of tropical Brazil to the cold countries of Patagonia."—E. Reclus, *The Earth, ch.* 15.—For an account of the Indian tribes of the Pampas, see American Aborigines: Pampas Tribes.

PAMPELUNA: Siege by the French (1521). See Navarre: A. D. 1442–1521.

PAMPTICOKES, The. See American Aborigines: Algonquian Family.

PAN-AMERICAN CONGRESS, The. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1889–1890.

PAN-HANDLE, The. See Virginia: A. D. 1779–1786.

PAN-IONIC AMPHICTYONY. See Ionic Amphictyony.

PANAMA: A. D. 1501-1502.—Discovery by Bastidas.—Coasted by Columbus. See America: A. D. 1498–1505, and 1500.

A. D. 1509.—Creation of the Province of Castilla del Oro.—Settlement on the Gulf of Uraba. See America: A. D. 1509–1511.

A. D. 1513-1517.—Vasco Nuñez de Balboa and the discovery of the Pacific.—The malignant rule of Pedrarias Davila. See America: A. D. 1513–1517.

A. D. 1519.—Name and Origin of the city.—Originally, Panama was the native name of an Indian fishing village, on the Pacific coast of the Isthmus, the word signifying "a place where many fish are taken." In 1519 the Spaniards founded there a city which they made their capital and chief mart on the Pacific coast.—H. H. Bancroft, *Hist. of the Pacific States, v.* 1, *ch.* 10–11 *and* 15.

A. D. 1671-1680.—Capture, destruction and recapture of the city of Panama by the Buccaneers. See America: A. D. 1639–1700.

A. D. 1688-1699.—The Scottish colony of Darien. See Scotland: A. D. 1695–1699.

A. D. 1826.—The Congress of American States. See Colombian States: A. D. 1826.

A. D. 1846-1855.—American right of transit secured by Treaty.—Building of the Panama Railroad. See Nicaragua: A. D. 1850.

A. D. 1855.—An independent state in the Colombian Confederation.—Opening of the Panama Railway. See Colombian States: A. D. 1830–1886.

PANAMA CANAL.—PANAMA SCANDAL.—"The commencement of an undertaking [projected by Count Ferdinand de Lesseps, the builder of the Suez Canal] for connecting the Atlantic and Pacific oceans, through the Isthmus of Panama, was a natural result of the success achieved by the Suez Canal. Various sites have been proposed from time to time for the construction of a canal across the Isthmus, the most northern being the Tehuantepec route, at a comparatively broad part of the Isthmus, and the most southern the Atrato route, following for some distance the course of the Atrato River. The site eventually selected, in 1879, for the construction of a canal was at the narrowest part of the Isthmus, and where the central ridge is the lowest, known as the Panama route, nearly following the course of the Panama Railway. It was the only scheme that did not necessarily involve a tunnel or locks. The length of the route between Colon on the Atlantic, and Panama on the Pacific, is 46 miles, not quite half the length of the Suez Canal; but a tide-level canal involved a cutting across the Cordilleras, at the Culebra Pass, nearly 300 feet deep, mainly through rock. The section of the canal was designed on the lines of the Suez Canal, with a bottom width of 72 feet, and a depth of water of 27 feet, except in the central rock cutting, where the width was to be increased to 78½ feet on account of the nearly vertical sides, and the depth to 29½ feet. . . . The work was commenced in 1882. . . . The difficulties and expenses, however, of the undertaking had been greatly under-estimated. The climate proved exceptionally unhealthy, especially when the soil began to be turned up by the excavations. The actual cost of the excavation was much greater than originally estimated; and the total amount of excavation required to form a level canal, which had originally been estimated at 100 million cubic yards, was subsequently computed, on more exact data, at 176½ million cubic yards. The preliminary works were also very extensive and costly; and difficulties were experienced, after a time, in raising the funds for carrying on the works, even when shares were offered at a very great discount. Eventually, in 1887, the capital at the disposal of the company had nearly come to an end; whilst only a little more than one-fifth of the excavation had been completed. . . . At that period it was determined to expedite the work, and reduce the cost of completing the canal, by introducing locks, and thus diminish the remaining amount of excavation by 85 million cubic yards; though the estimated cost, even with this modification, had increased from £33,500,000 to £65,500,000. . . . The financial embarrassments, however, of the company have prevented the carrying out of this scheme for completing the canal; and the works are at present [1891] at a standstill, in a very unfinished state."—L. F. Vernon-Harcourt, *Achievements in Engineering, ch.* 14.—"It was on December 14, 1888, that the Panama Canal Company stopped payments. Under the auspices of the French Government, a parliamentary inquiry was started in the hope of finding some means of saving the enterprise. Facts soon came to light, which, in the opinion of many, justified a prosecution. The indignation of the shareholders against the Count de Lesseps, his son, and the other Directors, waxed loud. In addition to ruinous miscalculations, these men were charged with corrupt expenditure with a view to influence public opinion. . . . The gathering storm finally burst on November 21 [1892], when the interpellation in regard to the Canal question was brought forward in the Chamber. M. Delahaye threw out suggestions of corruption against a large number of persons, alleging that 3,000,000 francs had been used by the company to bribe 150 Senators and Deputies. Challenged to give their names, he persisted in merely replying that if the Chamber wanted details, they must vote an inquiry. . . . It was ultimately agreed, by 311 to 243, to appoint a special Committee of 33 Members to conduct an investigation. The judicial summonses against the accused Directors were issued the same day, charging them with 'the use of fraudulent devices for creating belief in the existence of a chimerical event, the spending of sums accruing from issues handed to them for a fixed purpose, and the swindling of all or part of the fortune of others.' The case being called in the Court of Appeals, November 25, when all of the defendants—M. Ferdinand de Lesseps; Charles, his son; M. Marius Fontanes, Baron Cottu, and M. Eiffel—were absent, it was adjourned to January 10, 1893. . . . On November 28, the Marquis de la Ferronaye, followed by M. Brisson, the Chairman of the Committee of Inquiry, called the attention of the Government to the rumors regarding the death of Baron Reinach, and pressed the demand of the Committee that the body be exhumed, and the theory of suicide be tested. But for his sudden death, the Baron would have been included in the prosecution. He was said to have received immense sums for purposes of corruption; and his mysterious and sudden death on the eve of the prosecution started the wildest rumors of suicide and even murder. Public opinion demanded that full light be thrown on the episode; but the Minister of Justice said, that, as no formal charges of crime had been laid, the Government had no power to exhume the body. M. Loubet would make no concession in the matter; and, when M. Brisson moved a resolution of regret that the Baron's papers had not been sealed at his death, petulantly insisted that the order of the day 'pure and simple' be passed. This the Chamber refused to do by a vote of 304 to 219. The resignation of the Cabinet immediately followed. . . . A few days' interregnum followed during which M. Brisson and M. Casimir-Périer successively tried in vain to form a Cabinet. M. Ribot, the Foreign Minister, finally consented to try the task, and, on December 5, the new Ministry was announced. . . . The policy of the Government regarding the scandal now changed. . . . In the course of the investigation by the Committee, the most startling evidence of corruption was revealed. It was discovered that the principal Paris papers had received large amounts for puffing the Canal scheme. M. Thierrée, a banker, asserted that Baron Reinach had paid into his bank 3,390,000 francs in Panama funds, and had drawn it out in 26 checks to bearer. . . . On December 13, M. Rouvier, the Finance Minister, resigned, because his name had been connected with the scandal. . . . In the meantime, sufficient evidence had been gathered to cause the Government, on December 16, to arrest M. Charles de Lesseps, M. Fontane, and M. Sans-Leroy, Directors of the Canal Company, on the

charge, not, as before, of maladministration of the company's affairs, but of corrupting public functionaries. This was followed by the adoption of proceedings against five Senators and five Deputies.— *Quar. Reg. of Cur. Hist., March*, 1893. — "The trial of the De Lesseps, father and son, MM. Fontane, Cottu, and Eiffel, began January 10, before the court of appeals. MM. Fontane and Eiffel confessed, the latter to the bribery of Hebrard, director of 'Le Temps,' a newspaper, with 1,750,000 francs. On February 14, sentence was pronounced against Ferdinand and Charles De Lesseps, each being condemned to spend five years in prison and to pay a fine of 3,000 francs; MM. Fontane and Cottu, two years and 3,000 francs each; and M. Eiffel, two years and 20,000 francs. . . . On March 8, the trial of the younger de Lesseps, MM. Fontane, Baihaut, Blondin, and ex-Minister Proust, Senator Beral, and others, on charges of corruption, began before the assize court. . . . De Lesseps, . . . with MM. Baihaut and Blondin, was found guilty March 21, and sentenced to one year more of imprisonment. M. Blondin received a two-year sentence; but M. Baihaut was condemned to five years, a fine of 75,000 francs, and loss of civil rights. The others were acquitted." — *Cyclopedic Review of Current Hist., v. 3, no. 1* (1893). — "On June 15 the Court of Cassation quashed the judgment in the first trial on the ground that the acts had been committed more than three years before the institution of proceedings, reversing the ruling of the trial court that a preliminary investigation begun in 1891 suspended the three years' prescription. Fontane and Eiffel were set at liberty, but Charles de Lesseps had still to serve out the sentence for corruption." — *Appleton's Annual Cyclopædia*, 1893, p. 321. — The enemies of the Republic had wished to establish the venality of the popular representatives; "they succeeded only in showing the resistance that had been made to a temptation of which the public had not known before the strength and frequency. Instead of proving that many votes had been sold, they proved that many were found ready to buy them, which was very different." — P. De Coubertin, *L'Evolution Française sous la Troisième Republique*, p. 266.

PANATHENÆA, The Festival of the. See PARTHENON AT ATHENS.

PANDECTS OF JUSTINIAN. See CORPUS JURIS CIVILIS.

PANDES. See CASTE SYSTEM OF INDIA.

PANDOURS. See HUNGARY: A. D. 1567–1604.

PANICS OF 1837, 1857, 1873, 1893. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1835–1837, 1873, 1890–1893; and TARIFF LEGISLATION (UNITED STATES): A. D. 1846–1861.

PANIPAT, OR PANNIPUT, Battles of (1526, 1556, and 1761). See INDIA: A. D. 1399–1605; and 1747–1761.

PANIUM, Battle of (B. C. 198). See SELEUCIDÆ: B. C. 224–187.

PANJAB, The. See PUNJAB.

PANNONIA AND NORICUM. — "The wide extent of territory which is included between the Inn, the Danube, and the Save — Austria, Styria, Carinthia, Carniola, the Lower Hungary, and Sclavonia — was known to the ancients under the names of Noricum and Pannonia. In their original state of independence their fierce inhabitants were intimately connected. Under the Roman government they were frequently united."— E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, ch.* 1.—Pannonia embraced much the larger part of the territory described above, covering the center and heart of the modern Austro-Hungarian empire. It was separated from Noricum, lying west and northwest of it, by Mons Cetius. For the settlement of the Vandals in Pannonia, and its conquest by the Huns and Goths, see VANDALS: ORIGIN, &C.; HUNS: A. D. 433–453, and 453; and GOTHS: A. D. 473–474.

PANO, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: ANDESIANS.

PANORMUS.—The modern city of Palermo was of very ancient origin, founded by the Phœnicians and passing from them to the Carthaginians, who made it one of their principal naval stations in Sicily. Its Greek name, Panorma, signified a port always to be depended upon.

PANORMUS, Battles at (B. C. 254-251). See PUNIC WAR, THE FIRST.

PANTANO DE BARGAS, Battle of (1819). See COLOMBIAN STATES: A. D. 1810–1819.

PANTHEON AT ROME, The.—"At the same time with his Thermæ, Agrippa [son-in-law and friend of Augustus] built the famous dome, called by Pliny and Dion Cassius, and in the inscription of Severus on the architrave of the building itself, the Pantheon, and still retaining that name, though now consecrated as a Christian church under the name of S. Maria ad Martyres or della Rotonda. This consecration, together with the colossal thickness of the walls, has secured the building against the attacks of time, and the still more destructive attacks of the barons of the Middle Ages. . . . The Pantheon will always be reckoned among the masterpieces of architecture for solid durability combined with beauty of interior effect. The Romans prided themselves greatly upon it as one of the wonders of their great capital, and no other dome of antiquity could rival its colossal dimensions. . . . The inscription assigns its completion to the year A. D. 27, the third consulship of Agrippa. . . . The original name Pantheon, taken in connection with the numerous niches for statues of the gods in the interior, seems to contradict the idea that it was dedicated to any peculiar deity or class of deities. The seven principal niches may have been intended for the seven superior deities, and the eight ædiculæ for the next in dignity, while the twelve niches in the upper ring were occupied by the inferior inhabitants of Olympus. Dion hints at this explanation when he suggests that the name was taken from the resemblance of the dome to the vault of heaven."— R. Burn, *Rome and the Campagna, ch.* 13, *pt.* 2.—"The world has nothing else like the Pantheon. . . . The rust and dinginess that have dimmed the precious marble on the walls; the pavement, with its great squares and rounds of porphyry and granite, cracked crosswise and in a hundred directions, showing how roughly the troublesome ages have trampled here; the gray dome above, with its opening to the sky, as if heaven were looking down into the interior of this place of worship, left unimpeded for prayers to ascend the more freely: all these things make an impression of solemnity, which Saint Peter's itself fails to produce. 'I think,' said the sculptor, 'it

is to the aperture in the dome — that great Eye, gazing heavenward — that the Pantheon owes the peculiarity of its effect.'"—N. Hawthorne, *The Marble Faun, ch.* 50.

PANTIBIBLON, The exhumed Library of. See Libraries, Ancient: Babylonia and Assyria.

PANTIKAPÆUM. See Bosphorus, The City and Kingdom.

PAOLI, and the Corsican struggle. See Corsica: A. D. 1729–1769.

PAOLI, Surprise of Wayne at. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1777 (January—December).

PAPACY.

St. Peter and the Church at Rome.—"The generally received account among Roman Catholics, and one which can claim a long traditional acceptance, is that Peter came to Rome in the second year of Claudius (that is, A. D. 42), and that he held the see twenty-five years, a length of episcopate never reached again until by Pio Nono, who exceeded it. . . . Now if it is possible to prove a negative at all, we may conclude, with at least high probability, that Peter was not at Rome during any of the time on which the writings of the canonical Scriptures throw much light, and almost certainly that during that time he was not its bishop. We have an Epistle of Paul to the Romans full of salutations to his friends there, but no mention of their bishop. Nor is anything said of work done by Peter in founding that Church. On the contrary, it is implied that no Apostle had as yet visited it; for such is the inference from the passage already cited, in which Paul expresses his wish to see the Roman Christians in order that he might impart some spiritual gift to the end that they might be established. We have letters of Paul from Rome in which no message is sent from Peter; and in the very last of these letters Paul complains of being left alone, and that only Luke was with him. Was Peter one of the deserters? The Scripture accounts of Peter place him in Judæa, in Antioch, possibly in Corinth, but finally in Babylon. . . . Plainly, if Peter was ever at Rome, it was after the date of Paul's second Epistle to Timothy. Some Protestant controversialists have asserted that Peter was never at Rome; but though the proofs that he was there are not so strong as I should like them to be if I had any doctrine depending on it, I think the historic probability is that he was; though, as I say, at a late period of the history, and not long before his death. . . . For myself, I am willing, in the absence of any opposing tradition, to accept the current account that Peter suffered martyrdom at Rome. We know with certainty from John xxi. that Peter suffered martyrdom somewhere. If Rome, which early laid claim to have witnessed that martyrdom, were not the scene of it, where then did it take place? Any city would be glad to claim such a connexion with the name of the Apostle, and none but Rome made the claim. . . . From the question, whether Peter ever visited Rome, we pass now to a very different question. whether he was its bishop. . . . We think it scandalous when we read of bishops a hundred years ago who never went near their sees. . . . But if we are to believe Roman theory, the bad example had been set by St. Peter, who was the first absentee bishop. If he became bishop of Rome in the second year of Claudius, he appears never afterwards to have gone near his see until close upon his death. Nay, he never even wrote a letter to his Church while he was away; or if he did, they did not think it worth preserving. Baronius (in Ann. lviii. § 51) owns the force of the Scripture reasons for believing that Peter was not in Rome during any time on which the New Testament throws light. His theory is that, when Claudius commanded all Jews to leave Rome, Peter was forced to go away. And as for his subsequent absences, they were forced on him by his duty as the chief of the Apostles, having care of all the Churches. . . . These, no doubt, are excellent reasons for Peter's not remaining at Rome; but why, then, did he undertake duties which he must have known he could not fulfil?"—G. Salmon, *The Infallibility of the Church, pp.* 347–350.—The Roman Catholic belief as to St. Peter's episcopacy, and the primacy conferred by it on the Roman See, is stated by Dr. Döllinger as follows: "The time of . . . [St. Peter's] arrival in Rome, and the consequent duration of his episcopacy in that city, have been the subjects of many various opinions amongst the learned of ancient and modern times; nor is it possible to reconcile the apparently conflicting statements of ancient writers, unless we suppose that the prince of the apostles resided at two distinct periods in the imperial capital. According to St. Jerome, Eusebius, and Orosius, his first arrival in Rome was in the second year of the reign of Claudius (A. D. 42); but he was obliged, by the decree of the emperor, banishing all Jews from the city, to return to Jerusalem. From Jerusalem he undertook a journey through Asia Minor, and founded, or at least, visited, the Churches of Pontus, Gallacia, Cappadocia, and Bythinia. To these Churches he afterwards addressed his epistle from Rome. His second journey to Rome was in the reign of Nero; and it is of this journey that Dionysius, of Corinth, and Lactantius, write. There, with the blessed Paul, he suffered, in the year 67, the death of a martyr. We may now ascertain that the period of twenty-five years assigned by Eusebius and St. Jerome, to the episcopacy of St. Peter in Rome, is not a fiction of their imaginations; for from the second year of Claudius, in which the apostle founded the Church of Rome, to the year of his death, there intervene exactly twenty-five years. That he remained during the whole of this period in Rome, no one has pretended. . . . Our Lord conferred upon his apostle, Peter, the supreme authority in the Church. After he had required and obtained from him a public profession of his faith, he declared him to be the rock, the foundation upon which he would build his Church; and, at the same time, promised that he would give to him the keys of the kingdom of heaven. . . . In the enumeration of the apostles, frequently repeated by the Evangelists, we find that Peter is always the first named:—he is sometimes named alone, when the others are

mentioned in general. After the ascension of our Lord, it is he who directs and governs: he leads the assembly in which a successor to the apostle who had prevaricated, is chosen: after the descent of the Holy Ghost, he speaks first to the people, and announces to them Jesus Christ: he performs the first miracle, and, in the name of his brethren, addresses the synedrium: he punishes the crime of Ananias: he opens the gates of the Church to the Gentiles, and presides at the first council at Jerusalem. . . . The more the Church was extended, and the more its constitution was formed, the more necessary did the power with which Peter had been invested become,—the more evident was the need of a head which united the members in one body, of a point and centre of unity. . . . Succession by ordination was the means, by which from the beginning the power left by Christ in his Church was continued: thus the power of the apostles descended to the bishops, their successors, and thus as Peter died bishop of the Church of Rome, where he sealed his doctrine with his blood, the primacy which he had received would be continued in him by whom he was there succeeded. It was not without a particular interposition of Providence that this pre-eminence was granted to the city of Rome, and that it became the depository of ecclesiastical supremacy. This city, which rose in the midway between the east and the west, by its position, by its proximity to the sea, by its dignity, as capital of the Roman empire, being open on all sides to communication even with the most distant nations, was evidently more than any other adapted to become the centre of the universal Church. . . . There are not wanting, in the first three centuries, testimonies and facts, some of which directly attest, and others presuppose, the supremacy of the Roman Church and of its bishops."—J. J. I. Döllinger, *History of the Church, period* 1, *ch.* 1, *sect.* 4, *and ch.* 3, *sect.* 4 (*v.* 1).

Supremacy of the Roman See: Grounds of the Claim.—The historical ground of the claim to supremacy over the Christian Church asserted on behalf of the Roman See is stated by Cardinal Gibbons as follows: "I shall endeavor to show, from incontestable historical evidence, that the Popes have always, from the days of the Apostles, continued to exercise supreme jurisdiction, not only in the Western church, till the Reformation, but also throughout the Eastern church, till the great schism of the ninth century. 1. Take the question of appeals. An appeal is never made from a superior to an inferior court, nor even from one court to another of co-ordinate jurisdiction. We do not appeal from Washington to Richmond, but from Richmond to Washington. Now if we find the See of Rome, from the foundation of Christianity, entertaining and deciding cases of appeal from the Oriental churches; if we find that her decision was final and irrevocable, we must conclude that the supremacy of Rome over all the churches is an undeniable fact. Let me give you a few illustrations: To begin with Pope St. Clement, who was the third successor of St. Peter, and who is laudably mentioned by St. Paul in one of his Epistles. Some dissension and scandal having occurred in the church of Corinth, the matter is brought to the notice of Pope Clement. He at once exercises his supreme authority by writing letters of remonstrance and admonition to the Corinthians. And so great was the reverence entertained for these Epistles, by the faithful of Corinth, that for a century later it was customary to have them publicly read in their churches. Why did the Corinthians appeal to Rome far away in the West, and not to Ephesus so near home in the East, where the Apostle St. John still lived? Evidently because the jurisdiction of Ephesus was local, while that of Rome was universal. About the year 190, the question regarding the proper day for celebrating Easter was agitated in the East, and referred to Pope St. Victor I. The Eastern church generally celebrated Easter on the day on which the Jews kept the Passover; while in the West it was observed then, as it is now, on the first Sunday after the full moon of the vernal equinox. St. Victor directs the Eastern churches, for the sake of uniformity, to conform to the practice of the West, and his instructions are universally followed. Dionysius, Bishop of Rome, about the middle of the third century, having heard that the Patriarch of Alexandria erred on some points of faith, demands an explanation of the suspected Prelate, who, in obedience to his superior, promptly vindicates his own orthodoxy. St. Athanasius, the great Patriarch of Alexandria, appeals in the fourth century, to Pope Julius I., from an unjust decision rendered against him by the Oriental bishops; and the Pope reverses the sentence of the Eastern council. St. Basil, Archbishop of Cæsarea, in the same century, has recourse, in his afflictions, to the protection of Pope Damasus. St. John Chrysostom, Patriarch of Constantinople, appeals in the beginning of the fifth century, to Pope Innocent I., for a redress of grievances inflicted on him by several Eastern Prelates, and by the Empress Eudoxia of Constantinople. St. Cyril appeals to Pope Celestine against Nestorius; Nestorius also appeals to the same Pontiff, who takes the side of Cyril. Theodoret, the illustrious historian and Bishop of Cyrrhus, is condemned by the pseudo-council of Ephesus in 449, and appeals to Pope Leo. . . . John, Abbot of Constantinople, appeals from the decision of the Patriarch of that city to Pope St. Gregory I., who reverses the sentence of the Patriarch. In 859, Photius addressed a letter to Pope Nicholas I., asking the Pontiff to confirm his election to the Patriarchate of Constantinople. In consequence of the Pope's conscientious refusal, Photius broke off from the communion of the Catholic Church, and became the author of the Greek schism. Here are a few examples taken at random from Church History. We see Prelates most eminent for their sanctity and learning, occupying the highest position in the Eastern church, and consequently far removed from the local influences of Rome, appealing in every period of the early church, from the decisions of their own Bishops and their Councils to the supreme arbitration of the Holy See. If this does not constitute superior jurisdiction, I have yet to learn what superior authority means. 2. Christians of every denomination admit the orthodoxy of the Fathers of the first five centuries of the Church. No one has ever called in question the faith of such men as Basil, Chrysostom, Cyprian, Augustine, Jerome, Ambrose, and Leo. . . . Now the Fathers of the Church, with one voice, pay homage to the Bishops of Rome as their superiors. . . . 3. Ecumenical

Councils afford another eloquent vindication of Papal supremacy. An Ecumenical or General Council is an assemblage of Prelates representing the whole Catholic Church. . . . Up to the present time, nineteen Ecumenical Councils have been convened, including the Council of the Vatican. . . . The first General Council was held in Nicæa, in 325; the second, in Constantinople, in 381; the third, in Ephesus, in 431; the fourth, in Chalcedon, in 451; the fifth, in Constantinople, in 553; the sixth, in the same city, in 680; the seventh, in Nicæa, in 787; and the eighth, in Constantinople, in 869. The Bishops of Rome convoked these assemblages, or at least consented to their convocation; they presided by their legates over all of them, except the first and second councils of Constantinople, and they confirmed all these eight by their authority. Before becoming a law, the acts of the Councils required the Pope's signature. 4. I shall refer to one more historical point in support of the Pope's jurisdiction over the whole Church. It is a most remarkable fact that every nation hitherto converted from Paganism to Christianity, since the days of the Apostles, has received the light of faith from missionaries who were either especially commissioned by the See of Rome, or sent by Bishops in open communion with that See. This historical fact admits of no exception. Let me particularize: Ireland's Apostle is St. Patrick. Who commissioned him? Pope St. Celestine, in the fifth century. St. Palladius is the Apostle of Scotland. Who sent him? The same Pontiff, Celestine. The Anglo-Saxons received the faith from St. Augustine, a Benedictine monk, as all historians Catholic and non-Catholic testify. Who empowered Augustine to preach? Pope Gregory I., at the end of the sixth century. St. Remigius established the faith in France, at the close of the fifth century. He was in active communion with the See of Peter. Flanders received the Gospel in the seventh century from St. Eligius, who acknowledged the supremacy of the reigning Pope. Germany and Bavaria venerate as their Apostle St. Boniface, who is popularly known in his native England by his baptismal name of Winfrid. He was commissioned by Pope Gregory II., in the beginning of the eighth century, and was consecrated Bishop by the same Pontiff. In the ninth century, two saintly brothers, Cyril and Methodius, evangelized Russia, Sclavonia, and Moravia, and other parts of Northern Europe. They recognized the supreme authority of Pope Nicholas I., and of his successors, Adrian II. and John VIII. In the eleventh century, Norway was converted by missionaries introduced from England by the Norwegian King St. Olave. The conversion of Sweden was consummated in the same century by the British Apostles Saints Ulfrid and Eskill. Both of these nations immediately after their conversion commenced to pay Rome-scot, or a small annual tribute to the Holy See,—a clear evidence that they were in communion with the Chair of Peter. All the other nations of Europe, having been converted before the Reformation, received likewise the light of faith from Roman Catholic missionaries, because Europe then recognized only one Christian Chief."—James, Cardinal Gibbons, *The Faith of our Fathers, ch.* 10.

ALSO IN: Francis P. Kenrick, Archbishop of Baltimore, *The Primacy of the Apostolic See vindicated.*

Supremacy of the Roman See: Grounds of the Denial.—"The first document by which the partisans of the Papal sovereignty justify themselves, is the letter written by St. Clement in the name of the Church at Rome to the Church at Corinth. They assert, that it was written by virtue of a superior authority attached to his title of Bishop of Rome. Now, it is unquestionable, 1st. That St. Clement was not Bishop of Rome when he wrote to the Corinthians. 2d. That in this matter he did not act of his own authority, but in the name of the Church at Rome, and from motives of charity. The letter signed by St. Clement was written A. D. 69, immediately after the persecution by Nero, which took place between the years 64 and 68, as all learned men agree. . . . It may be seen from the letter itself that it was written after a persecution; if it be pretended that this persecution was that of Domitian, then the letter must be dated in the last years of the first century, since it was chiefly in the years 95 and 96 that the persecution of Domitian took place. Now, it is easy to see from the letter itself, that it was written before that time, for it speaks of the Jewish sacrifices as still existing in the temple of Jerusalem. The temple was destroyed with the city of Jerusalem, by Titus A. D. 70. Hence, the letter must have been written before that year. Besides, the letter was written after some persecution, in which had suffered, at Rome, some very illustrious martyrs. There was nothing of the kind in the persecution of Domitian. The persecution of Nero lasted from the year 64 to the year 68. Hence it follows, that the letter to the Corinthians could only have been written in the year 69, that is to say, twenty-four years before Clement was Bishop of Rome. In presence of this simple calculation what becomes of the stress laid by the partisans of Papal sovereignty, upon the importance of this document as emanating from Pope St. Clement? Even if it could be shown that the letter of St. Clement was written during his episcopate, this would prove nothing, because this letter was not written by him by virtue of a superior and personal authority possessed by him, but from mere charity, and in the name of the Church at Rome. Let us hear Eusebius upon this subject: 'Of this Clement there is one epistle extant, acknowledged as genuine, . . . which he wrote in the name of the Church at Rome to that of Corinth, at the time when there was a dissension in the latter.' . . . He could not say more explicitly, that Clement did not in this matter act of his own authority, by virtue of any power he individually possessed. Nothing in the letter itself gives a suspicion of such authority. It thus commences: 'The Church of God which is at Rome, to the Church of God which is at Corinth.' . . . There is every reason to believe that St. Clement draughted this letter to the Corinthians. From the first centuries it has been considered as his work. It was not as Bishop of Rome, but as a disciple of the Apostles, that he wrote it. . . . In the second century the question concerning Easter was agitated with much warmth. Many Oriental Churches wished to follow the Judaical traditions, preserved by several Apostles in the celebration of that feast, and to hold it upon the fourteenth day of the March moon; other Eastern Churches, in agreement with the Western Churches according to an equally Apostolic tradition, cele-

brated the festival of Easter the Sunday following the fourteenth day of the March moon. The question in itself considered was of no great importance; and yet it was generally thought that all the Churches should celebrate at one and the same time the great Christian festival, and that some should not be rejoicing over the resurrection of the Saviour, while others were contemplating the mysteries of his death. How was the question settled? Did the Bishop of Rome interpose his authority and overrule the discussion, as would have been the case had he enjoyed a supreme authority? Let us take the evidence of History. The question having been agitated, 'there were synods and convocations of the Bishops on this question,' says Eusebius, 'and all unanimously drew up an ecclesiastical decree, which they communicated to all the Churches in all places. . . . There is an epistle extant even now of those who were assembled at the time; among whom presided Theophilus, Bishop of the Church in Cesarea and Narcissus, Bishop of Jerusalem. There is another epistle' (of the Roman Synod) 'extant on the same question, bearing the name of Victor. An epistle also of the Bishops in Pontus, among whom Palmas, as the most ancient, presided; also of the Churches of Gaul over whom Irenæus presided. Moreover, one from those in Osrhoene, and the cities there. And a particular epistle from Bacchyllus, Bishop of the Corinthians; and epistles of many others who, advancing one and the same doctrine, also passed the same vote.' It is evident that Eusebius speaks of the letter of the Roman synod in the same terms as of the others; he does not attribute it to Bishop Victor, but to the assembly of the Roman Clergy; and lastly, he only mentions it in the second place after that of the Bishops of Palestine. Here is a point irrefragably established; it is that in the matter of Easter, the Church of Rome discussed and judged the question in the same capacity as the other churches, and that the Bishop of Rome only signed the letter in the name of the synod which represented that Church."—Abbé Guettée, *The Papacy, pp.* 53–58.—"At the time of the Council of Nicæa it was clear that the metropolitans of Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch, held a superior rank among their brethren, and had a kind of ill-defined jurisdiction over the provinces of several metropolitans. The fathers of Nicæa recognized the fact that the privileges of these sees were regulated by customs already regarded as primitive, and these customs they confirmed. . . . The empire was afterwards divided for the purposes of civil government into four Prefectures. . . . The organization of the Church followed in its main lines that of the empire. It also had its dioceses and provinces, coinciding for the most part with the similarly named political divisions. Not only did the same circumstances which marked out a city for political preëminence also indicate it as a fit centre of ecclesiastical rule, but it was a recognized principle with the Church that the ecclesiastical should follow the civil division. At the head of a diocese was a patriarch, at the head of a province was a metropolitan; the territory of a simple bishop was a parish. . . . The see of Constantinople . . . became the oriental counterpart of that of Rome. . . . But the patriarchal system of government, like every other, suffered from the shocks of time. The patriarch of Antioch had, in the first instance, the most extensive territory, for he claimed authority not only over the civil diocese of the East, but over the Churches in Persia, Media, Parthia, and India, which lay beyond the limits of the empire. But this large organization was but loosely knit, and constantly tended to dissolution. . . . After the conquests of Caliph Omar the great see of Antioch sank into insignificance. The region subject to the Alexandrian patriarch was much smaller than that of Antioch, but it was better compacted. Here too however the Monophysite tumult so shook its organization that it was no longer able to resist the claims of the patriarch of Constantinople. It also fell under the dominion of the Saracens—a fate which had already befallen Jerusalem. In the whole East there remained only the patriarch of Constantinople in a condition to exercise actual authority. . . . According to Rufinus's version of the sixth canon of the Council of Nicæa, the Bishop of Rome had entrusted to him the care of the suburbicarian churches [probably including Lower Italy and most of Central Italy, with Sicily, Sardinia and Corsica]. . . . But many causes tended to extend the authority of the Roman patriarch beyond these modest limits. The patriarch of Constantinople depended largely for his authority on the will of the emperor, and his spiritual realm was agitated by the constant intrigues of opposing parties. His brother of Rome enjoyed generally more freedom in matters spiritual, and the diocese over which he presided, keeping aloof for the most part from controversies on points of dogma, was therefore comparatively calm and united. Even the Orientals were impressed by the majesty of old Rome, and gave great honour to its bishop. In the West, the highest respect was paid to those sees which claimed an Apostle as founder, and among these the Church of St. Peter and St. Paul naturally took the highest place. It was, in fact, the one apostolic see of Western Europe, and as such received a unique regard. . . . Doubtful questions about apostolic doctrine and custom were addressed certainly to other distinguished bishops, as Athanasius and Basil, but they came more readily and more constantly to Rome, as already the last appeal in many civil matters. We must not suppose however that the Churches of the East were ready to accept the sway of Rome, however they might respect the great city of the West. . . . The authority of the Roman see increased from causes which are sufficiently obvious to historical enquirers. But the greatest of the Roman bishops were far too wise to tolerate the supposition that their power depended on earthly sanctions. They contended steadfastly that they were the heads of the Church on earth, because they were the successors of him to whom the Lord had given the keys of the kingdom of heaven, St. Peter. And they also contended that Rome was, in the most emphatic sense, the mother-church of the whole West. Innocent I. claims that no Church had ever been founded in Italy, Gaul, Spain, Africa, Sicily, or the Mediterranean islands, except by men who had received their commission from St. Peter or his successors. At the same time, they admitted that the privileges of the see were not wholly derived immediately from its founder, but were conferred by past generations out of respect for St. Peter's see. But the bishop who most clearly and emphati-

cally asserted the claims of the Roman see to pre-eminence over the whole Church on earth was no doubt Leo I., a great man who filled a most critical position with extraordinary firmness and ability. Almost every argument by which in later times the authority of the see of St. Peter was supported is to be found in the letters of Leo. . . . The Empire of the West never seriously interfered with the proceedings of the Roman bishop; and when it fell, the Church became the heir of the empire. In the general crash, the Latin Christians found themselves compelled to drop their smaller differences, and rally round the strongest representative of the old order. The Teutons, who shook to pieces the imperial system, brought into greater prominence the essential unity of all that was Catholic and Latin in the empire, and so strengthened the position of the see of Rome. . . . It must not however be supposed that the views of the Roman bishops as to the authority of Rome were universally accepted even in the West. Many Churches had grown up independently of Rome and were abundantly conscious of the greatness of their own past. . . . And in the African Church the reluctance to submit to Roman dictation which had showed itself in Cyprian's time was maintained for many generations. . . . In Gaul too there was a vigorous resistance to the jurisdiction of the see of St. Peter."—S. Cheetham, *Hist. of the Christian Church during the First Six Centuries, pp.* 181–195.—"A colossal city makes a colossal bishop, and this principle reached its maximum embodiment in Rome. The greatest City of the World made the greatest Bishop of the World. Even when the Empire was heathen the City lifted the Bishop so high that he drew to himself the unwelcome attention of the secular power, and in succession, in consequence, as in no other see, the early Bishops of Rome were martyrs. When the Empire became Christian, Rome's place was recognized as first, and the principle on which that primacy rested was clearly and accurately defined when the Second General Council, acting on this principle, assigned to the new seat of empire, Constantinople, the second place; it was the principle, namely, of honor, based upon material greatness. . . . The principle of the primacy, as distinguished from the supremacy growing out of Petrine claims was the heart and soul of Gallicanism in contrast to Ultramontanism, and was crushed out even in the Roman communion not twenty years ago."—Rt. Rev. G. F. Seymour, *The Church of Rome in her relation to Christian Unity* (*"Hist. and Teachings of the Early Church," lect.* 5).

Also in: H. Hallam, *The Middle Ages, ch.* 7, *pt.* 1.

Origin of the Papal title.—"'Papa,' that strange and universal mixture of familiar endearment and of reverential awe, extended in a general sense to all Greek Presbyters and all Latin Bishops, was the special address which, long before the names of patriarch or archbishop, was given to the head of the Alexandrian church. . . . He was the Pope. The Pope of Rome was a phrase which had not yet [at the time of the meeting of the Council of Nicæa, A. D. 325] emerged in history. But Pope of Alexandria was a well-known dignity. . . . This peculiar Alexandrian application of a name, in itself expressing simple affection, is thus explained:—Down to Heraclas (A. D. 230), the Bishop of Alexandria, being the sole Egyptian Bishop, was called 'Abba' (father), and his clergy 'elders.' From his time more bishops were created, who then received the name of 'Abba,' and consequently the name of 'Papa' ('ab-aba,' pater patrum=grandfather) was appropriated to the primate. The Roman account (inconsistent with facts) is that the name was first given to Cyril, as representing the Bishop of Rome in the Council of Ephesus. (Suicer, in voce). The name was fixed to the Bishop of Rome in the 7th century."—A. P. Stanley, *Lects. on the Hist. of the Eastern Church, lect.* 3.

Also in: J. Bingham, *Antiq. of the Christ. Church, bk.* 2, *ch.* 2, *sect.* 7.—J. Alzog, *Manual of Universal Ch. Hist., sect.* 130.—See Christianity: A. D. 312–337.

A. D. 42-461.—The early Bishops of Rome, to Leo the Great.—The following is the succession of the popes, according to Roman Catholic authorities, during the first four hundred and twenty years: "Peter, to the year of Christ 67; Linus, Anencletus, Clement; (to 77?) Evaristus, Alexander, Xystus, Telesphorus, Hyginus, to 142; Pius, to 157; Anicetus, to 168; Soter, to 177; Eleutherius, to 193; Victor, to 202; Zephyrinus, to 219; Callistus, to 223; Urban, to 230; Pontianus, to 235; Anterus, to 236; Fabian, to 250; Cornelius, from 251 to 252; Lucius, to 253; Stephan, to 257; Xystus II, to 258; Dionysius, from 259 to 269; Felix, to 274; Eutychianus, to 283; Caius, to 296; Marcellinus, to 304; Marcellus, after a vacancy of four years, from 308 to 310; Eusebius, from the 20th of May to the 26th of September, 310; Melchiades, from 311 to 314; Silvester, from 314 to 335. . . . Mark was chosen on the 18th of January 336, and died on the 7th of October of the same year. Julius I, from 337 to 352, the steadfast defender of St. Athanasius. . . . The less steadfast Liberius, from 352 to 366, purchased, in 358, his return from exile by an ill-placed condescension to the demands of the Arians. He, however, soon redeemed the honour which he had forfeited by this step, by his condemnation of the council of Rimini, for which act he was again driven from his Church. During his banishment, the Roman clergy were compelled to elect the deacon Felix in his place, or probably only as administrator of the Roman Church. When Liberius returned to Rome, Felix fled from the city, and died in the country, in 365. Damasus, from 366 to 384, by birth a Spaniard, had, at the very commencement of his pontificate, to assert his rights against a rival named Ursicinus, who obtained consecration from some bishops a few days after the election of Damasus. The faction of Ursicinus was the cause of much bloodshed. . . . Siricius, from 385 to 389, was, although Ursicinus again endeavoured to intrude himself, unanimously chosen by the clergy and people. . . . Anastasius, from 398 to 402; a pontiff, highly extolled by his successor, and by St. Jerome, of whom the latter says, that he was taken early from this earth, because Rome was not longer worthy of him, and that he might not survive the desolation of the city by Alaric. He was succeeded by Innocent I, from 402 to 417. . . . During the possession of Rome by Alaric [see Rome: A. D. 408–410], Innocent went to Ravenna, to supplicate the emperor, in the name of the Romans, to conclude a peace with the Goths. The pontificate of his successor, the Greek Zosimus, was only of

twenty one months. The election of Boniface, from 418 to 422, was disturbed by the violence of the archdeacon Eulalius, who had attached a small party to his interests. . . . He was followed by Celestine I, from 422 to 432, the combatant of Nestorianism and of Semipelagianism. To Sixtus III, from 432 to 440, the metropolitans, Helladius of Tarsus, and Eutherius of Tyana, appealed, when they were threatened with deposition at the peace between St. Cyril and John of Antioch. Leo the Great, from 440 to 461, is the first pope of whom we possess a collection of writings: they consist of 96 discourses on festivals, and 141 epistles. By his high and well-merited authority, he saved Rome, in 452, from the devastation of the Huns; and induced Attila, named 'the scourge of God,' to desist from his invasion of Italy [see HUNS: A. D. 452]. Again, when, in 457 [455], the Vandal king Geiserich entered Rome [see ROME: A. D. 455], the Romans were indebted to the eloquent persuasions of their holy bishop for the preservation, at least, of their lives."—J. J. I. Döllinger, *Hist. of the Church, v.* 2, *pp.* 213–215.—"For many centuries the bishops of Rome had been comparatively obscure persons: indeed, Leo was the first really great man who occupied the see, but he occupied it under circumstances which tended without exception to put power in his hand. . . . Circumstances were thrusting greatness upon the see of St. Peter: the glory of the Empire was passing into her hands, the distracted Churches of Spain and Africa, harassed and torn in pieces by barbarian hordes and wearied with heresies, were in no position to assert independence in any matter, and were only too glad to look to any centre whence a measure of organization and of strength seemed to radiate; and the popes had not been slow in rising to welcome and promote the greatness with which the current and tendency of the age was investing them. Their rule seems to have been, more than anything else, to make the largest claim, and enforce as much of it as they could, but the theory of papal power was still indeterminate, vague, unfixed. She was Patriarch of the West —what rights did that give her? . . . Was her claim . . . a claim of jurisdiction merely, or did she hold herself forth as a doctrinal authority in a sense in which other bishops were not? In this respect, again, the claim into which Leo entered was indefinite and unformulated. . . . The Imperial instincts of old Rome are dominant in him, all that sense of discipline, order, government—all the hatred of uniformity, individuality, eccentricity. These are the elements which make up Leo's mind. He is above all things a governor and an administrator. He has got a law of ecclesiastical discipline, a supreme canon of dogmatic truth, and these are his instruments to subdue the troubled world. . . . The rule which governed Leo's conduct as pope was a very simple one, it was to take every opportunity which offered itself for asserting and enforcing the authority of his see: he was not troubled with historical or scriptural doubts or scruples which might cast a shadow of indecision, 'the pale cast of thought,' on his resolutions and actions. To him the papal authority had come down as the great inheritance of his position; it was identified in his mind with the order, the authority, the discipline, the orthodoxy which he loved so dearly; it suited exactly his Imperial ambition, in a word, his 'Roman' disposition and character, and he took it as his single great weapon against heresy and social confusion."—C. Gore, *Leo the Great, ch.* 6 *and* 7.

A. D. 461-604.—The succession of Popes from Leo the Great to Gregory the Great.—The successor of Leo the Great, "the Sardinian Hilarius, from 461 to 468, had been one of his legates at the council of Ephesus in 449. . . . The zeal of Simplicius, from 468 to 483, was called into action chiefly by the confusion occasioned in the east by the Monophysites. The same may be said of Felix II (or III) from 483 to 492, in whose election the prefect Basilius concurred, as plenipotentiary of king Odoacer. Gelasius I, from 492 to 496, and Anastasius II, laboured, but in vain, in endeavouring to heal the schism, formed by Acacius, at Constantinople. This schism occasioned a division in Rome at the election of a new pontiff. The senator Festus had promised the emperor that he would enforce the reception of the Henoticon at Rome; and by means of corruption established against the deacon Symmachus, who had in his favour the majority of voices, a powerful party, which chose Laurence as antipope. Again was a double election the cause of bloody strife in the streets of Rome, until the Arian king, Theodoric, at Ravenna, declared for Symmachus, who gave to his rival the bishopric of Luceria. . . . More tranquil was the pontificate of the succeeding pope, Hormisdas, from 514 to 523, and made illustrious by the restoration of peace, in 519, in the eastern Church.—John I died at Ravenna, in 519, in prison, into which he was cast by the suspicious Theodoric, after his return from Constantinople.—Felix III (or IV) from 526 to 530, was chosen by the Romans, at the command of the king. At short intervals, followed Boniface II, from 530 to 532; and John II, from 533 to 535.—Agapite I went, at the desire of the Gothic king, Theodatus, to obtain peace from the emperor, to Constantinople, where he died in 536.—Sylverius died, in 540, during his second exile, on the island of Palmaria. . . . Vigilius, who was ordained in 537, and who became lawful pope in 540, was compelled to remain in the east, from 546 to 554, sometimes a prisoner in Constantinople, and sometimes in exile. He died at Syracuse, on his return to Rome, in 555. Pelagius I, from 555 to 560, found difficulty in obtaining an acknowledgement of his election, as, by his condemnation of the three articles, he was considered in the west as a traitor to the council of Chalcedon, and because there existed a suspicion that he was accessory to the death of Vigilius.—John III, from 560 to 573, beheld the commencement of the Lombard dominion in Italy.—Benedict I, from 574 to 578, and Pelagius II, from 578 to 590, ruled the Church during the melancholy times of the Lombard devastations. One of the most splendid appearances in the series of the Roman pontiffs was that of Gregory the Great, from 590 to 604."—J. J. I. Döllinger, *Hist. of the Church, v.* 2, *pp.* 213–217.—"Pope Pelagius died on the 8th of February, 590. The people of Rome . . . were at this time in the utmost straits. Italy lay prostrate and miserable under the Lombard invasion; the invaders now threatened Rome itself, and its inhabitants trembled; famine and pestilence within the city produced a climax of distress; an overflow of the Tiber at the time aggravated the

general alarm and misery; Gregory himself, in one of his letters, compares Rome at this time to an old and shattered ship, letting in the waves on all sides, tossed by a daily storm, its planks rotten and sounding of wreck. In this state of things all men's thoughts at once turned to Gregory. The pope was at this period the virtual ruler of Rome, and the greatest power in Italy; and they must have Gregory as their pope; for, if any one could save them, it was he. His abilities in public affairs had been proved; all Rome knew his character and attainments; he had now the further reputation of eminent saintliness. He was evidently the one man for the post; and accordingly he was unanimously elected by clergy, senate, and people. But he shrank from the proffered dignity. There was one way by which he might possibly escape it. No election of a pope could at this time take effect without the emperor's confirmation, and an embassy had to be sent to Constantinople to obtain it. Gregory therefore sent at the same time a letter to the emperor (Mauricius, who had succeeded Tiberius in 582), imploring him to withhold his confirmation; but it was intercepted by the prefect of the city, and another from the clergy, senate, and people sent in its place, entreating approval of their choice. . . . At length the imperial confirmation of his election arrived. He still refused; fled from the city in disguise, eluding the guards set to watch the gates, and hid himself in a forest cave. Pursued and discovered by means, it is said, of a supernatural light, he was brought back in triumph, conducted to the church of St. Peter, and at once ordained on the 3rd of September, 590. . . . Having been once placed in the high position he so little coveted, he rose to it at once, and fulfilled its multifarious duties with remarkable zeal and ability. His comprehensive policy, and his grasp of great issues, are not more remarkable than the minuteness of the details, in secular as well as religious matters, to which he was able to give his personal care. And this is the more striking in combination with the fact that, as many parts of his writings show, he remained all the time a monk at heart, thoroughly imbued with both the ascetic principles and the narrow credulity of contemporary monasticism. His private life, too, was still in a measure monastic: the monastic simplicity of his episcopal attire is noticed by his biographer; he lived with his clergy under strict rule, and in 595 issued a synodal decree substituting clergy for the boys and secular persons who had formerly waited on the pope in his chamber."—J. Barmby, *Gregory the Great, ch.* 2.—"Of the immense energy shown by St. Gregory in the exercise of his Principate, of the immense influence wielded by him both in the East and in the West, of the acknowledgment of his Principate by the answers which emperor and patriarch made to his demands and rebukes, we possess an imperishable record in the fourteen books of his letters which have been preserved to us. They are somewhat more than 850 in number. They range over every subject, and are addressed to every sort of person. If he rebukes the ambition of a patriarch, and complains of an emperor's unjust law, he cares also that the tenants on the vast estates of the Church which his officers superintend at a distance should not be in any way harshly treated. . . . The range of his letters is so great, their detail so minute, that they illuminate his time and enable us to form a mental picture, and follow faithfully that pontificate of fourteen years, incessantly interrupted by cares and anxieties for the preservation of his city, yet watching the beginnings and strengthening the polity of the western nations, and counterworking the advances of the eastern despotism. The divine order of greatness is, we know, to do and to teach. Few, indeed, have carried it out on so great a scale as St. Gregory. The mass of his writing preserved to us exceeds the mass preserved to us from all his predecessors together, even including St. Leo, who with him shares the name of Great, and whose sphere of action the mind compares with his. If he became to all succeeding times an image of the great sacerdotal life in his own person, so all ages studied in his words the pastoral care, joining him with St. Gregory of Nazianzum and St. Chrysostom. The man who closed his life at sixty-four, worn out, not with age, but with labour and bodily pains, stands, beside the learning of St. Jerome, the perfect episcopal life and statesmanship of St. Ambrose, the overpowering genius of St. Augustine, as the fourth doctor of the western Church, while he surpasses them all in that his doctorship was seated on St. Peter's throne. If he closes the line of Fathers, he begins the period when the Church, failing to preserve a rotten empire in political existence, creates new nations; nay, his own hand has laid for them their foundation-stones."—T. W. Allies, *The Holy See and the Wandering of the Nations, from St. Leo I. to St. Gregory I., pp.* 309–335.—See, also, Rome: A. D. 590–640.

A. D. 604-731.—The succession of Popes.—Sabinian, A. D. 604–606; Boniface III., 607; Boniface IV., 608–615; Deusdedit, 615–618; Boniface V., 619–625; Honorius I., 625–638; Severinus, 640; John IV., 640–642; Theodore I., 642–649; Martin I., 649–655; Eugenius I., 655–657; Vitalian, 657–672; Adeodatus II., 672–676; Donus I., 676–678; Agatho, 678–682; Leo II., 682–683; Benedict II., 684–685; John V., 685–686; Conon, 686–687; Sergius I., 687–701; John VI., 701–705; John VII., 705–707; Sisinnius, 708; Constantine, 708–715; Gregory II., 715–731.

A. D. 728-774.—Rise of the Papal Sovereignty at Rome.—The extinguishment of the authority of the Eastern emperors at Rome and in Italy began with the revolt provoked by the attempts of the iconoclastic Leo, the Isaurian, to abolish image-worship in the Christian churches (see Iconoclastic Controversy). The Pope, Gregory II., remonstrated vehemently, but in vain. At his signal all central Italy rose in revolt. "The exarch was compelled to shut himself up in Ravenna; for the cities of Italy, instead of obeying the imperial officers, elected magistrates of their own, on whom they conferred, in some cases, the title of duke. Assemblies were held, and the project of electing an emperor of the West was adopted." But another danger showed itself at this juncture which alarmed Rome and Italy more than the iconoclastic persecutions of the Byzantine emperor. The king of the Lombards took advantage of the insurrection to extend his own domains. He invaded the exarchate and got actual possession of Ravenna; whereat Pope Gregory turned his influence to the Byzantine side, with such effect that the Lombards were beaten back and Ravenna recovered. In 731 Gregory II. died and was suc-

ceeded by Pope Gregory III. "The election of Gregory III. to the papal chair was confirmed by the Emperor Leo in the usual form; nor was that pope consecrated until the mandate from Constantinople reached Rome. This was the last time the emperors of the East were solicited to confirm the election of a pope." Leo continued to press his severe measures against image-worship, and the pope boldly convened at Rome a synod of ninety-three bishops which excommunicated the whole body of the Iconoclasts, emperor and all. The latter now dispatched a strong expedition to Italy to suppress the threatening papal power; but it came to naught, and the Byzantine authority was practically at an end, already, within the range of papal leadership. "From this time, A. D. 733, the city of Rome enjoyed political independence under the guidance and protection of the popes; but the officers of the Byzantine emperors were allowed to reside in the city, justice was publicly administered by Byzantine judges, and the supremacy of the Eastern Empire was still recognised. So completely, however, had Gregory III. thrown off his allegiance, that he entered into negotiations with Charles Martel, in order to induce that powerful prince to take an active part in the affairs of Italy. The pope was now a much more powerful personage than the Exarch of Ravenna, for the cities of central Italy, which had assumed the control of their local government, intrusted the conduct of their external political relations to the care of Gregory, who thus held the balance of power between the Eastern emperor and the Lombard king. In the year 742, while Constantine V., the son of Leo, was engaged with a civil war, the Lombards were on the eve of conquering Ravenna, but Pope Zacharias threw the whole of the Latin influence into the Byzantine scale, and enabled the exarch to maintain his position until the year 751, when Astolph, king of the Lombards, captured Ravenna. The exarch retired to Naples, and the authority of the Byzantine emperors in central Italy ended."—G. Finlay, *Hist. of the Byzantine Empire, bk.* 1, *ch.* 1, *sect.* 2.—The Lombards, having obtained Ravenna and overturned the throne of the Byzantine exarchs, were now bent on extending their sovereignty over Rome. But the popes found an ally beyond the Alps whose interests coincided with their own. Pepin, the first Carolingian king of the Franks, went twice to their rescue and broke the Lombard power; his son Charlemagne finished the work [see LOMBARDS: A. D. 754–774], and by the acts of both these kings the bishops of Rome were established in a temporal no less than a spiritual principality.—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, ch.* 49.

ALSO IN: P. Godwin, *Hist. of France: Ancient Gaul, bk.* 4, *ch.* 15.—See, also, FRANKS: A. D. 768–814.

A. D. 731-816.—The succession of Popes.—Gregory III., A. D. 731–741; Zacharias, 741–752; Stephen I. (or II.), 752; Stephen II. (or III.), 752–757; Paul I., 757–767; Stephen III. (or IV.), 768–772; Hadrian I., 772–795; Leo III., 795–816.

A. D. 755-774.—Origin of the Papal States. —The Donations of Pepin and Charlemagne. —As the result of Pepin's second expedition to Italy (A. D. 755), "the Lombard king sued for quarter, promised to fulfil the terms of the treaty made in the preceding year, and to give up all the places mentioned in it. Pepin made them all over to the Holy See, by a solemn deed, which was placed in the archives of the Roman Church. . . . Pepin took such steps as should insure the execution of the Lombard's oath. Ravenna, Rimini, Resaro, Fano, Cesena, Sinigaglia, Jesi, Forlimpopoli, Forli, Castrocaro, Montefeltro, Acerragio, Montelucari, supposed to be the present Nocera, Serravalle, San Marigni, Bobio, Urbino, Caglio, Luccoli, Eugubio, Comacchio and Narni were evacuated by the Lombard troops; and the keys of the 22 cities were laid, with King Pepin's deed of gift, upon the Confession of St. Peter. The independence of the Holy See was established."—J. E. Darras, *Gen. Hist. of the Catholic Church, period* 3, *ch.* 10.—"An embassy from the Byzantine emperor asserted, during the negotiation of the treaty, the claims of that sovereign to a restoration of the exarchate; but their petitions and demands failed of effect on 'the steadfast heart of Pippin' [or Pepin], who declared that he had fought alone in behalf of St. Peter, on whose Church he would bestow all the fruits of victory. Fulrad, his abbot, was commissioned to receive the keys of the twenty-two towns his arms had won, and to deposit them as a donation on the grave of the apostle at Rome. Thus the Pope was made the temporal head of that large district . . . which, with some few changes, has been held by his successors."—P. Godwin, *Hist. of France: Ancient Gaul, bk.* 4, *ch.* 15.—"When on Pipin's death the restless Lombards again took up arms and menaced the possessions of the Church, Pipin's son Charles or Charlemagne swept down like a whirlwind from the Alps at the call of Pope Hadrian [774], seized king Desiderius in his capital, assumed himself the Lombard crown, and made northern Italy thenceforward an integral part of the Frankish empire. . . . Whether out of policy or from that sentiment of reverence to which his ambitious mind did not refuse to bow, he was moderate in claims of jurisdiction, he yielded to the pontiff the place of honour in processions, and renewed, although in the guise of a lord and conqueror, the gift of the Exarchate and Pentapolis, which Pipin had made to the Roman Church twenty years before."—J. Bryce, *The Holy Roman Empire, ch.* 4.—"It is reported, also, . . . that, jealous of the honor of endowing the Holy See in his own name, he [Charlemagne] amplified the gifts of Pippin by annexing to them the island of Corsica, with the provinces of Parma, Mantua, Venice, and Istria, and the duchies of Spoleto and Beneventum. . . . This rests wholly upon the assertion of Anastasius; but Karl could not give away what he did not possess, and we know that Corsica, Venice and Beneventum were not held by the Franks till several years later. . . . Of the nature and extent of these gifts nothing is determined: that they did not carry the right of eminent domain is clear from the subsequent exercise of acts of sovereignty within them by the Frankish monarchs; and the probability is, according to the habits of the times, that the properties were granted only under some form of feudal vassalage."—P. Godwin, *Hist. of France: Ancient Gaul, bk.* 4, *ch.* 16.—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, ch.* 49.—"Indefinite in their terms, these grants were never meant by the donors to convey full dominion

over the districts — that belonged to the head of the Empire — but only as in the case of other church estates, a perpetual usufruct or 'dominium utile.' They were, in fact, mere endowments. Nor had the gifts been ever actually reduced into possession."—J. Bryce, *The Holy Roman Empire, ch.* 10.

A. D. 774 (?).—Forgery of the "Donation of Constantine."—"Before the end of the 8th century some apostolical scribe, perhaps the notorious Isidore, composed the decretals and the donation of Constantine, the two magic pillars of the spiritual and temporal monarchy of the popes [see below: A. D. 829–847]. This memorable donation was introduced to the world by an epistle of Adrian I., who exhorts Charlemagne to imitate the liberality and revive the name of the great Constantine. According to the legend, the first of the Christian emperors was healed of the leprosy, and purified in the waters of baptism, by St. Silvester, the Roman bishop; and never was physician more gloriously recompensed. His royal proselyte withdrew from the seat and patrimony of St. Peter, declared his resolution of founding a new capital in the East; and resigned to the popes the free and perpetual sovereignty of Rome, Italy, and the provinces of the West. This fiction was productive of the most beneficial effects. The Greek princes were convicted of the guilt of usurpation; and the revolt of Gregory was the claim of his lawful inheritance. The popes were delivered from their debt of gratitude; and the nominal gifts of the Carlovingians were no more than the just and irrevocable restitution of a scanty portion of the ecclesiastical State."—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, ch.* 49.—"But this is not all, although this is what historians, in admiration of its splendid audacity, have chiefly dwelt upon. The edict proceeds to grant to the Roman pontiff and his clergy a series of dignities and privileges, all of them enjoyed by the emperor and his senate, all of them shewing the same desire to make the pontifical a copy of the imperial office. The Pope is to inhabit the Lateran palace, to wear the diadem, the collar, the purple cloak, to carry the sceptre, and to be attended by a body of chamberlains. . . . The practice of kissing the Pope's foot was adopted in imitation of the old imperial court. It was afterwards revived by the German Emperors."—J. Bryce, *The Holy Roman Empire, ch.* 7, *and foot-note.*

Also in: M. Gosselin, *The Power of the Pope in the Middle Ages, v.* 1, *p.* 317.—E. F. Henderson, *Select Historical Doc's of the Middle Ages, bk.* 3, *no.* 3.

A. D. 800.—The giving of the Roman imperial crown to Charlemagne. See Germany: A. D. 687–800; and 800.

A. D. 816–1073.—The succession of Popes.—Stephen IV. (or V.), A. D. 816–817; Paschal I., 817–824; Eugene II., 824–827; Valentine, 827; Gregory IV., 827–844; Sergius II., 844–847; Leo IV., 847–855; Benedict III., 855–858; Nicholas I., 858–867; Hadrian II., 867–872; John VIII., 872–882; Marinus, 882–884; Hadrian III., 884–885; Stephen V. (or VI.), 885–891; Formosus, 891–896; Boniface VI., 896; Stephen VI. (or VII.), 896–897; Romanus, 897–898; Theodore II., 898; John IX., 898–900; Benedict IV., 900–903; Leo V., 903; Sergius III., 904–911; Anastasius III., 911–913; Lando, 913–914; John X., 914–928; Leo VI., 928–929; Stephen VII. (or VIII.), 929–931; John XI., 931–936; Leo VII., 936–939; Stephen VIII. (or IX.), 939–942; Marinus II., 942–946; Agapetus II., 946–956; John XII., 956–964; Leo VIII., antipope, 963–965; Benedict V., 964–965; John XIII., 965–972; Benedict VI., 972–974; Donus II., 974–975; Benedict VII., 975–984; John XIV., 984–985; John XV., 985–996; Gregory V., 996–999; John XVI., antipope, 997–998; Sylvester II., 999–1003; John XVII., 1003; John XVIII., 1003–1009; Sergius IV., 1009–1012; Benedict VIII., 1012–1024; John XIX., 1024–1033; Benedict IX., 1033–1044; Sylvester III., antipope, 1044; Gregory VI., 1044–1046; Clement II., 1046–1047; Benedict IX., 1047–1048; Damasus II., 1048; Leo IX., 1049–1054; Victor II., 1055–1057; Stephen IX. (or X.), 1057–1058; Benedict X., antipope, 1058–1059; Nicholas II., 1058–1061; Alexander II., 1061–1073.

A. D. 829–847.—The False Decretals.—"There existed in each of the national churches, a collection of ecclesiastical laws, or canons, which were made use of as circumstances required. One of these collections was in use in Spain as early as the sixth century, and was subsequently attributed to Isidore, Bishop of Seville. Towards the middle of the ninth century, a new recension of these canons appeared in France, based upon the so-called Isidorian collection, but into which many spurious fragments, borrowed from private collections and bearing upon their face incontestable evidence of the ignorance of their authors, had been introduced. This recension contained also a number of forged documents. There were, altogether, above a hundred spurious decrees of popes, from Clement to Damasus (A. D. 384), not to mention some of other popes, and many false canons of councils. It also contained the forged Deed of Donation ascribed to Constantine [see above: A. D. 774 ?]. However, these decretals, which, as they stand, are now proved, both by intrinsic and extrinsic arguments, to be impudent forgeries, are nevertheless, in matter of fact, the real utterances of popes, though not of those to whom they are ascribed, and hence the forgery is, on the whole, one of chronological location, and does not affect their essential character."—J. Alzog, *Manual of Universal Church History, v.* 2, *p.* 195.—"Various opinions exist as to the time at which this collection was made, and the precise date of its publication. Mabillon supposes the compilation to have been made about A. D. 785; and in this opinion he is followed by others. But the collection did not appear until after the death of Charlemagne. Some think that these Decretals cannot be of an earlier date than 829, and Blondel supposed that he discovered in them traces of the acts of a council at Paris held in that year. All that can be determined is that most probably the Decretals were first published in France, perhaps at Mayence, about the middle of the ninth century; but it is impossible to discover their real author. The spuriousness of these Decretals was first exposed by the Magdeburg Centuriators, with a degree of historical and critical acumen beyond the age in which they lived. The Jesuit Turrianus endeavoured, but in vain, to defend the spurious documents against this attack. . . . Of these Epistles none (except two, which appear on other grounds to be spurious) were ever heard of before the ninth century. They contain a vast number of anachronisms

and historical inaccuracies. Passages are quoted from more recent writings, including the Vulgate, according to the version of Jerome; and, although the several Epistles profess to have been written by different pontiffs, the style is manifestly uniform, and often very barbarous, such as could not have proceeded from Roman writers of the first century. . . . The success of this forgery would appear incredible, did we not take into account the weak and confused government of the successors of Charlemagne, in whose time it was promulgated; the want of critical acumen and resources in that age; the skill with which the pontiffs made use of the Decretals only by degrees; and the great authority and power possessed by the Roman pontiffs in these times. The name of Isidore also served to recommend these documents, many persons being ready to believe that they were in fact only a completion of the genuine collection of Isidore, which was highly esteemed. . . . The unknown compiler was subsequently called Pseudo-Isidorus."— J. E. Riddle, *Hist. of the Papacy, v.* 1, *pp.* 405-407.

Also in: A. Neander, *General Hist. of the Christian Religion and Church, v.* 6 (*Bohn's ed.*), *pp.* 2-8.—H. H. Milman, *Hist. of Latin Christianity, bk.* 5, *ch.* 4.—M. Gosselin, *The Power of the Pope, v.* 1, *p.* 317.—J. N. Murphy, *The Chair of Peter, ch.* 9.—H. C. Lea, *Studies in Ch. Hist., pp.* 43-76.—P. Schaff, *Hist. of the Christian Church, v.* 4, *ch.* 4, *sect.* 60.

A. D. 887-1046.—Demoralization of the Church.—Degradation of the Holy See.—Reforms of the Emperor, Henry III.—"No exaggeration is possible of the demoralized state into which the Christian world, and especially the Church of Rome, had fallen in the years that followed the extinction of the Carlovingian line (A. D. 887). The tenth century is even known among Protestants 'par excellence' as the sæculum obscurum, and Baronius expresses its portentous corruption in the vivid remark that Christ was as if asleep in the vessel of the Church. 'The infamies prevalent among the clergy of the time,' says Mr. Bowden [Life of Hildebrand], 'as denounced by Damiani and others, are to be alluded to, not detailed.' . . . When Hildebrand was appointed to the monastery of St. Paul at Rome, he found the offices of devotion systematically neglected, the house of prayer defiled by the sheep and cattle who found their way in and out through its broken doors, and the monks, contrary to all monastic rule, attended in their refectory by women. The excuse for these irregularities was the destitution to which the holy house was reduced by the predatory bands of Campagna; but when the monastic bodies were rich, as was the case in Germany, matters were worse instead of better. . . . At the close of the ninth century, Stephen VI. dragged the body of an obnoxious predecessor from the grave, and, after subjecting it to a mock trial, cut off its head and three fingers, and threw it into the Tiber. He himself was subsequently deposed, and strangled in prison. In the years that followed, the power of electing to the popedom fell into the hands of the intriguing and licentious Theodora, and her equally unprincipled daughters, Theodora and Marozia [see Rome: A. D. 903-964]. These women, members of a patrician family, by their arts and beauty, obtained an unbounded influence over the aristocratic tyrants of the city. One of the Theodoras advanced a lover, and Marozia a son, to the popedom. The grandson of the latter, Octavian, succeeding to her power, as well as to the civil government of the city, elevated himself, on the death of the then Pope, to the apostolic chair, at the age of eighteen, under the title of John XII. (A. D. 956). His career was in keeping with such a commencement. 'The Lateran Palace,' says Mr. Bowden, 'was disgraced by becoming a receptacle for courtezans: and decent females were terrified from pilgrimages to the threshold of the Apostles by the reports which were spread abroad of the lawless impurity and violence of their representative and successor.' . . . At length he was carried off by a rapid illness, or by the consequences of a blow received in the prosecution of his intrigues. Boniface VII. (A. D. 974), in the space of a few weeks after his elevation, plundered the treasury and basilica of St. Peter of all he could conveniently carry off, and fled to Constantinople. John XVIII. (A. D. 1003) expressed his readiness, for a sum of money from the Emperor Basil, to recognize the right of the Greek Patriarch to the title of ecumenical or universal bishop, and the consequent degradation of his own see; and was only prevented by the general indignation excited by the report of his intention. Benedict IX. (A. D. 1033) was consecrated Pope, according to some authorities, at the age of ten or twelve years, and became notorious for adulteries and murders. At length he resolved on marrying his first cousin; and, when her father would not assent except on the condition of his resigning the popedom, he sold it for a large sum, and consecrated the purchaser as his successor. Such are a few of the most prominent features of the ecclesiastical history of these dreadful times, when, in the words of St. Bruno, 'the world lay in wickedness, holiness had disappeared, justice had perished, and truth had been buried; Simon Magus lording it over the Church, whose bishops and priests were given to luxury and fornication.' Had we lived in such deplorable times as have been above described . . . we should have felt for certain, that if it was possible to retrieve the Church, it must be by some external power; she was helpless and resourceless; and the civil power must interfere, or there was no hope. So thought the young and zealous emperor, Henry III. (A. D. 1039), who, though unhappily far from a perfect character, yet deeply felt the shame to which the Immaculate Bride was exposed, and determined with his own right hand to work her deliverance. . . . This well-meaning prince did begin that reformation which ended in the purification and monarchical estate of the Church. He held a Council of his Bishops in 1047; in it he passed a decree that 'Whosoever should make any office or station in the Church a subject of purchase or sale, should suffer deprivation and be visited with excommunication;' at the same time, with regard to his own future conduct, he solemnly pledged himself as follows:—'As God has freely of His mere mercy bestowed upon me the crown of the empire, so will I give freely and without price all things that pertain unto His religion.' This was his first act; but he was aware that the work of reform, to be thoroughly executed, must proceed from Rome, as the centre of the ecclesiastical commonwealth, and he determined, upon those imperial precedents and feudal principles

which Charlemagne had introduced, himself to appoint a Pope, who should be the instrument of his general reformation. The reigning Pope at this time was Gregory VI., and he introduces us to so curious a history that we shall devote some sentences to it. Gregory was the identical personage who had bought the papal office of the profligate Benedict IX. for a large sum, and was consecrated by him, and yet he was far from a bad sort of man after all. . . . He had been known in the world as John Gratianus; and at the time of his promotion was arch-priest of Rome. 'He was considered,' says Mr. Bowden, 'in those bad times more than ordinarily religious; he had lived free from the gross vices by which the clergy were too generally disgraced.' . . . He could not be quite said to have come into actual possession of his purchase; for Benedict, his predecessor, who sold it to him, being disappointed in his intended bride, returned to Rome after an absence of three months, and resumed his pontifical station, while the party of his intended father-in-law had had sufficient influence to create a Pope of their own, John, Bishop of Sabina, who paid a high price for his elevation, and took the title of Sylvester III. And thus there were three self-styled Popes at once in the Holy City, Benedict performing his sacred functions at the Lateran, Gregory at St. Peter's, and Sylvester at Santa Maria Maggiore. Gregory, however, after a time, seemed to preponderate over his antagonists; he maintained a body of troops, and with these he suppressed the suburban robbers who molested the pilgrims. Expelling them from the sacred limits of St. Peter's, he carried his arms further, till he had cleared the neighbouring towns and roads of these marauders. . . . This was the point of time at which the Imperial Reformer made his visitation of the Church and See of the Apostles. He came into Italy in the autumn of 1046, and held a Council at Sutri, a town about thirty miles to the north of Rome. Gregory was allowed to preside; and, when under his auspices the abdication of Benedict had been recorded, and Sylvester had been stripped of his sacerdotal rank and shut up in a monastery for life, Gregory's own turn came" and he was persuaded to pronounce a sentence of condemnation upon himself and to vacate the pontifical chair. "The new Pope whom the Emperor gave to the Church instead of Gregory VI., Clement II., a man of excellent character, died within the year. Damasus II. also, who was his second nomination, died in three or four weeks after his formal assumption of his pontifical duties. Bruno, Bishop of Toul, was his third choice. . . . And now we are arrived at the moment when the State reformer struck his foot against the hidden rock. . . . He had chosen a Pope, but 'quis custodiat ipsos custodes'? What was to keep fast that Pope in that very view of the relation of the State to the Church, that plausible Erastianism, as it has since been called, which he adopted himself? What is to secure the Pope from the influences of some Hildebrand at his elbow, who, a young man himself, shall rehearse, in the person of his superior, that part which he is one day to play in his own, as Gregory VII.? Such was the very fact; Hildebrand was with Leo, and thus commences the ecclesiastical career of that wonderful man."—J. H. Newman, *Essays Critical and Historical, v. 2, pp.* 255–265.

—See, also, Rome: A. D. 962–1057; and Germany: A. D. 973–1122.

A. D. 1053.—Naples and Sicily granted as fiefs of the Church to the sons of Tancred — the Normans. See Italy (Southern): A. D. 1000–1090.

A. D. 1054.—The Filioque Controversy.—Separation of the Orthodox (Greek) Church. See Filioque Controversy; also, Christianity: A. D. 330–1054.

A. D. 1056-1122.—Hildebrand and Henry IV. — The imperious pontifical reign of Gregory VII.—Empire and Papacy in conflict.—The War of Investitures.— "Son of a Tuscan carpenter, but, as his name shows, of German origin, Hildebrand had been from childhood a monk in the monastery of Sta Maria, on Mount Aventine, at Rome, where his uncle was abbot, and where he became the pupil of a learned Benedictine archbishop, the famous Laurentius of Amalfi, and formed a tender friendship with St. Odilon of Cluny [or Clugny]. Having early attached himself to the virtuous Pope Gregory VI., it was with indignation that he saw him confounded with two unworthy competitors, and deposed together with them by the arbitrary influence of the emperor at Sutri. He followed the exiled pontiff to France, and, after his death, went to enrol himself among the monks of Cluny, where he had previously resided, and where, according to several writers, he held the office of prior. During a part of his youth, however, he must have lived at the German Court, where he made a great impression on the Emperor Henry III., and on the best bishops of the country, by the eloquence of his preaching. . . . It was at Cluny that Hildebrand met, in 1049, the new Pope, Bruno, Bishop of Toul. . . . Bruno himself had been a monk: his cousin, the Emperor Henry III., had, by his own authority, caused him to be elected at Worms, December 1048, and proclaimed under the name of Leo IX. Hildebrand, seeing him already clothed with the pontifical purple, reproached him for having accepted the government of the Church, and advised him to guard ecclesiastical liberty by being canonically elected at Rome. Bruno yielded to this salutary remonstrance; laying aside the purple and the pontifical ornaments, he caused Hildebrand to accompany him to Rome, where his election was solemnly renewed by the Roman clergy and people. This was the first blow given to the usurped authority of the emperor. From that moment Hildebrand was withdrawn from Cluny by the Pope, in spite of the strong resistance of the Abbot St. Hugh. Created Cardinal Subdeacon of the Roman Church, and Abbot of San Paolo fuori le Mura, he went on steadily towards the end he had in view. Guided by his advice, Leo IX., after having renewed his courage at Monte Cassino, prepared several decrees of formal condemnation against the sale of benefices and against the marriage of priests; and these decrees were fulminated in a series of councils on both sides the Alps, at Rome, Verceil, Mayence, and Reims. The enemy, till then calm in the midst of his usurped rule, felt himself sharply wounded. Nevertheless, the simoniacal bishops, accomplices or authors of all the evils the Pope wished to cure, pretended as well as they could not to understand the nature and drift of the pontiff's act. They hoped time would be their friend; but they were soon undeceived. Among the

many assemblies convoked and presided over by Pope Leo IX., the Council of Reims, held in 1094, was the most important. . . . Henry I., King of France, opposed the holding of this Council with all his might. . . . The Pope stood his ground: he was only able to gather round him twenty bishops; but, on the other hand, there came fifty Benedictine abbots. Thanks to their support, energetic canons were promulgated against the two great scandals of the time, and several guilty prelates were deposed. They went still further: a decree pronounced by this Council vindicated, for the first time in many years, the freedom of ecclesiastical elections, by declaring that no promotion to the episcopate should be valid without the choice of the clergy and people. This was the first signal of the struggle for the enfranchisement of the Church, and the first token of the preponderating influence of Hildebrand. From that time all was changed. A new spirit breathed on the Church —a new life thrilled the heart of the papacy. . . . Vanquished and made prisoner by the Normans—not yet, as under St. Gregory VII., transformed into devoted champions of the Church —Leo IX. vanquished them, in turn, by force of courage and holiness, and wrested from them their first oath of fidelity to the Holy See while granting to them a first investiture of their conquests. Death claimed the pontiff when he had reigned five years. . . . At the moment when the struggle between the papacy and the Western empire became open and terrible, the East, by a mysterious decree of Providence, finally separated itself from Catholic unity. . . . The schism was completed by Michael Cerularius, whom the Emperor Constantine Monomachius had placed, in 1043, on the patriarchal throne. The separation took place under the vain pretext of Greek and Latin observances on the subject of unleavened bread, of strangled meats, and of the singing of the Alleluia. . . . Leo IX. being dead, the Romans wished to elect Hildebrand, and only renounced their project at his most earnest entreaties. He then hastened to cross the Alps, and directed his steps to Germany [1054], provided with full authority from the Roman clergy and people to choose, under the eyes of the Emperor Henry III., whoever, among the prelates of the empire, that prince should judge most worthy of the tiara. . . . Hildebrand selected Gebhard, Bishop of Eichstadt; and in spite of the emperor, who desired to keep near him a bishop who enjoyed his entire confidence—in spite even of Gebhard himself—he carried him off to Rome, where, according to the ancient custom, the clergy proceeded to his election under the name of Victor II. The new Pope, at the risk of his life, adhered to the counsels of Hildebrand, and continued the war made by his predecessor on simoniacal bishops and married priests. . . . At this crisis [October, 1056] the Emperor Henry III. died in the flower of his age, leaving the throne of Germany to his only son, a child of six years old, but already elected and crowned—the regent being his mother, the Empress Agnes. . . . Victor II. had scarcely followed the emperor to the tomb [July, 1057] when the Roman clergy hastened, for the first time, to elect a Pope without any imperial intervention. In the absence of Hildebrand, the unanimous choice of the electors fixed on the former chancellor and legate at Constantinople of Leo IX., on Frederic, monk and abbot of Monte Cassino," raised to the throne by the name of Stephen, sometimes numbered as the ninth, but generally as the tenth Pope of that name.—Count de Montalembert, *The Monks of the West, bk.* 19, *ch.* 2 (*v.* 6).—Stephen X. died in the year following his election, and again the papal chair was filled during the absence of Hildebrand from Rome. The new Pope, who took the name of Benedict X., was obnoxious to the reforming party, of which Hildebrand was the head, and the validity of his election was denied. With the support of the imperial court in Germany, Gerard, Bishop of Florence, was raised to the throne, as Nicholas II., and his rival gave way to him. Nicholas II., dying in 1061, was succeeded by Alexander II. elected equally under Hildebrand's influence. On the death of Alexander in 1073, Hildebrand himself was forced against his will, to accept the papal tiara. He "knew well the difficulties that would beset one who should endeavour to govern the Church as became an upright and conscientious Pope. Hence, dreading the responsibility, he protested, but to no purpose, against his own elevation to the papal throne. . . . Shrinking from its onerous duties, Gregory thought he saw one way still open by which he might escape the burden. The last decree on papal elections contained an article requiring that the Pope-elect should receive the approval of the Emperor of Germany. Gregory, who still assumed only the title of 'Bishop-elect of Rome,' notified Henry IV., King of Germany and Emperor-elect, of what had taken place, and begged him not to approve the action or confirm the choice of the Romans. 'But should you,' he went on to say, 'deny my prayer, I beg to assure you that I shall most certainly not allow your scandalous and notorious excesses to go unpunished.' Several historians, putting this bold declaration beside the decree of Nicholas II. (A. D. 1059), which went on the assumption that the King of Germany did not enjoy the right of approving the Pope-elect until after he had been crowned Emperor, and then, only by a concession made to himself personally, have pronounced it suppositious. But when it is recollected that its authenticity rests upon the combined testimony of Bonizo, Bishop of Sutri, the friend of Hildebrand, and of William, abbot of Metz, as well as on the authority of the Acta Vaticana, it is difficult to see how the objection can be sustained. . . . Henry IV., on receiving news of Hildebrand's election, sent Count Eberhard, of Nellenburg, as his plenipotentiary to Rome to protest against the proceeding. The politic Hildebrand was careful not to be taken at a disadvantage. 'I have indeed' said he, 'been elected by the people, but against my own will. I would not, however, allow myself to be forced to take priest's orders until my election should have been ratified by the king and the princes of Germany.' Lambert of Hersfeld informs us that Henry was so pleased with this manner of speech that he gave orders to allow the consecration to go on, and the ceremony was accordingly performed on the Feast of the Purification in the following year (A. D. 1074). This is the last instance of a papal election being ratified by an emperor. . . . Out of respect to the memory of Gregory VI., his former friend and master, Hildebrand, on ascending the papal throne, took the ever-illustrious name of Gregory VII."—J. Alzog, *Manual of*

Universal Church Hist., v. 2, pp. 347–348. — "From the most remote Christian antiquity, the marriage of clergymen had been regarded with the dislike, and their celibacy rewarded by the commendation, of the people. . . . This prevailing sentiment had ripened into a customary law, and the observance of that custom had been enforced by edicts and menaces, by rewards and penalties. But nature had triumphed over tradition, and had proved too strong for Councils and for Popes. When Hildebrand ascended the chair first occupied by a married Apostle, his spirit burned within him to see that marriage held in her impure and unhallowed bonds a large proportion of those who ministered at the altar, and who handled there the very substance of the incarnate Deity. It was a profanation well adapted to arouse the jealousy, not less than to wound the conscience, of the Pontiff. Secular cares suited ill with the stern duties of a theocratic ministry. Domestic affections would choke or enervate in them that corporate passion which might otherwise be directed with unmitigated ardour towards their chief and centre. Clerical celibacy would exhibit to those who trod the outer courts of the great Christian temple, the impressive and subjugating image of a transcendental perfection, too pure not only for the coarser delights of sense, but even for the alloy of conjugal or parental love. It would fill the world with adherents of Rome, in whom every feeling would be quenched which could rival that sacred allegiance. . . . With such anticipations, Gregory, within a few weeks from his accession, convened a council at the Lateran, and proposed a law, not, as formerly, forbidding merely the marriage of priests, but commanding every priest to put away his wife, and requiring all laymen to abstain from any sacred office which any wedded priest might presume to celebrate. Never was legislative foresight so verified by the result. What the great Council of Nicæa had attempted in vain, the Bishops assembled in the presence of Hildebrand accomplished, at his instance, at once, effectually, and for ever. Lamentable indeed were the complaints, bitter the reproaches, of the sufferers. Were the most sacred ties thus to be torn asunder at the ruthless bidding of an Italian priest? Were men to become angels, or were angels to be brought down from heaven to minister among men? Eloquence was never more pathetic, more just, or more unavailing. Prelate after prelate silenced these complaints by austere rebukes. Legate after legate arrived with papal menaces to the remonstrants. Monks and abbots preached the continency they at least professed. Kings and barons laughed over their cups at many a merry tale of compulsory divorce. Mobs pelted, hooted, and besmeared with profane and filthy baptisms the unhappy victims of pontifical rigour. It was a struggle not to be prolonged — broken hearts pined and died away in silence. Expostulations subsided into murmurs, and murmurs were drowned in the general shout of victory. Eight hundred years have since passed away. Amidst the wreck of laws, opinions, and institutions, this decree of Hildebrand's still rules the Latin Church, in every land where sacrifices are offered on her altars. . . . With this Spartan rigour towards his adherents, Gregory combined a more than Athenian address and audacity towards his rivals and antagonists. So long as the monarchs of the West might freely bestow on the objects of their choice the sees and abbeys of their states, papal dominion could be but a passing dream, and papal independency an empty boast. Corrupt motives usually determined that choice; and the objects of it were but seldom worthy. Ecclesiastical dignities were often sold to the highest bidder, and then the purchaser indemnified himself by a use no less mercenary of his own patronage; or they were given as a reward to some martial retainer, and the new churchman could not forget that he had once been a soldier. The cope and the coat-of-mail were worn alternately. The same hand bore the crucifix in the holy festival, and the sword in the day of battle. . . . In the hands of the newly consecrated Bishop was placed a staff, and on his finger a ring, which, received as they were from his temporal sovereign, proclaimed that homage and fealty were due to him alone. And thus the sacerdotal Proconsuls of Rome became, in sentiment at least, and by the powerful obligation of honour, the vicegerents, not of the Pontifex Maximus, but of the Imperator. To dissolve this 'trinoda necessitas' of simoniacal preferments, military service, and feudal vassalage, a feebler spirit would have exhorted, negotiated, and compromised. To Gregory it belonged to subdue men by courage, and to rule them by reverence. Addressing the world in the language of his generation, he proclaimed to every potentate, from the Baltic to the Straits of Calpé, that all human authority being holden of the divine, and God himself having delegated his own sovereignty over men to the Prince of the Sacred College, a divine right to universal obedience was the inalienable attribute of the Roman Pontiffs. . . . In turning ever the collection of the epistles of Hildebrand, we are every where met by this doctrine asserted in a tone of the calmest dignity and the most serene conviction. Thus he informs the French monarch that every house in his kingdom owed to Peter, as their father and pastor, an annual tribute of a penny, and he commands his legates to collect it in token of the subjection of France to the Holy See. He assures Solomon the King of Hungary, that his territories are the property of the Holy Roman Church. Solomon being incredulous and refractory, was dethroned by his competitor for the Hungarian crown. His more prudent successor, Ladislaus, acknowledged himself the vassal of the Pope, and paid him tribute. . . . From every part of the European continent, Bishops are summoned by these imperial missives to Rome, and there are either condemned and deposed, or absolved and confirmed in their sees. In France, in Spain, and in Germany, we find his legates exercising the same power; and the correspondence records many a stern rebuke, sometimes for their undue remissness, sometimes for their misapplied severity. The rescripts of Trajan scarcely exhibit a firmer assurance both of the right and the power to control every other authority, whether secular or sacerdotal, throughout the civilized world."— Sir J. Stephen, *Hildebrand* (*Edinburgh Rev., April*, 1845).— "At first Gregory appeared to desire to direct his weapons against King Philip of France, 'the worst of the tyrants who enslaved the Church.' . . . But with a more correct estimate of the circumstances of Germany and the dangers which threatened from Lombardy, he let this conflict drop and

turned against Henry IV. The latter had so alienated Saxony and Thuringia by harsh proceedings, that they desired to accuse him to the Pope of oppression and simony. Gregory immediately demanded the dismissal of the councillors who had been excommunicated by his predecessor. His mother, who was devoted to the Pope, sought to mediate, and the Saxon revolt which now broke out (still in 1073) still further induced him to give way. He wrote a submissive letter to the Pope, rendered a repentant confession at Nuremberg in 1074 in the presence of his mother and two Roman cardinals, and, along with the excommunicated councillors, who had promised on oath to surrender all church properties obtained by simony, was received into the communion of the Church. . . . But . . . Henry, after overthrowing his enemies, soon returned to his old manner, and the German clergy resisted the interference of the Pope. At the Roman Synod (February, 1075) Gregory then decreed numerous ecclesiastical penalties against resistant German and Lombard bishops, and five councillors of the King were once more laid under the ban on account of simony. But in addition, at a Roman synod of the same year, he carried through the bold law of investiture, which prohibited bishops and abbots from receiving a bishopric or abbacy from the hands of a layman, and prohibited the rulers from conferring investiture on penalty of excommunication. Before the publication of the law Gregory caused confidential overtures to be made to the King, in order, as it seems, to give the King an opportunity of taking measures to obviate the threatening dangers which were involved in this extreme step. At the same time he himself was threatened and entangled on all hands; Robert Guiscard, whom he had previously excommunicated, he once more laid under the ban. . . . Henry, who in the summer of 1075 still negotiated directly with the Pope through ambassadors, after completely overthrowing the Saxons now ceased to pay any attention. . . . At Worms (24th January 1076) he caused a great portion of the German bishops to declare the deposition of the Pope who, as was said, was shattering the Empire and degrading the bishops. The Lombard bishops subscribed the decree of deposition at Piacenza and Pavia. Its bearers aroused a fearful storm against themselves at the Lenten Synod of Rome (1076), and Gregory now declared the excommunication and deposition of Henry, and released his subjects from their oath. Serious voices did indeed deny the Pope's right to the latter course; but a portion of the German bishops at once humbled themselves before the Pope, others began to waver, and the German princes, angered over Henry's government, demanded at Tribur in October, 1076, that the King should give satisfaction to the Pope, and the Pope hold judgment on Henry in Germany itself; if by his own fault Henry should remain under the ban for a year's time, another King was to be elected. Henry then resolved to make his peace with the Pope in order to take their weapon out of the hands of the German princes. Before the Pope came to Germany, he hastened in the winter with his wife and child from Besançon, over Mont Cenis, and found a friendly reception in Lombardy, so that the Pope, already on the way to Germany, betook himself to the Castle of Canossa to the Margravine Matilda of Tuscany, fearing an evil turn of affairs from Henry and the Lombards who were hostile to the Pope. But Henry was driven by his threatened position in Germany to seek release from the ban above every thing. This brought him as a penitent into the court-yard of Canossa (January 1077), where Gregory saw him stand from morning till evening during three days before he released him from the ban at the intercession of Matilda."— W. Moeller, *Hist. of the Christian Church in the Middle Ages, pp.* 256–258.—"It was on the 25th of January, 1077, that the scene took place, which, as is natural, has seized so strongly upon the popular imagination, and has so often supplied a theme for the brush of the painter, the periods of the historian, the verse of the poet. . . . The king was bent upon escaping at any sacrifice from the bond of excommunication and from his engagement to appear before the Pontiff, at the Diet summoned at Augsburg for the Feast of the Purification. The character in which he presented himself before Gregory was that of a penitent, throwing himself in deep contrition upon the Apostolic clemency, and desirous of reconciliation with the Church. The Pope, after so long experience of his duplicity, disbelieved in his sincerity, while, as a mere matter of policy, it was in the highest degree expedient to keep him to his pact with the German princes and prelates. . . . On three successive days did he appear barefooted in the snowy court-yard of the castle, clad in the white garb of a penitent, suing for relief from ecclesiastical censure. It was difficult for Gregory to resist the appeal thus made to his fatherly compassion, the more especially as Hugh, Abbot of Cluny, and the Countess Matilda besought him 'not to break the bruised reed.' Against his better judgment, and in despite of the warnings of secular prudence, the Pope consented on the fourth day to admit to his presence the royal suppliant. . . . The conditions of absolution imposed upon the king were mainly four: that he should present himself upon a day and at a place, to be named by the Pontiff, to receive the judgment of the Apostolic See, upon the charges preferred by the princes and prelates of Germany, and that he should abide the Pontifical sentence — his subjects meanwhile remaining released from their oath of fealty; that he should respect the rights of the Church and carry out the papal decrees; and that breach of this engagement should entitle the Teutonic magnates to proceed to the election of another king. Such were the terms to which Henry solemnly pledged himself, and on the faith of that pledge the Pontiff, assuming the vestments of religion, proceeded to absolve him with the appointed rites. . . . So ends the first act in this great tragedy. Gregory's misgivings as to the king's sincerity soon receive too ample justification. 'Fear not,' the Pontiff is reported to have said, with half contemptuous sadness to the Saxon envoys who complained of his lenity to the monarch: 'Fear not, I send him back to you more guilty than he came.' Henry's words to the Pope had been softer than butter; but he had departed with war in his heart. . . . Soon he lays a plot for seizing Gregory at Mantua, whither the Pontiff is invited for the purpose of presiding over a Council. But the vigilance of the Great Countess foils the proposed treachery. Shortly the ill-advised monarch again assumes an attitude of open hostility

to the Pope. . . . The Teutonic princes, glad to throw off an authority which they loathe and despise — not heeding the advice to pause given by the Roman legates — proceed at the Diet of Forchein to the election of another king. Their choice falls upon Rudolph of Swabia, who is crowned at Metz on the 26th of March, 1077. The situation is now complicated by the strife between the two rival sovereigns. . . . At last, in Lent, 1080, Gregory, no longer able to tolerate the continual violation by Henry of the pledges given at Canossa, and greatly moved by tidings of his new and manifold sacrileges and cruelties, pronounces again the sentence of excommunication against him, releasing his subjects from their obedience, and recognizing Rudolph as king. Henry thereupon calls together some thirty simoniacal and incontinent prelates at Brixen, and causes them to go through the form of electing an anti-pope in the person of Guibert, Archbishop of Ravenna, an ecclesiastic some time previously excommunicated by Gregory for grave offences. Then the tide turns in Henry's favour. At the battle of the Elster (15th October, 1080), Rudolph is defeated and mortally wounded, and on the same day the army of the Great Countess is overthrown and dispersed at La Volta in the Mantuan territory. Next year, in the early spring, Henry crosses the Alps and advances towards Rome. . . . A little before Pentecost Henry appears under the walls of the Papal city, expecting that his party within it will throw open the gates to him; but his expectation is disappointed. . . . In 1082, the monarch again advances upon Rome and ineffectually assaults it. In the next year he makes a third and more successful attempt, and captures the Leonine city. . . . On the 21st of March, 1084, the Lateran Gate is opened to Henry by the treacherous Romans, and the excommunicated monarch, with the anti-pope by his side, rides in triumph through the streets. The next day, Guibert solemnly takes possession of St. John Lateran, and bestows the Imperial Crown upon Henry in the Vatican Basilica. Meanwhile Gregory is shut up in the Castle of St. Angelo. Thence, after six weeks, he is delivered by Guiscard, Duke of Calabria, the faithful vassal of the Holy See. But the burning of the city by Guiscard's troops, upon the uprising of the Romans, turns the joy of his rescue into mourning. Eight days afterwards he quits 'the smoking ruins of his once beautiful Rome,' and after pausing for a few days, at Monte Casino, reaches Salerno, where his life pilgrimage is to end."—W. S. Lilly, *The Turning-Point of the Middle Ages* (*Contemporary Rev., August*, 1882).— Gregory died at Salerno on the 25th of May, 1085, leaving Henry apparently triumphant; but he had inspired the Papacy with his will and mind, and the battle went on. At the end of another generation — in A. D. 1122 — the question of investitures was settled by a compromise called the Concordat of Worms. "Both of the contending parties gave up something, but one much more than the other; the Church shadows, the State substance. The more important elections should be henceforth made in the presence of the Emperor, he engaging not to interfere with them, but to leave to the Chapter or other electing body the free exercise of their choice. This was in fact to give over in most instances the election to the Pope; who gradually managed to exclude the Emperor from all share in Episcopal appointments. The temporalities of the See or Abbey were still to be made over to the Bishop or Abbot elect, not, however, any longer by the delivering to him of the ring and crozier, but by a touch of the sceptre, he having done homage for them, and taken the oath of obedience. All this was in Germany to find place before consecration, being the same arrangement that seven years earlier had brought the conflict between Anselm and our Henry I. to an end."—R. C. Trench, *Lect's on Medieval Ch. Hist., lect.* 9.

Also in: A. F. Villemain, *Life of Gregory VII., bk.* 2.—W. R. W. Stephens, *Hildebrand and His Times.*—H. H. Milman, *Hist. of Latin Christianity, bks.* 6–8.—E. F. Henderson, *Select Hist. Docs. of the Middle Ages, bk.* 4.—See, also, Germany: A. D. 973–1122; Canossa; and Rome: A. D. 1081–1084.

A. D. 1059.—Institution of the procedure of Papal Election.—"According to the primitive custom of the church, an episcopal vacancy was filled up by election of the clergy and people belonging to the city or diocese. . . . It is probable that, in almost every case, the clergy took a leading part in the selection of their bishops; but the consent of the laity was absolutely necessary to render it valid. They were, however, by degrees excluded from any real participation, first in the Greek, and finally in the western church. . . . It does not appear that the early Christian emperors interfered with the freedom of choice any further than to make their own confirmation necessary in the great patriarchal sees, such as Rome and Constantinople, which were frequently the objects of violent competition, and to decide in controverted elections. . . . The bishops of Rome, like those of inferior sees, were regularly elected by the citizens, laymen as well as ecclesiastics. But their consecration was deferred until the popular choice had received the sovereign's sanction. The Romans regularly despatched letters to Constantinople or to the exarchs of Ravenna, praying that their election of a pope might be confirmed. Exceptions, if any, are infrequent while Rome was subject to the eastern empire. This, among other imperial prerogatives, Charlemagne might consider as his own. . . . Otho the Great, in receiving the imperial crown, took upon him the prerogatives of Charlemagne. There is even extant a decree of Leo VIII., which grants to him and his successors the right of naming future popes. But the authenticity of this instrument is denied by the Italians. It does not appear that the Saxon emperors went to such a length as nomination, except in one instance (that of Gregory V. in 996); but they sometimes, not uniformly, confirmed the election of a pope, according to ancient custom. An explicit right of nomination was, however, conceded to the emperor Henry III. in 1047, as the only means of rescuing the Roman church from the disgrace and depravity into which it had fallen. Henry appointed two or three very good popes. . . . This high prerogative was perhaps not designed to extend beyond Henry himself. But even if it had been transmissible to his successors, the infancy of his son Henry IV., and the factions of that minority, precluded the possibility of its exercise. Nicolas II., in 1059, published a decree which restored the right of election to the Romans, but with a remarkable variation from

the original form. The cardinal bishops (seven in number, holding sees in the neighbourhood of Rome, and consequently suffragans of the pope as patriarch or metropolitan) were to choose the supreme pontiff, with the concurrence first of the cardinal priests and deacons (or ministers of the parish churches of Rome), and afterwards of the laity. Thus elected, the new pope was to be presented for confirmation to Henry, 'now king, and hereafter to become emperor,' and to such of his successors as should personally obtain that privilege. This decree is the foundation of that celebrated mode of election in a conclave of cardinals which has ever since determined the headship of the church. . . . The real author of this decree, and of all other vigorous measures adopted by the popes of that age, whether for the assertion of their independence or the restoration of discipline, was Hildebrand"—afterwards Pope Gregory VII.—H. Hallam, *The Middle Ages, ch.* 7, *pt.* 1 (*v.* 2).

Also in: E. F. Henderson, *Select Hist. Docs. of the Middle Ages, bk.* 4, *no.* 1.

A. D. 1077-1102.—Donation of the Countess Matilda.—"The Countess Matilda, born in 1040, was daughter of Boniface, Marquis of Tuscany, and Beatrice, sister of the Emperor Henry III. On the death of her only brother, without issue, she succeeded to all his dominions, of Tuscany, Parma, Lucca, Mantua and Reggio. Rather late in life, she married Guelpho, son of the Duke of Bavaria—no issue resulting from their union. This princess displayed great energy and administrative ability in the troubled times in which she lived, occasionally appearing at the head of her own troops. Ever a devoted daughter of the Church, she specially venerated Pope Gregory VII., to whom she afforded much material support, in the difficulties by which he was constantly beset. To this Pontiff, she made a donation of a considerable portion of her dominions, for the benefit of the Holy See, A. D. 1077, confirming the same in a deed to Pope Pascal II., in 1102, entituled 'Cartula donationis Comitissæ Mathildis facta S. Gregorio PP. VII., et innovata Paschali PP. II.'; apud Theiner 'Codex Diplomaticus,' etc., tom. 1, p. 10. As the original deed to Gregory VII. is not extant, and the deed of confirmation or renewal does not recite the territories conveyed, there is some uncertainty about their exact limits. However, it is generally thought that they comprised the district formerly known as the Patrimony of Saint Peter, lying on the right bank of the Tiber, and extending from Aquapendente to Ostia. The Countess Matilda died in 1115, aged 75."—J. N. Murphy, *The Chair of Peter, p.* 235, *foot-note.*—See below: A. D. 1122–1250.

A. D. 1086-1154.—The succession of Popes.—Victor III., A. D. 1086–1087; Urban II., 1088–1099; Pascal II., 1099–1118; Gelasius II., 1118–1119; Callistus II., 1119–1124; Honorius II., 1124–1130; Innocent II., 1130–1143; Celestine II., 1143–1144; Lucius II., 1144–1145; Eugene III., 1145–1153; Anastasius IV., 1153–1154.

A. D. 1094.—Pope Urban II. and the first Crusade.—The Council of Clermont. See Crusades: A. D. 1094.

A. D. 1122-1250.—Continued conflict with the Empire.—The Popes and the Hohenstaufen Emperors.—"The struggle about investiture ended, as was to be expected, in a compromise; but it was a compromise in which all the glory went to the Papacy. Men saw that the Papal claims had been excessive, even impossible; but the object at which they aimed, the freedom of the Church from the secularising tendencies of feudalism, was in the main obtained. . . . But the contest with the Empire still went on. One of the firmest supporters of Gregory VII. had been Matilda, Countess of Tuscany, over whose fervent piety Gregory had thrown the spell of his powerful mind. At her death, she bequeathed her possessions, which embraced nearly a quarter of Italy, to the Holy See [see above: A. D. 1077–1102]. Some of the lands which she had held were allodial, some were fiefs of the Empire; and the inheritance of Matilda was a fruitful source of contention to two powers already jealous of one another. The constant struggle that lasted for two centuries gave full scope for the development of the Italian towns. . . . The old Italian notion of establishing municipal freedom by an equilibrium of two contending powers was stamped still more deeply on Italian politics by the wars of Guelfs and Ghibellins. The union between the Papacy and the Lombard Republics was strong enough to humble the mightiest of the Emperors. Frederic Barbarossa, who held the strongest views of the Imperial prerogative, had to confess himself vanquished by Pope Alexander III. [see Italy: A. D. 1154–1162, to 1174–1183], and the meeting of Pope and Emperor at Venice was a memorable ending to the long struggle; that the great Emperor should kiss the feet of the Pope whom he had so long refused to acknowledge, was an act which stamped itself with dramatic effect on the imagination of men, and gave rise to fables of a still more lowly submission [see Venice: A. D. 1177]. The length of the strife, the renown of Frederic, the unswerving tenacity of purpose with which Alexander had maintained his cause, all lent lustre to this triumph of the Papacy. The consistent policy of Alexander III., even in adverse circumstances, the calm dignity with which he asserted the Papal claims, and the wisdom with which he used his opportunities, made him a worthy successor of Gregory VII. at a great crisis in the fortunes of the Papacy. It was reserved, however, for Innocent III. to realise most fully the ideas of Hildebrand. If Hildebrand was the Julius, Innocent was the Augustus, of the Papal Empire. He had not the creative genius nor the fiery energy of his great forerunner; but his clear intellect never missed an opportunity, and his calculating spirit rarely erred from its mark. . . . On all sides Innocent III. enjoyed successes beyond his hopes. In the East, the crusading zeal of Europe was turned by Venice to the conquest of Constantinople [see Crusades: A. D. 1201–1203], and Innocent could rejoice for a brief space in the subjection of the Eastern Church. In the West, Innocent turned the crusading impulse to the interest of the Papal power, by diverting it against heretical sects which, in Northern Italy and the South of France, attacked the system of the Church [see Albigenses]. . . . Moreover Innocent saw the beginning, though he did not perceive the full importance, of a movement which the reaction against heresy produced within the Church. The Crusades had quickened men's activity, and the heretical sects had aimed at kindling greater fervour of spiritual life. . . . By the side of the monastic aim of averting, by the prayers and

penitence of a few, God's anger from a wicked world, there grew up a desire for self-devotion to missionary labour. Innocent III. was wise enough not to repulse this new enthusiasm, but find a place for it within the ecclesiastical system. Francis of Assisi gathered round him a body of followers who bound themselves to a literal following of the Apostles, to a life of poverty and labour, amongst the poor and outcast; Dominic of Castile formed a society which aimed at the suppression of heresy by assiduous teaching of the truth. The Franciscan and Dominican orders grew almost at once into power and importance, and their foundation marks a great reformation within the Church [see MENDICANT ORDERS]. The reformation movement of the eleventh century, under the skilful guidance of Hildebrand, laid the foundations of the Papal monarchy in the belief of Europe. The reformation of the thirteenth century found full scope for its energy under the protection of the Papal power; for the Papacy was still in sympathy with the conscience of Europe, which it could quicken and direct. These mendicant orders were directly connected with the Papacy, and were free from all episcopal control. Their zeal awakened popular enthusiasm; they rapidly increased in number and spread into every land. The Friars became the popular preachers and confessors, and threatened to supersede the old ecclesiastical order. Not only amongst the common people, but in the universities as well, did their influence become supreme. They were a vast army devoted to the service of the Pope, and overran Europe in his name. They preached Papal indulgences, they stirred up men to crusades in behalf of the Papacy, they gathered money for the Papal use. . . . The Emperor Frederic II., who had been brought up under Innocent's guardianship, proved the greatest enemy of the newly-won sovereignty of the Pope. King of Sicily and Naples, Frederic was resolved to assert again the Imperial pretensions of North Italy, and then win back the Papal acquisitions in the centre; if his plan had succeeded, the Pope would have lost his independence and sunk to be the instrument of the house of Hohenstaufen. Two Popes of inflexible determination and consummate political ability were the opponents of Frederic. Gregory IX. and Innocent IV. flung themselves with ardour into the struggle, and strained every nerve till the whole Papal policy was absorbed by the necessities of the strife [see ITALY: A. D. 1183–1250; and GERMANY: A. D. 1138–1268]. . . . Frederic II. died [1250], but the Popes pursued with their hostility his remotest descendants, and were resolved to sweep the very remembrance of him out of Italy. To accomplish their purpose, they did not hesitate to summon the aid of the stranger. Charles of Anjou appeared as their champion, and in the Pope's name took possession of the Sicilian kingdom [see ITALY: A. D. 1250–1268]. By his help the last remnants of the Hohenstaufen house were crushed, and the claims of the Empire to rule over Italy were destroyed for ever. But the Papacy got rid of an open enemy only to introduce a covert and more deadly foe. The Angevin influence became superior to that of the Papacy, and French popes were elected that they might carry out the wishes of the Sicilian king. By its resolute efforts to escape from the power of the Empire, the Papacy only paved the way for a connexion that ended in its enslavement to the influence of France."—M. Creighton, *Hist. of the Papacy during the Period of the Reformation, v.* 1, *pp.* 18–23.

ALSO IN: T. L. Kington, *Hist. of Frederick II. Emperor of the Romans.*

A. D. 1154-1198.—The succession of Popes.—Hadrian IV., A. D. 1154–1159; Alexander III., 1159–1181; Lucius III., 1181–1185; Urban III., 1185–1187; Gregory VIII., 1187; Clement III., 1187–1191; Celestine III., 1191–1198.

A. D. 1162-1170.—Conflict of Church and State in England.—Becket and Henry II. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1162–1170.

A. D. 1198-1216.—The establishing of Papal Sovereignty in the States of the Church.—"Innocent III. may be called the founder of the States of the Church. The lands with which Pippin and Charles had invested the Popes were held subject to the suzerainty of the Frankish sovereign and owned his jurisdiction. On the downfall of the Carolingian Empire the neighbouring nobles, calling themselves Papal vassals, seized on these lands; and when they were ousted in the Pope's name by the Normans, the Pope did not gain by the change of neighbours. Innocent III. was the first Pope who claimed and exercised the rights of an Italian prince. He exacted from the Imperial Prefect in Rome the oath of allegiance to himself; he drove the Imperial vassals from the Matildan domain [see TUSCANY: A. D. 685–1115], and compelled Constance, the widowed queen of Sicily, to recognise the Papal suzerainty over her ancestral kingdom. He obtained from the Emperor Otto IV. (1201) the cession of all the lands which the Papacy claimed, and so established for the first time an undisputed title to the Papal States."—M. Creighton, *Hist. of the Papacy during the Period of the Reformation, v.* 1, *p.* 21.

A. D. 1198-1294.—The succession of Popes.—Innocent III., A. D. 1198–1216; Honorius III., 1216–1227; Gregory IX., 1227–1241; Celestine IV., 1241; Innocent IV., 1243–1254; Alexander IV., 1254–1261; Urban IV., 1261–1264; Clement IV., 1265–1268; Gregory X., 1271–1276; Innocent V., 1276; Hadrian V., 1276; John XXI., 1276–1277; Nicholas III., 1277–1280; Martin IV., 1281–1285; Honorius IV., 1285–1287; Nicholas IV., 1288–1292; Celestine V., 1294.

A. D. 1198-1303.—The acme of Papal power.—The pontificates from Innocent III. to Boniface VIII.—"The epoch when the spirit of papal usurpation was most strikingly displayed was the pontificate of Innocent III. In each of the three leading objects which Rome had pursued, independent sovereignty, supremacy over the Christian church, control over the princes of the earth, it was the fortune of this pontiff to conquer. He realized . . . that fond hope of so many of his predecessors, a dominion over Rome and the central parts of Italy. During his pontificate Constantinople was taken by the Latins; and however he might seem to regret a diversion of the crusaders, which impeded the recovery of the Holy Land, he exulted in the obedience of the new patriarch and the reunion of the Greek church. Never, perhaps, either before or since, was the great eastern schism in so fair a way of being healed; even the kings of Bulgaria and Armenia acknowledged the supremacy of Innocent, and permitted his interference with their ecclesiastical institutions. The maxims of Greg-

ory VII. were now matured by more than a hundred years, and the right of trampling upon the necks of kings had been received, at least among churchmen, as an inherent attribute of the papacy. 'As the sun and the moon are placed in the firmament' (such is the language of Innocent), 'the greater as the light of the day, and the lesser of the night, thus are there two powers in the church — the pontifical, which, as having the charge of souls, is the greater; and the royal, which is the less, and to which the bodies of men only are intrusted.' Intoxicated with these conceptions (if we may apply such a word to successful ambition), he thought no quarrel of princes beyond the sphere of his jurisdiction. 'Though I cannot judge of the right to a fief,' said Innocent to the kings of France and England, 'yet it is my province to judge where sin is committed, and my duty to prevent all public scandals.' . . . Though I am not aware that any pope before Innocent III. had thus announced himself as the general arbiter of differences and conservator of the peace throughout Christendom, yet the scheme had been already formed, and the public mind was in some degree prepared to admit it. . . . The noonday of papal dominion extends from the pontificate of Innocent III. inclusively to that of Boniface VIII.; or, in other words, through the 13th century. Rome inspired during this age all the terror of her ancient name. She was once more the mistress of the world, and kings were her vassals."— H. Hallam, *The Middle Ages, ch.* 7, *pt.* 1-2 (*v.* 2).

Also in: J. Miley, *Hist. of the Papal States, v.* 3, *bk.* 1, *ch.* 3.—M. Gosselin, *The Power of the Pope in the Middle Ages, pt.* 2, *ch.* 3.—M. Creighton, *Hist. of the Papacy during the Reformation, introd., ch.* 1 (*v.* 1).

A. D. 1203.—The planting of the germs of the Papal Inquisition. See Inquisition: A. D. 1203-1525.

A. D. 1205-1213.—Subjugation of the English King John. See England: A. D. 1205-1213.

A. D. 1215.—The beginning, in Italy, of the Wars of the Guelfs and Ghibellines. See Italy: A. D. 1215.

A. D. 1266.—Transfer of the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies to Charles of Anjou. See Italy: A. D. 1250-1268.

A. D. 1268.—The Pragmatic Sanction of St. Louis, affirming the rights of the Gallican Church. See France: A. D. 1268.

A. D. 1275.—Ratification of the Donation of Charlemagne and the Capitulation of Otho IV. by Rodolph of Hapsburg. See Germany: A. D. 1273-1308.

A. D. 1279.—The English Statute of Mortmain. See England: A. D. 1279.

A. D. 1294-1348.—The stormy pontificate of Boniface VIII.—His conflict with Philip IV. of France.—The "Babylonish Captivity."—Purchase of Avignon, which becomes the Papal Seat.—Boniface VIII., who came to the Papal throne in 1294, "was a man of so much learning that Petrarch extols him as the wonder of the world. His craft and cruelty, however, were shown in his treatment of Celestine V. [his predecessor], whom he first persuaded to resign the pontificate, five months after his election, on account of his inexperience in politics; and then, having succeeded to the chair, instead of letting the good man return to the cloister for which he panted, he kept him in confinement to the day of his death. His resentment of the opposition of the two cardinals Colonna to his election was so bitter, that not content with degrading them, he decreed the whole family — one of the most illustrious in Rome — to be for ever infamous, and incapable of ecclesiastical dignities. He pulled down their town of Prænestе, and ordered the site to be sown with salt to extinguish it, like Carthage, for ever. This pontificate is famous for the institution of the Jubilee, though, according to some accounts, it was established a century before by Innocent III. By a bull dated 22nd February 1300, Boniface granted a plenary remission of sins to all who, before Christmas, in that and every subsequent hundredth year, should visit the churches of St. Peter and St. Paul daily, for 30 days if inhabitants of Rome, and for half that time if strangers. His private enemies, the Colonnas, Frederic of Sicily, who had neglected to pay his tribute, and the abettors of the Saracens, were the only persons excluded. The city was crowded with strangers, who flocked to gain the indulgence; enormous sums were offered at the holy tombs; and the solemnity became so profitable that Clement VI. reduced the period for its observance from 100 years to 50, and later popes have brought it down to 25. Boniface appeared at the jubilee with the spiritual and temporal swords carried before him, the bearers of which proclaimed the text, — 'Behold, here are two swords.' . . . The pope had the pleasure of receiving a . . . respectful recognition from the barons of Scotland. Finding themselves hard pressed by the arms of Edward I., they resolved to accept a distant, in preference to a neighbouring, master; accordingly, they tendered the kingdom to the pope, pretending that, from the most ancient times, Scotland had been a fief of the holy Roman See. Boniface, eagerly embracing the offer, commanded the archbishop of Canterbury to require the king to withdraw his troops, and submit his pretensions to the apostolic tribunal. . . . Boniface got no other satisfaction than to be told that the laws of England did not permit the king to subject the rights of his crown to any foreign tribunal. His conflict with the king of France was still more unfortunate. Philip the Fair, like our own Edward I., thought fit to compel the clergy to contribute towards the expenses of his repeated campaigns. The pope thereupon issued a bull entitled 'Clericis laicos' (A. D. 1296), charging the laity with inveterate hostility to the clergy, and prohibiting, under pain of excommunication, any payment out of ecclesiastical revenues without his consent. The king retorted by prohibiting the export of coin or treasure from his dominions, without license from the crown. This was cutting off the pope's revenue at a blow, and so modified his anger that he allowed the clergy to grant a 'free benevolence' to the king, when in urgent need. A few years after (1301), Philip imprisoned a bishop on charge of sedition, when Boniface thundered out his bulls 'Salvator mundi,' and 'Ausculta fili,' the first of which suspended all privileges accorded by the Holy See to the French king and people, and the second, asserting the papal power in the now familiar text from Jeremiah [Jer. i. 10], summoned the superior clergy to Rome. Philip burned the bull, and prohibited the clergy from obeying the summons. The peers and people of

France stood by the crown, treating the exhortations of the clergy with defiance. The pope, incensed at this resistance, published the Decretal called 'Unam sanctam,' which affirms the unity of the Church, without which there is no salvation, and hence the unity of its head in the successor of St. Peter. Under the pope are two swords, the spiritual and the material — the one to be used by the church, the other for the church. . . . The temporal sword is . . . subject to the spiritual, and the spiritual to God only. The conclusion is, 'that it is absolutely essential to the salvation of every human being that he be subject unto the Roman pontiff.' The king, who showed great moderation, appealed to a general council, and forbad his subjects to obey any orders of Boniface till it should be assembled. The pope resorted to the usual weapons. He drew up a bull for the excommunication of the king; offered France to Albert of Austria, king of the Romans, and wrote to the king of England to incite him to prosecute his war. Meantime, Philip having sent William de Nogaret on an embassy to the pope, this daring envoy conceived the design of making him prisoner. Entering Anagni [the pope's native town and frequent residence, 40 miles from Rome] at the head of a small force, privately raised in the neighbourhood, the conspirators, aided by some of the papal household, gained possession of the palace and burst into the pope's presence. Boniface, deeming himself a dead man, had put on his pontifical robes and crown, but these had little effect on the irreverent intruders. De Nogaret was one of the Albigenses; his companion, a Colonna, was so inflamed at the sight of his persecutor that he struck him on the face with his mailed hand, and would have killed him but for the intervention of the other. The captors unaccountably delaying to carry off their prize, the people of the place rose and rescued the Holy Father. He hastened back to Rome, but died of the shock a month after, leaving a dangerous feud between the Church and her eldest son."—G. Trevor, *Rome: from the Fall of the Western Empire, ch.* 9.—"Boniface has been consigned to infamy by contemporary poets and historians, for the exhibition of some of the most revolting features of the human character. Many of the charges, such as that he did not believe in eternal life; that he was guilty of monstrous heresy; that he was a wizard; and that he asserted that it is no sin to indulge in the most criminal pleasures — are certainly untrue. They are due chiefly to his cruelty to Celestine and the Celestinians, and his severity to the Colonnas, which led the two latter to go everywhere blackening his character. They have been exaggerated by Dante; and they may be ascribed generally to his pride and violence, and to the obstinate determination, formed by a man who 'was born an age too late,' to advance claims then generally becoming unpopular, far surpassing in arrogance those maintained by the most arbitrary of his predecessors. . . . This victory of Philip over Boniface was, in fact, the commencement of a wide-spread reaction on the part of the laity against ecclesiastical predominance. The Papacy had first shown its power by a great dramatic act, and its decline was shown in the same manner. The drama of Anagni is to be set against the drama of Canossa."—A. R. Pennington, *The Church in Italy, ch.* 6.—"The next pope, Benedict XI., endeavoured to heal the breach by annulling the decrees of Boniface against the French king, and reinstating the Colonnas; but he was cut off by death in ten months from his election [1304], and it was generally suspected that his removal was effected by poison. . . . On the death of Benedict, many of the cardinals were for closing the breach with France by electing a French pope; the others insisted that an Italian was essential to the independence of the Holy See. The difference was compromised by the election of the archbishop of Bordeaux, a Frenchman by birth, but owing his preferments to Boniface, and an active supporter of his quarrel against Philip. The archbishop, however, had secretly come to terms with the king, and his first act, as Clement V., was to summon the cardinals to attend him at Lyons, where he resolved to celebrate his coronation. The Sacred College crossed the Alps with undissembled repugnance, and two-and-seventy years elapsed before the Papal court returned to Rome. This period of humiliation and corruption the Italian writers not inaptly stigmatise as the 'Babylonish captivity.' Clement began his pontificate by honourably fulfilling his engagements with the French. He absolved the king and all his subjects. . . . If it be true that the king claimed . . . the condemnation of Boniface as a heretic, Clement had the manliness to refuse. He ventured to inflict a further disappointment by supporting the claim of Henry of Luxembourg to the empire in preference to the French king's brother. To escape the further importunities of his too powerful ally, the pope removed into the dominions of his own vicar, the king of Naples (A. D. 1309). The place selected was Avignon, belonging to Charles the Lame as count of Provence. . . . In the 9th century, it [Avignon] passed to the kings of Arles, or Burgundy, but afterwards became a free republic, governed by its own consuls, under the suzerainty of the count of Provence. . . . The Neapolitan dynasty, though of French origin, was independent of the French crown, when the pope took up his residence at Avignon. Charles the Lame was soon after succeeded by his third son Robert, who, dying in 1343, left his crown to his granddaughter Joanna, the young and beautiful wife of Andrew, prince of Hungary. . . . In one of her frequent exiles Clement took advantage of her necessities to purchase her rights in Avignon for 80,000 gold florins, but this inadequate price was never paid. The pope placed it to the account of the tribute due to himself from the Neapolitan crown, and having procured a renunciation of the paramount suzerainty of the emperor, he took possession of the city and territory as absolute sovereign (A. D. 1348)."—G. Trevor, *Rome: from the Fall of the Western Empire, ch.* 9–10.

Also in: H. H. Milman, *Hist. of Latin Christianity, bk.* 12 (*v.* 5).—J. E. Darras, *Hist. of the Catholic Church, period* 6, *ch.* 1 (*v.* 3).

A. D. 1305-1377.—The Popes of "the Babylonish Captivity" at Avignon.—The following is the succession of the Popes during the Avignon period: Boniface VIII., A. D. 1294–1303; Benedict XI., 1303–1304; Clement V., 1305–1314; John XXII., 1316–1334; Benedict XII., 1334–1342; Clement VI., 1342–1352; Innocent VI., 1352–1362; Urban V., 1362–1370; Gregory XI., 1371–1378.—"The Avignon Popes, without exception, were all more or less dependent upon

France. Frenchmen themselves, and surrounded by a College of Cardinals in which the French element predominated, they gave a French character to the government of the Church. This character was at variance with the principle of universality inherent in it and in the Papacy. . . . The migration to France, the creation of a preponderance of French Cardinals, and the consequent election of seven French Popes in succession, necessarily compromised the position of the Papacy in the eyes of the world, creating a suspicion that the highest spiritual power had become the tool of France. This suspicion, though in many cases unfounded, weakened the general confidence in the Head of the Church, and awakened in the other nations a feeling of antagonism to the ecclesiastical authority which had become French. The bonds which united the States of the Church to the Apostolic See were gradually loosened. . . . The dark points of the Avignon period have certainly been greatly exaggerated. The assertion that the Government of the Avignon Popes was wholly ruled by the 'will and pleasure of the Kings of France,' is, in this general sense, unjust. The Popes of those days were not all so weak as Clement V., who submitted the draft of the Bull, by which he called on the Princes of Europe to imprison the Templars, to the French King. Moreover, even this Pope, the least independent of the 14th century Pontiffs, for many years offered a passive resistance to the wishes of France, and a writer [Wenck], who has thoroughly studied the period, emphatically asserts that only for a few years of the Pontificate of Clement V. was the idea so long associated with the 'Babylonian Captivity' of the Popes fully realized. The extension of this epithet to the whole of the Avignon sojourn is an unfair exaggeration."—L. Pastor, *Hist. of the Popes from the Close of the Middle Ages, v.* 1, *pp.* 58–60.

A. D. 1306-1393.—Resistance to Papal encroachments in England. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1306–1393.

A. D. 1314-1347.—Pretension to settle the disputed election of Emperor.—The long conflict with Louis of Bavaria in Germany and Italy. See GERMANY: A. D. 1314–1347.

A. D. 1347-1354.—Rienzi's revolution at Rome. See ROME: A. D. 1347–1354.

A. D. 1352-1378.—Subjugation of the States of the Church and the return from Avignon to Rome.—Revolt and war in the Papal States, supported by Florence.—"Under the pontificate of Innocent VI. the advantages reaped by the Papal See from its sojourn at Avignon seemed to have come to an end. The disturbed condition of France no longer offered them security and repose. . . . Moreover, the state of affairs in Italy called loudly for the Pope's intervention. . . . The desperate condition of the States of the Church, which had fallen into the hands of small princes, called for energetic measures, unless the Popes were prepared to see them entirely lost to their authority. Innocent VI. sent into Italy a Spanish Cardinal, Gil Albornoz, who had already shown his military skill in fighting against the Moors. The fiery energy of Albornoz was crowned with success, and the smaller nobles were subdued in a series of hard fought battles. In 1367 Urban V. saw the States of the Church once more reduced into obedience to the Pope." Several motives, accordingly, combined "to urge Urban V., in 1367, to return to Rome amid the cries of his agonised Cardinals, who shuddered to leave the luxury of Avignon for a land which they held to be barbarous. A brief stay in Rome was sufficient to convince Urban V. that the fears of his Cardinals were not unfounded. . . . After a visit of three years Urban returned to Avignon; his death, which happened three months after his return, was regarded by many as a judgment of God upon his desertion of Rome. Urban V. had returned to Rome because the States of the Church were reduced to obedience: his successor, Gregory XI., was driven to return through dread of losing entirely all hold upon Italy. The French Popes awakened a strong feeling of natural antipathy among their Italian subjects, and their policy was not associated with any of the elements of state life existing in Italy. Their desire to bring the States of the Church immediately under their power involved the destruction of the small dynasties of princes, and the suppression of the democratic liberties of the people. Albornoz had been wise enough to leave the popular governments untouched, and to content himself with bringing the towns under the Papal obedience. But Urban V. and Gregory XI. set up French governors, whose rule was galling and oppressive; and a revolt against them was organised by Florence [1376], who, true to her old traditions, unfurled a banner inscribed only with the word 'Liberty.' The movement spread through all the towns in the Papal States, and in a few months the conquests of Albornoz had been lost. The temporal dominion of the Papacy might have been swept away if Florence could have brought about the Italian league which she desired. But Rome hung back from the alliance, and listened to Gregory XI., who promised to return if Rome would remain faithful. The Papal excommunication handed over the Florentines to be the slaves of their captors in every land, and the Kings of England and France did not scruple to use the opportunity offered to their cupidity. Gregory XI. felt that only the Pope's presence could save Rome for the Papacy. In spite of evil omens — for his horse refused to let him mount when he set out on his journey — Gregory XI. left Avignon; in spite of the entreaties of the Florentines Rome again joyfully welcomed the entry of its Pope in 1377. But the Pope found his position in Italy to be surrounded with difficulties. His troops met with some small successes, but he was practically powerless, and aimed only at settling terms of peace with the Florentines. A congress was called for this purpose, and Gregory XI. was anxiously awaiting its termination that he might return to Avignon, when death seized him, and his last hours were embittered by the thoughts of the crisis that was now inevitable."—M. Creighton, *Hist. of the Papacy during the Period of the Reformation, introd., ch.* 2 (*v.* 1).

ALSO IN: H. E. Napier, *Florentine History, bk.* 1, *ch.* 26 (*v.* 2).—See, also, FLORENCE: A. D. 1375–1378.

A. D. 1369-1378.—Dealings with the Free Company of Sir John Hawkwood.—Wars with Milan, Florence and other states. See ITALY: A. D. 1343–1393.

A. D. 1377-1417.—Election of Urban VI. and Clement VII.—The Great Western Schism.—Battle in Rome and siege and par-

tial destruction of Castle St. Angelo.—The Council of Pisa.—Forty years of Popes and Anti-Popes.—"For 23 years after Rienzi's death, the seat of the Papal Court remained at Avignon; and during this period Rome and the States of the Church were harried to death by contending factions. . . . At last Gregory XI. returned, in January, 1377. The keys of the Castle St. Angelo were sent to him at Corneto; the papal Court was re-established in Rome; but he survived only about a year, and died in March, 1378. Then came the election of a new Pope, which was held in the Castle St. Angelo. While the conclave was sitting, a crowd gathered round the place, crying out, 'Romano lo volemo'—we will have a Roman for Pope. Yet, notwithstanding this clamour, Cardinal Prignani, Archbishop of Bari, and a Neapolitan by birth, was finally chosen, under the title of Urban VI.—[this being an intended compromise between the Italian party and the French party in the college of Cardinals]. When Cardinal Orsini presented himself at the window to announce that a new Pope had been elected, the mob below cried out, 'His name, his name!' 'Go to St. Peter's and you will learn,' answered the Cardinal. The people, misunderstanding his answer, supposed him to announce the election of Cardinal Tebaldeschi, who was arch-priest of St. Peter's, and a Roman by birth. This news was received with great joy and acclamation," which turned to rage when the fact was known. Then "the people . . . broke into still fiercer cries, rushed to arms, and gathering round the conclave, threatened them with death unless a Roman was elected. But the conclave was strong in its position, and finally the people were pacified, and accepted Urban VI. Such, however, was the fear of the Cardinals, that they were with difficulty persuaded to proceed to the Vatican and perform the ceremonies necessary for the installation of the new Pope. This, however, finally was done, and the Castle was placed in the charge of Pietro Guntellino, a Frenchman, and garrisoned by a Gallic guard, the French Cardinals remaining also within its walls for safety. On the 20th of September they withdrew to Fondi, and in conjunction with other schismatics they afterwards [September 20, 1378] elected an anti-Pope [Robert of Geneva] under the title of Clement VII. Guntellino, who took part with them, on being summoned by Urban to surrender the Castle, refused to do so without the order of his compatriots, the French Cardinals at Avignon. Meantime the papal and anti-papal party assaulted each other, first with citations, censures, and angry words, and then with armed force. The anti-papal party, having with them the Breton and Gascon soldiery, and the Savoyards of the Count of Mountjoy, the anti-Pope's nephew, marched upon the city, overcame the undisciplined party of the Pope, reinforced the Castle St. Angelo, and fortified themselves in the Vatican, ravaging the Campagna on their way. The papal party now besieged the Castle, attacking it with machines and artillery, but for a year's space it held out. Finally, on the 28th of April, 1379, the anti-papal party were utterly routed by Alberico, Count of Palliano and Galeazzo, at the head of the papal, Italian, and imperial forces. Terrible was the bloodshed of this great battle, at which, according to Baronius, 5,000 of the anti-papal army fell. But the Castle still refused to surrender," until famine forced a capitulation. "The damage done to it during this siege must have been very great. In some parts it had been utterly demolished, and of all its marbles not a trace now remained. . . . After the surrender of the Castle to Urban, such was the rage of the people against it for the injury it had caused them during the siege, that they passed a public decree ordering it to be utterly destroyed and razed to the earth. . . . In consequence of this decree, an attempt was made to demolish it. It was stripped of everything by which it was adorned, and its outer casing was torn off; but the solid interior of peperino defied all their efforts, and the attempt was given up." —W. W. Story, *Castle St. Angelo, ch.* 5.—"Urban was a learned, pious, and austere man; but, in his zeal for the reformation of manners, the correction of abuses, and the retrenchment of extravagant expenditure, he appears to have been wanting in discretion; for immediately after his election he began to act with harshness to the members of the Sacred College, and he also offended several of the secular princes. Towards the end of June, 12 of the cardinals—11 Frenchmen and one Spaniard—obtained permission to leave Rome, owing to the summer heats, and withdrew to Anagni. Here, in a written instrument, dated 9th August, 1378, they protested against the election, as not having been free, and they called on Urban to resign. A few days later, they removed to Fondi, in the kingdom of Naples, where they were joined by three of the Italians whom they had gained over to their views; and, on the 19th of September, the 15 elected an antipope, the French Cardinal Robert of Cevennes [more frequently called Robert of Geneva], who took the name of Clement VII. and reigned at Avignon 16 years, dying September 16, 1394. Thus there were two claimants of the Papal throne—Urban holding his court at Rome, and Clement residing with his followers at Avignon. The latter was strong in the support of the sovereigns of France, Scotland, Naples, Aragon, Castile, and Savoy; while the remainder of Christendom adhered to Urban. Clement was succeeded by Peter de Luna, the Cardinal of Aragon, who, on his election, assumed the name of Benedict XIII., and reigned at Avignon 23 years—A. D. 1394–1417. This lamentable state of affairs lasted altogether 40 years. Urban's successors at Rome, duly elected by the Italian cardinals and those of other nations acting with them, were, Boniface IX., a Neapolitan, A. D. 1389–1404; Innocent VII., a native of Sulmona, A. D. 1404–1406; Gregory XII., a Venetian, A. D. 1406–1409; Alexander V., a native of Candia, who reigned ten months, A. D. 1409–1410; and John XXIII., a Neapolitan, A. D. 1410–1417. . . . Although the Popes above enumerated, as having reigned at Rome, are now regarded as the legitimate pontiffs, and, as such, are inscribed in the Catalogues of Popes, while Clement and Benedict are classed as antipopes, there prevailed at the time much uncertainty on the subject. . . . In February, 1395, Charles VI. of France convoked an assembly of the clergy of his dominions, under the presidency of Simon Cramandus, Patriarch of Alexandria, in order, if possible, to terminate the schism. The assembly advised that the rival Pontiffs, Boniface IX. and Benedict XIII., should abdicate. The same view was taken by most of the

universities of Europe," but the persons chiefly concerned would not accept it. Nor was it found possible in 1408 to bring about a conference of the two popes. The cardinals, then, of both parties, withdrew support from the factious pontiffs and held a general meeting at Leghorn. There they agreed that Gregory XII. and Benedict XIII. had equally lost all claim to obedience, and they resolved to convoke, on their own authority "a General Council, to meet at Pisa, on the 25th of March, 1409. Gregory and Benedict were duly informed thereof, and were requested to attend the council. . . . The Council of Pisa sat from March 25th to August 7th, 1409. There were present 24 cardinals of both 'obediences,' 4 patriarchs, 12 archbishops, 80 bishops, 87 abbots; the procurators of 102 absent archbishops and bishops, and of 200 absent abbots; the generals of 4 mendicant orders; the deputies of 13 Universities . . . ; the representatives of over 100 cathedral and collegiate chapters, 282 doctors and licentiates of canon and civil law; and the ambassadors of the Kings of England, France, Poland, Bohemia, Portugal, Sicily, and Cyprus." Both claimants of the Papacy were declared unworthy to preside over the Church, and forbidden to act as Pope. In June, the conclave of cardinals assembled and elected a third Pope — one Peter Filargo, a Friar Minor, who took the name of Alexander V., but who died ten months afterwards. The cardinals then elected as his successor Cardinal Cossa, "a politic worldly man, who assumed the name of John XXIII." But, meantime, Germany, Naples and some of the other Italian States still adhered to Gregory, and Benedict kept the support of Scotland, Spain and Portugal. The Church was as much divided as ever. "The Council of Pisa . . . only aggravated the evil which it laboured to cure. Instead of two, there were now three claimants of the Papal Chair. It was reserved for the General Council of Constance to restore union and peace to the Church."—J. N. Murphy, *The Chair of Peter, ch.* 20.—"The amount of evil wrought by the schism of 1378, the longest known in the history of the Papacy, can only be estimated, when we reflect that it occurred at a moment, when thorough reform in ecclesiastical affairs was a most urgent need. This was now utterly out of the question, and, indeed, all evils which had crept into ecclesiastical life were infinitely increased. Respect for the Holy See was also greatly impaired, and the Popes became more than ever dependent on the temporal power, for the schism allowed each Prince to choose which Pope he would acknowledge. In the eyes of the people, the simple fact of a double Papacy must have shaken the authority of the Holy See to its very foundations. It may truly be said that these fifty years of schism prepared the way for the great Apostacy of the 16th century."— L. Pastor, *Hist. of the Popes from the Close of the Middle Ages, v.* 1, *p.* 141.

Also in: A. Neander, *General Hist. of the Christian Religion and Church, v.* 9, *sect.* 1.—H. H. Milman, *Hist. of Latin Christianity, bk.* 13, *ch.* 1.-5 (*v.* 6).—J. Alzog, *Manual of Universal Church Hist., sect.* 269-270 (*v.* 3).—J. C. Robertson, *Hist. of the Christian Church, bk.* 8, *ch.* 5 (*v.* 7).—St. C. Baddeley, *Charles III. of Naples and Urban VI.*—See, also, Italy: A. D. 1343–1389.

A. D. 1378-1415.—Rival Popes during the Great Schism.—Urban VI., A. D. 1378–1389 (Rome); Clement VII., 1378–1394 (Avignon); Boniface IX., 1389–1404 (Rome); Benedict XIII., 1394–1423 (Avignon); Innocent VII., 1404–1406 (Rome); Gregory XII., 1406–1415 (Rome); Alexander V., 1409–1410 (elected by the Council of Pisa); John XXIII., 1410–1415.

A. D. 1386-1414.—Struggle of the Italian Popes against Ladislas of Naples. See Italy (Southern): A. D. 1386–1414.

A. D. 1414-1418. — The Council of Constance.—Election of Martin V.—Ending of the Great Schism and failure of Church Reform.—"In April, A. D. 1412, the Pope [John XXIII.], to preserve appearances, opened at Rome the council which had been agreed upon at Pisa for the reformation of the Church in her Head and members. Quite a small number of bishops put in an appearance, who, after having condemned the antipopes, and some heretical propositions of Wycliffe and John Huss, hastily adjourned. John, who does not seem to have had any very earnest wish to correct his own life, and who, consequently, could not be expected to be over solicitous about the correction of those of others, was carefully provident to prevent the bishops coming to Rome in excessive numbers. He had come to a secret understanding with Ladislaus, his former enemy, that the latter should have all the roads well guarded. Ladislaus soon turned against the Pope, and forced him to quit Rome, and seek refuge, first at Florence, and next at Bologna (A. D. 1413). From this city John opened communications with the princes of Europe with the purpose of fixing a place for holding the council. . . . The Emperor Sigismund appointed the city of Constance, where the council did, in fact, convene, November 1, A. D. 1414. . . . The abuses which prevailed generally throughout the Church, and which were considerably increased by the existence of three rival Popes, and by the various theories on Church government called forth by the controversy, greatly perplexed men's minds, and created much anxiety as to the direction affairs might eventually take. This unsettled state of feeling accounts for the unusually large number of ecclesiastics who attended the council. There were 18,000 ecclesiastics of all ranks, of whom, when the number was largest, 3 were patriarchs, 24 cardinals, 33 archbishops, close upon 150 bishops, 124 abbots, 50 provosts, and 300 doctors in the various degrees. Many princes attended in person. There were constantly 100,000 strangers in the city, and, on one occasion, as many as 150,000, among whom were many of a disreputable character. Feeling ran so high that, as might have been anticipated, every measure was extreme. Owing to the peculiar composition of the Council, at which only a limited number of bishops were present, and these chiefly in the interest of John XXIII., it was determined to decide all questions, not by a majority of episcopal suffrages, but by that of the representatives of the various nations, including doctors. The work about to engage the Council was of a threefold character, viz., 1. To terminate the papal schism; 2. To condemn errors against faith, and particularly those of Huss; and 3. To enact reformatory decrees. . . . It was with some difficulty that John could be induced to attend at Constance, and when he did finally consent, it was only because he was forced to take the step by the representations

of others. . . . Regarding the Council as a continuation of that of Pisa, he naturally thought that he would be recognized as the legitimate successor of the Pope chosen by the latter. . . . All questions were first discussed by the various nations, each member of which had the right to vote. Their decision was next brought before a general conference of nations, and this result again before the next session of the Council. This plan of organisation destroyed the hopes of John XXIII., who relied for success on the preponderance of Italian prelates and doctors. . . . To intimidate John, and subdue his resistance, a memorial, written probably by an Italian, was put in circulation, containing charges the most damaging to that pontiff's private character. . . . So timely and effective was this blow that John was thenceforth utterly destitute of the energy and consideration necessary to support his authority, or direct the affairs of the Council." In consequence, he sent a declaration to the Council that, in order to give peace to the Church, he would abdicate, provided his two rivals in the Papacy, Gregory XII. and Benedict XIII., would also resign. Later, in March, 1415, he repeated this promise under oath. The Emperor, Sigismund, was about to set out to Nizza to induce the other claimants to resign, when John's conduct gave rise to a suspicion that he did not intend to act in good faith. He was charged with an intention to escape from the Council, with the assistance of Frederic, Duke of Austria. He now gave his promise under oath not to depart from the city before the Council had dissolved. "But, notwithstanding these protestations, 'John escaped (March 21, 1415), disguised as a groom, during a great tournament arranged by the duke, and made his way to Schaffhausen, belonging to the latter, thence to Laufenburg and Freiburg, thence again to the fortress of Brisac, whence he had intended to pass to Burgundy, and on to Avignon. That the Council went on with its work after the departure of John, and amid the general perplexity and confusion, was entirely due to the resolution of the emperor, the eloquence of Gerson [of the University of Paris], and the indefatigable efforts of the venerable master, now cardinal, d'Ailly. The following memorable decrees were passed . . . : 'A Pope can neither transfer nor dissolve a general Council without the consent of the latter, and hence the present Council may validly continue its work even after the flight of the Pope. All persons, without distinction of rank, even the Pope himself, are bound by its decisions, in so far as these relate to matters of faith, to the closing of the present schism, and to the reformation of the Church of God in her Head and members. All Christians, not excepting the Pope, are under obligation to obey the Council.'. . . Pope John, after getting away safe to Schaffhausen, complained formally of the action of the Council towards himself, summoned all the cardinals to appear personally before him within six days, and sent memorials to the King of France [and others], . . . justifying his flight. Still the Council went on with its work; disposed, after a fashion, of the papal difficulty, and of the cases of Huss and Jerome of Prague [whom it condemned and delivered to the civil authorities, to be burned—see BOHEMIA: A. D. 1405–1415]. . . . In the meantime, Frederic, Margrave of Brandenburg, acting under the joint order of Council and Emperor, arrested the fugitive Pope at Freiburg, and led him a prisoner to Radolfzell, near Constance, where 54 (originally 72) charges —some of them of a most disgraceful character—extracted from the testimony of a host of witnesses, were laid before him by a committee of the Council." He attempted no defense, and on May 29, 1415, John XXIII. was formally and solemnly deposed and was kept in confinement for the next three years. In July, Gregory XII. was persuaded to resign his papal claims and to accept the dignity of Cardinal Legate of Ancona. Benedict XIII., more obstinate, refused to give up his pretensions, though abandoned even by the Spaniards, and was deposed, on the 26th of July, 1417. "The three claimants to the papacy having been thus disposed of, it now remained to elect a legitimate successor to St. Peter. Previously to proceeding to an election, a decree was passed providing that, in this particular instance, but in no other, six deputies of each nation should be associated with the cardinals in making the choice." It fell upon Otho Colonna, "a cardinal distinguished for his great learning, his purity of life, and gentleness of disposition." In November, 1417, he was anointed and crowned under the name of Martin V. The Council was formally closed on the 16th of May following, without having accomplished the work of Church reformation which had been part of its intended mission. "Sigismund and the German nation, and for a time the English also, insisted that the question of the reformation of the Church, the chief points of which had been sketched in a schema of 18 articles, should be taken up and disposed of before proceeding to the election of a Pope." But in this they were baffled. "Martin, the newly elected Pope, did not fully carry out all the proposed reforms. It is true, he appointed a committee composed of six cardinals and deputies from each nation, and gave the work into their hands; but their councils were so conflicting that they could neither come to a definite agreement among themselves, nor would they consent to adopt the plan of reform submitted by the Pope."—J. Alzog, *Manual of Universal Church Hist., sects.* 270–271 (*v.* 3).—"The election of Martin V. might have been a source of unalloyed happiness to Christendom, if he had at once taken the crucial question of Church Reform vigorously in hand; but the Regulations of the Chancery issued soon after his accession showed that little was to be expected from him in this respect. They perpetuated most of the practices in the Roman Court which the Synod had designated as abuses. Neither the isolated measures afterwards substituted for the universal reform so urgently required, nor the Concordats made with Germany, the three Latin nations, and England, sufficed to meet the exigencies of the case, although they produced a certain amount of good. The Pope was indeed placed in a most difficult position, in the face of the various and opposite demands made upon him, and the tenacious resistance offered by interests now long established to any attempt to bring things back to their former state. The situation was complicated to such a degree that any change might have brought about a revolution. It must also be borne in mind that all the proposed reforms involved a diminution of

the Papal revenues; the regular income of the Pope was small and the expenditure was very great. For centuries, complaints of Papal exactions had been made, but no one had thought of securing to the Popes the regular income they required. . . . The delay of the reform, which was dreaded by both clergy and laity, may be explained, though not justified, by the circumstances we have described. It was an unspeakable calamity that ecclesiastical affairs still retained the worldly aspect caused by the Schism, and that the much needed amendment was again deferred."—L. Pastor, *Hist. of the Popes, from the Close of the Middle Ages*, *v.* 1, *pp.* 209–210.

Also in: H. H. Milman, *Hist. of Latin Christianity, bk.* 13, *ch.* 8–10 (*v.* 6).—J. C. Robertson, *Hist. of the Christian Church, bk.* 8, *ch.* 8 (*v.* 7).

A. D. 1431.—Election of Eugenius IV.

A. D. 1431-1448.—The Council of Basle.—Triumph of the Pope and defeat, once more, of Church Reform.—"The Papacy had come forth so little scathed from the perils with which at one time these assemblies menaced it, that a Council was no longer that word of terror which a little before it had been. There was more than one motive for summoning another, if indeed any help was to be found in them. Bohemia, wrapt in the flames of the Hussite War, was scorching her neighbours with fiercer fires than those by which she herself was consumed. The healing of the Greek Schism was not yet confessed to be hopeless, and the time seemed to offer its favourable opportunities. No one could affirm that the restoration of sound discipline, the reformation of the Church in head and in members, had as yet more than begun. And thus, in compliance with the rule laid down at the Council of Constance,—for even at Rome they did not dare as yet openly to set at nought its authority,—Pope Eugenius IV. called a third Council together [1431], that namely of Basle. . . . Of those who sincerely mourned over the Church's ills, the most part, after the unhappy experience of the two preceding Councils, had so completely lost all faith in these assemblies that slight regard was at first yielded to the summons; and this Council seemed likely to expire in its cradle as so many had done before, as not a few should do after. The number of Bishops and high Church dignitaries who attended it was never great. A democratic element made itself felt throughout all its deliberations; a certain readiness to resort to measures of a revolutionary violence, such as leaves it impossible to say that it had not itself to blame for much of its ill-success. At the first indeed it displayed unlooked-for capacities for work, entering into important negotiations with the Hussites for their return to the bosom of the Church; till the Pope, alarmed at these tokens of independent activity, did not conceal his ill-will, making all means in his power to dissolve the Council. This, meanwhile, growing in strength and in self-confidence, re-affirmed all of strongest which had been affirmed already at Pisa and Constance, concerning the superiority of Councils over Popes; declared of itself that, as a lawfully assembled Council, it could neither be dissolved, nor the place of its meeting changed, unless by its own consent; and, having summoned Eugenius and his Cardinals to take their share in its labours, began the work of reformation in earnest. Eugenius yielded for the time; recalled the Bull which had hardly stopped short of anathematizing the Council; and sent his legates to Basle. Before long, however, he and the Council were again at strife; Eugenius complaining, apparently with some reason, that in these reforms one source after another of the income which had hitherto sustained the Papal Court was being dried up, while no other provision was made for the maintenance of its due dignity, or even for the defraying of its necessary expenses. As the quarrel deepened the Pope removed the seat of the Council to Ferrara (Sept. 18, 1437), on the plea that negotiations with the envoys of the Greek Church would be more conveniently conducted in an Italian city; and afterwards to Florence. The Council refused to stir, first suspending (Jan. 24, 1438), then deposing the Pope (July 7, 1439), and electing another, Felix V., in his stead; this Felix being a retired Duke of Savoy, who for some time past had been playing the hermit in a villa on the shores of the lake of Geneva [see Savoy: 11–15th Centuries]. The Council in this extreme step failed to carry public opinion with it. It was not merely that Eugenius denounced his competitor by the worst names he could think of, declaring him a hypocrite, a wolf in sheep's clothing, a Moloch, a Cerberus, a Golden Calf, a second Mahomet, an antichrist; but the Church in general shrank back in alarm at the prospect of another Schism, to last, it might be, for well-nigh another half century. And thus the Council lost ground daily; its members fell away; its confidence in itself departed; and, though it took long in dying, it did in the end die a death of inanition (June 23, 1448). Again the Pope remained master of the situation, the last reforming Council,—for it was the last,—having failed in all which it undertook as completely and as ingloriously as had done the two which went before."—R. C. Trench, *Lects. on Medieval Church History, lect.* 20.—"In the year 1438 the Emperor John and the Greek Patriarch made their appearance at the council of Ferrara. In the following year the council was transferred to Florence, where, after long discussions, the Greek emperor, and all the members of the clergy who had attended the council, with the exception of the Bishop of Ephesus, adopted the doctrine of the Roman church concerning the possession of the Holy Ghost, the addition to the Nicene Creed, the nature of purgatory, the condition of the soul after its separation from the body until the day of judgment, the use of unleavened bread in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and the papal supremacy. The union of the two churches was solemnly ratified in the magnificent cathedral of Florence on the 6th of July 1439, when the Greeks abjured their ancient faith in a vaster edifice and under a loftier dome than that of their own much-vaunted temple of St. Sophia. The Emperor John derived none of the advantages he had expected from the simulated union of the churches. Pope Eugenius, it is true, supplied him liberally with money, and bore all the expenses both of the Greek court and clergy during their absence from Constantinople; he also presented the emperor with two galleys, and furnished him with a guard of 300 men, well equipped, and paid at the cost of the papal treasury; but his Holiness forgot his promise to send a fleet to defend Constantinople, and none

of the Christian princes showed any disposition to fight the battles of the Greeks, though they took up the cross against the Turks. On his return John found his subjects indignant at the manner in which the honour and doctrines of the Greek church had been sacrificed in an unsuccessful diplomatic speculation. The bishops who had obsequiously signed the articles of union at Florence, now sought popularity by deserting the emperor, and making a parade of their repentance, lamenting their wickedness in falling off for a time from the pure doctrine of the orthodox church. The only permanent result of this abortive attempt at Christian union was to increase the bigotry of the orthodox, and to furnish the Latins with just grounds for condemning the perfidious dealings and bad faith of the Greeks. In both ways it assisted the progress of the Othoman power. The Emperor John, seeing public affairs in this hopeless state, became indifferent to the future fate of the empire, and thought only of keeping on good terms with the sultan."—G. Finlay, *History of the Byzantine and Greek Empires, bk.* 4, *ch.* 2, *sect.* 6 (*v.* 2).—Pope "Eugenius died, February 23, 1447; . . . but his successors were able to secure the fruits of the victory [over the Council of Basle] for a long course of years. The victory was won at a heavy cost, both for the Popes and for Christendom; for the Papacy recovered its ascendancy far more as a political than as a religious power. The Pope became more than ever immersed in the international concerns of Europe, and his policy was a tortuous course of craft and intrigue, which in those days passed for the new art of diplomacy. . . . To revert to a basis of spiritual domination lay beyond the vision of the energetic princes, the refined dilettanti, the dexterous diplomatists, who sat upon the chair of St. Peter during the age succeeding the Council of Basle. Of signs of uneasiness abroad they could not be quite ignorant; but they sought to divert men's minds from the contemplation of so perplexing a problem as Church reform, by creating or fostering new atmospheres of excitement and interest; . . . or at best (if we may adopt the language of their apologists) they took advantage of the literary and artistic movement then active in Italy as a means to establish a higher standard of civilisation which might render organic reform needless."—R. L. Poole, *Wycliffe and Movements for Reform, ch.* 12.

Also in: J. E. Darras, *General Hist. of the Catholic Church, 6th period, ch.* 4 (*v.* 3).—See, also, France: A. D. 1438; and 1515–1518.

A. D. 1439.—Election of Felix V. (by the Council of Basle).

A. D. 1447-1455.—The pontificate of Nicolas V.—Recovery of character and influence.—Beginning of the Renaissance. See Italy: A. D. 1447–1480.

A. D. 1455.—Election of Callistus III.

A. D. 1458.—Election of Pius II., known previously as the learned Cardinal Æneas Sylvius Piccolomini, historian and diplomatist.

A. D. 1464.—Election of Paul II.

A. D. 1471-1513.—The darkest age of Papal crime and vice.—Sixtus IV. and the Borgias.—The warrior Pontiff, Julius II.—"The impunity with which the Popes escaped the councils held in the early part of the 15th century was well fitted to inspire them with a reckless contempt for public opinion; and from that period down to the Reformation, it would be difficult to parallel among temporal princes the ambitious, wicked, and profligate lives of many of the Roman Pontiffs. Among these, Francesco della Rovere, who succeeded Paul II. with the title of Sixtus IV., was not the least notorious. Born at Savona, of an obscure family, Sixtus raised his nephews, and his sons who passed for nephews, to the highest dignities in Church and State, and sacrificed for their aggrandisement the peace of Italy and the cause of Christendom against the Turks. Of his two nephews, Julian and Leonard della Rovere, the former, afterwards Pope Julius II., was raised to the purple in the second year of his uncle's pontificate." It was this pope—Sixtus IV.—who had a part in the infamous "Conspiracy of the Pazzi" to assassinate Lorenzo de' Medici and his brother [see Florence: A. D. 1469–1492]. "This successor of St. Peter took a pleasure in beholding the mortal duels of his guards, for which he himself sometimes gave the signal. He was succeeded [1484] by Cardinal Gian Batista Cibò, a Genoese, who assumed the title of Innocent VIII. Innocent was a weak man, without any decided principle. He had seven children, whom he formally acknowledged, but he did not seek to advance them so shamelessly as Sixtus had advanced his 'nephews.'. . . Pope Innocent VIII. [who died July 25, 1492] was succeeded by the atrocious Cardinal Roderigo Borgia, a Spaniard of Valencia, where he had at one time exercised the profession of an advocate. After his election he assumed the name of Alexander VI. Of 20 cardinals who entered the conclave, he is said to have bought the suffrages of all but five; and Cardinal Ascanio Sforza, whom he feared as a rival, was propitiated with a present of silver that was a load for four mules. Alexander's election was the signal for flight to those cardinals who had opposed him. . . . Pope Alexander had by the celebrated Vanozza, the wife of a Roman citizen, three sons: John, whom he made Duke of Gandia, in Spain; Cæsar and Geoffrey; and one daughter, Lucretia."—T. H. Dyer, *Hist. of Modern Europe, v.* 1, *pp.* 105, 108, 175, 177–178.—Under the Borgias, "treasons, assassinations, tortures, open debauchery, the practice of poisoning, the worst and most shameless outrages, are unblushingly and publicly tolerated in the open light of heaven. In 1490, the Pope's vicar having forbidden clerics and laics to keep concubines, the Pope revoked the decree, 'saying that that was not forbidden, because the life of priests and ecclesiastics was such that hardly one was to be found who did not keep a concubine, or at least who had not a courtesan.' Cæsar Borgia at the capture of Capua 'chose forty of the most beautiful women, whom he kept for himself; and a pretty large number of captives were sold at a low price at Rome.' Under Alexander VI., 'all ecclesiastics, from the greatest to the least, have concubines in the place of wives, and that publicly. If God hinder it not,' adds this historian, 'this corruption will pass to the monks and religious orders, although, to confess the truth, almost all the monasteries of the town have become bawd-houses, without any one to speak against it.' With respect to Alexander VI., who loved his daughter Lucretia, the reader may find in Burchard the description of the marvellous orgies in which he joined with Lucretia and Cæsar, and

the enumeration of the prizes which he distributed. Let the reader also read for himself the story of the bestiality of Pietro Luigi Farnese, the Pope's son, how the young and upright Bishop of Fano died from his outrage, and how the Pope, speaking of this crime as 'a youthful levity,' gave him in this secret bull 'the fullest absolution from all the pains which he might have incurred by human incontinence, in whatever shape or with whatever cause.' As to civil security, Bentivoglio caused all the Marescotti to be put to death; Hippolyto d' Este had his brother's eyes put out in his presence; Cæsar Borgia killed his brother; murder is consonant with their public manners, and excites no wonder. A fisherman was asked why he had not informed the governor of the town that he had seen a body thrown into the water; 'he replied that he had seen about a hundred bodies thrown into the water during his lifetime in the same place, and that no one had ever troubled about it.' 'In our town,' says an old historian, 'much murder and pillage was done by day and night, and hardly a day passed but some one was killed.' Cæsar Borgia one day killed Peroso, the Pope's favourite, between his arms and under his cloak, so that the blood spurted up to the Pope's face. He caused his sister's husband to be stabbed and then strangled in open day, on the steps of the palace; count, if you can, his assassinations. Certainly he and his father, by their character, morals, open and systematic wickedness, have presented to Europe the two most successful images of the devil. . . . Despotism, the Inquisition, the Cicisbei, dense ignorance, and open knavery, the shamelessness and the smartness of harlequins and rascals, misery and vermin,—such is the issue of the Italian Renaissance."—H. A. Taine, *Hist. of English Literature, v.* 1, *pp.* 354–355.—"It is certain . . . that the profound horror with which the name of Alexander VI. strikes a modern ear, was not felt among the Italians at the time of his election. The sentiment of hatred with which he was afterwards regarded arose partly from the crimes by which his Pontificate was rendered infamous, partly from the fear which his son Cesare inspired, and partly from the mysteries of his private life which revolted even the corrupt conscience of the 16th century. This sentiment of hatred had grown to universal execration at the time of his death. In course of time, when the attention of the Northern nations had been directed to the iniquities of Rome, and when the glaring discrepancy between Alexander's pretension as a Pope and his conduct as a man had been apprehended, it inspired a legend, which, like all legends, distorts the facts which it reflects. Alexander was, in truth, a man eminently fitted to close an old age and to inaugurate a new, to demonstrate the paradoxical situation of the Popes by the inexorable logic of his practical impiety, and to fuse two conflicting world forces in the cynicism of supreme corruption. . . . Alexander was a stronger and a firmer man than his immediate predecessors. 'He combined,' says Guicciardini, 'craft with singular sagacity, a sound judgment with extraordinary powers of persuasion; and to all the grave affairs of life he applied ability and pains beyond belief.' His first care was to reduce Rome to order. The old factions of Colonna and Orsini, which Sixtus had scotched, but which had raised their heads again during the dotage of Innocent, were destroyed in his pontificate. In this way, as Machiavelli observed, he laid the real basis for the temporal power of the Papacy. Alexander, indeed, as a sovereign, achieved for the Papal See what Louis XI. had done for the throne of France, and made Rome on its small scale follow the type of the large European monarchies. . . . Former Pontiffs had raised money by the sale of benefices and indulgences: this, of course, Alexander also practised—to such an extent, indeed, that an epigram gained currency; 'Alexander sells the keys, the altars, Christ. Well, he bought them; so he has a right to sell them.' But he went further and took lessons from Tiberius. Having sold the scarlet to the highest bidder, he used to feed his prelate with rich benefices. When he had fattened him sufficiently, he poisoned him, laid hands upon his hoards, and recommenced the game. . . . Former Popes had preached crusades against the Turk, languidly or energetically according as the coasts of Italy were threatened. Alexander frequently invited Bajazet to enter Europe and relieve him of the princes who opposed his intrigues in the favour of his children. The fraternal feeling which subsisted between the Pope and the Sultan was to some extent dependent on the fate of Prince Djem, a brother of Bajazet and son of the conqueror of Constantinople, who had fled for protection to the Christian powers, and whom the Pope kept prisoner, receiving 40,000 ducats yearly from the Porte for his jail fee. . . . Lucrezia, the only daughter of Alexander by Vannozza, took three husbands in succession, after having been formally betrothed to two Spanish nobles. . . . History has at last done justice to the memory of this woman, whose long yellow hair was so beautiful, and whose character was so colourless. The legend which made her a poison-brewing Mænad, has been proved a lie—but only at the expense of the whole society in which she lived. . . . It seems now clear enough that not hers, but her father's and her brother's, were the atrocities which made her married life in Rome a byeword. She sat and smiled through all the tempests which tossed her to and fro, until she found at last a fair port in the Duchy of Ferrara. . . . [On the 12th of August, 1503], the two Borgias invited the Cardinal Carneto to dine with them in the Belvedere of Pope Innocent. Thither by the hands of Alexander's butler they previously conveyed some poisoned wine. By mistake they drank the death-cup mingled for their victim. Alexander died, a black and swollen mass, hideous to contemplate, after a sharp struggle with the poison."—J. A. Symonds, *Renaissance in Italy: The Age of the Despots, ch.* 6.—The long-accepted story of Pope Alexander's poisoning, as related above by Mr. Symonds, is now discredited. "The principal reason why this picturesque tale has of late been generally regarded as a fiction is the apparent impossibility of reconciling it with a fact in connexion with Pope Alexander's last illness which admits of no dispute, the date of its commencement. The historians who relate the poisoning unanimously assert that the effect was sudden and overpowering, that the pope was carried back to the Vatican in a dying state and expired shortly afterwards. The 18th of August has hitherto been accepted without dispute as the date of his death: it follows, therefore, that the fatal banquet must have been on the 17th at

the earliest. But a cloud of witnesses, including the despatches of ambassadors resident at the papal court, prove that the pope's illness commenced on the 12th, and that by the 17th his condition was desperate. The Venetian ambassador and a Florentine letter-writer, moreover, the only two contemporary authorities who assign a date for the entertainment, state that it was given on the 5th or 6th, . . . which would make it a week before the pope was taken ill. . . . It admits . . . of absolute demonstration that the banquet could not have been given on the 12th or even on the 11th, and of proof hardly less cogent that the pope did actually die on the 18th. All the evidence that any entertainment was ever given, or that any poisoning was ever attempted, connects the name of Cardinal Corneto with the transaction. He and no other, according to all respectable authorities (the statement of late writers that ten cardinals were to have been poisoned at once may be dismissed without ceremony as too ridiculous for discussion), was the cardinal whom Alexander on this occasion designed to remove. Now, Cardinal Corneto was not in a condition to partake of any banquet either on 11 Aug. or 12 Aug. Giustiniani, the Venetian ambassador, who attributes the pope's illness to a fever contracted at supper at the cardinal's villa on 5 Aug., says, writing on the 13th, 'All have felt the effects, and first of all Cardinal Adrian [Corneto], who attended mass in the papal chapel on Friday [11 Aug.], and after supper was attacked by a violent paroxysm of fever, which endured until the following morning; yesterday [the 12th] he had it again, and it has returned to-day.' Evidently, then, the cardinal could not give or even be present at an entertainment on the 12th, and nothing could have happened on that day to throw a doubt on the accuracy of Burcardus's statement that the pope was taken ill in the morning, which would put any banquet and any poisoning during the course of it out of the question. . . . There is, therefore, no reason for discrediting the evidence of the two witnesses, the only contemporary witnesses to date, who fix the supper to 5 Aug. or 6 Aug. at the latest. It is possible that poison may have been then administered which did not produce its effects until 12 Aug.; but the picturesque statement of the suddenness of the pope's illness and the consternation thus occasioned are palpable fictions, which so gravely impair the credit of the historians relating them that the story of the poisoning cannot be accepted on their authority. . . . The story, then, that Alexander accidentally perished by poison which he had prepared for another — though not in itself impossible or even very improbable — must be dismissed as at present unsupported by direct proof or even incidental confirmation of any kind. It does not follow that he may not have been poisoned designedly."—R. Garnett, *The Alleged Poisoning of Alexander VI.* (*English Historical Rev., April,* 1894).—"Of Pius III., who reigned for a few days after Alexander, no account need be taken. Giuliano della Rovere was made Pope in 1503. Whatever opinion may be formed of him considered as the high-priest of the Christian faith, there can be no doubt that Julius II. was one of the greatest figures of the Renaissance, and that his name, instead of that of Leo X., should by right be given to the golden age of letters and of arts in Rome. He stamped the century with the impress of a powerful personality. It is to him we owe the most splendid of Michael Angelo's and Raphael's masterpieces. The Basilica of St. Peter's, that materialized idea, which remains to symbolize the transition from the Church of the Middle Ages to the modern semi-secular supremacy of Papal Rome, was his thought. No nepotism, no loathsome sensuality, no flagrant violation of ecclesiastical justice stain his pontificate. His one purpose was to secure and extend the temporal authority of the Popes; and this he achieved by curbing the ambition of the Venetians, who threatened to enslave Romagna, by reducing Perugia and Bologna to the Papal sway, by annexing Parma and Piacenza, and by entering on the heritage bequeathed to him by Cesarè Borgia. At his death he transmitted to his successors the largest and most solid sovereignty in Italy. But restless, turbid, never happy unless fighting, Julius drowned the peninsula in blood. He has been called a patriot, because from time to time he raised the cry of driving the barbarians from Italy: it must, however, be remembered that it was he, while still Cardinal di San Pietro in Vincoli, who finally moved Charles VIII. from Lyons; it was he who stirred up the League of Cambray [see VENICE: A. D. 1508–1509] against Venice, and who invited the Swiss mercenaries into Lombardy [see ITALY: A. D. 1510–1513]; in each case adding the weight of the Papal authority to the forces which were enslaving his country. . . . Leo X. succeeded Julius in 1513, to the great relief of the Romans, wearied with the continual warfare of the old 'Pontefice terribile.'"—J. A. Symonds, *Renaissance in Italy: The Age of the Despots, ch.* 6.

ALSO IN: J. C. Robertson, *Hist. of the Christian Church, bk.* 9, *ch.* 5 (*v.* 8).—M. Creighton, *Hist. of the Papacy, bk.* 5, *ch.* 3–17.—W. Gilbert, *Lucrezia Borgia.*—P. Villari, *Life and Times of Machiavelli, introd., ch.* 4 (*v.* 1); *bk.* 1, *ch.* 6–14 (*v.* 2–3).

A. D. 1493.—The Pope's assumption of authority to give the New World to Spain. See AMERICA: A. D. 1493.

A. D. 1496-1498.—The condemnation of Savonarola. See FLORENCE: A. D. 1490–1498.

A. D. 1503 (September).—Election of Pius III.

A. D. 1503 (October).—Election of Julius II.

A. D. 1508-1509.—Pope Julius II. and the League of Cambrai against Venice. See VENICE: A. D. 1508–1509.

A. D. 1510-1513.—The Holy League against France.—The pseudo-council at Pisa.—Conquests of Julius II. See ITALY: A. D. 1510–1513.

A. D. 1513.—Election of Leo X.

A. D. 1515-1516.—Treaty of Leo X. with Francis I. of France.—Abrogation of the Pragmatic Sanction of Charles VII.—The Concordat of Bologna.—Destruction of the liberties of the Gallican Church. See FRANCE: A. D. 1515–1518.

A. D. 1516-1517.—Monetary demands of the court and family of Pope Leo X., and his financial expedients.—The theory of Indulgences and their marketability.—"The position which the pope [Leo X.], now absolute lord of Florence and master of Siena, occupied, the powerful alliances he had contracted with the other powers of Europe, and the views which his

family entertained on the rest of Italy, rendered it absolutely indispensable for him, spite of the prodigality of a government that knew no restraint, to be well supplied with money. He seized every occasion of extracting extraordinary revenues from the church. The Lateran council was induced, immediately before its dissolution (15th of March, 1517), to grant the pope a tenth of all church property throughout Christendom. Three different commissions for the sale of indulgences traversed Germany and the northern states at the same moment. These expedients were, it is true, resorted to under various pretexts. The tenths were, it was said, to be expended in a Turkish war, which was soon to be declared; the produce of indulgences was for the building of St. Peter's Church, where the bones of the martyrs lay exposed to the inclemency of the elements. But people had ceased to believe in these pretences. . . . For there was no doubt on the mind of any reasonable man, that all these demands were mere financial speculations. There is no positive proof that the assertion then so generally made — that the proceeds of the sale of indulgences in Germany was destined in part for the pope's sister Maddelena — was true. But the main fact is indisputable, that the ecclesiastical aids were applied to the uses of the pope's family."— L. Ranke, *Hist. of the Reformation in Germany, bk.* 2, *ch.* 1 (*v.* 1).—"Indulgences, in the earlier ages of the Church, had been a relaxation of penance, or of the discipline imposed by the Church on penitents who had been guilty of mortal sin. The doctrine of penance required that for such sin satisfaction should be superadded to contrition and confession. Then came the custom of commuting these appointed temporal penalties. When Christianity spread among the northern nations, the canonical penances were frequently found to be inapplicable to their condition. The practice of accepting offerings of money in the room of the ordinary forms of penance, harmonized with the penal codes in vogue among the barbarian peoples. At first the priest had only exercised the office of an intercessor. Gradually the simple function of declaring the divine forgiveness to the penitent transformed itself into that of a judge. By Aquinas, the priest is made the instrument of conveying the divine pardon, the vehicle through which the grace of God passes to the penitent. With the jubilees, or pilgrimages to Rome, ordained by the popes, came the plenary indulgences, or the complete remission of all temporal penalties — that is, the penalties still obligatory on the penitent — on the fulfillment of prescribed conditions. These penalties might extend into purgatory, but the indulgence obliterated them all. In the 13th century, Alexander of Hales and Thomas Aquinas set forth the theory of supererogatory merits, or the treasure of merit bestowed upon the Church through Christ and the saints, on which the rulers of the Church might draw for the benefit of the less worthy and more needy. This was something distinct from the power of the keys, the power to grant absolution, which inhered in the priesthood alone. The eternal punishment of mortal sin being remitted or commuted by the absolution of the priest, it was open to the Pope or his agents, by the grant of indulgences, to remit the temporal or terminable penalties that still rested on the head of the transgressor. Thus souls might be delivered forthwith from purgatorial fire. Pope Sixtus IV., in 1477, had officially declared that souls already in purgatory are emancipated 'per modum suffragii'; that is, the work done in behalf of them operates to effect their release in a way analogous to the efficacy of prayer. Nevertheless, the power that was claimed over the dead, was not practically diminished by this restriction. The business of selling indulgences had grown by the profitableness of it. 'Everywhere,' says Erasmus, 'the remission of purgatorial torment is sold; nor is it sold only, but forced upon those who refuse it.' As managed by Tetzel and the other emissaries sent out to collect money for the building of St. Peter's Church, the indulgence was a simple bargain, according to which, on the payment of a stipulated sum, the individual received a full discharge from the penalties of sin or procured the release of a soul from the flames of purgatory. The forgiveness of sins was offered in the market for money."—G. P. Fisher, *The Reformation, ch.* 4.— The doctrine concerning indulgences which the Roman Catholic Church maintains at the present day is stated by one of its most eminent prelates as follows: "What then is an Indulgence? It is no more than a remission by the Church, in virtue of the keys, or the judicial authority committed to her, of a portion, or the entire, of the temporal punishment due to sin. The infinite merits of Christ form the fund whence this remission is derived: but besides, the Church holds that, by the communion of Saints, penitential works performed by the just, beyond what their own sins might exact, are available to other members of Christ's mystical body; that, for instance, the sufferings of the spotless Mother of God, afflictions such as probably no other human being ever felt in the soul, — the austerities and persecutions of the Baptist, the friend of the Bridegroom, who was sanctified in his mother's womb, and chosen to be an angel before the face of the Christ,— the tortures endured by numberless martyrs, whose lives had been pure from vice and sin,— the prolonged rigours of holy anchorites, who, flying from the temptations and dangers of the world, passed many years in penance and contemplation, all these made consecrated and valid through their union with the merits of Christ's passion,—were not thrown away, but formed a store of meritorious blessings, applicable to the satisfaction of other sinners. It is evident that, if the temporal punishment reserved to sin was anciently believed to be remitted through the penitential acts, which the sinner assumed, any other substitute for them, that the authority imposing or recommending them received as an equivalent, must have been considered by it truly of equal value, and as acceptable before God. And so it must be now. If the duty of exacting such satisfaction devolves upon the Church,—and it must be the same now as it formerly was,— she necessarily possesses at present the same power of substitution, with the same efficacy, and, consequently, with the same effects. And such a substitution is what constitutes all that Catholics understand by the name of an Indulgence. . . . Do I then mean to say, that during the middle ages, and later, no abuse took place in the practise of indulgences? Most certainly not. Flagrant and too frequent

abuses, doubtless, occurred through the avarice, and rapacity, and impiety of men; especially when indulgence was granted to the contributors towards charitable or religious foundations, in the erection of which private motives too often mingle. But this I say, that the Church felt and ever tried to remedy the evil. . . . The Council of Trent, by an ample decree, completely reformed the abuses which had subsequently crept in, and had been unfortunately used as a ground for Luther's separation from the Church."—N. Wiseman, *Lect's on the Principal Doctrines and Practices of the Catholic Church, lect.* 12..

A. D. 1517.—Tetzel and the hawking of Indulgences through Germany.—"In Germany the people were full of excitement. The Church had opened a vast market on earth. The crowd of customers, and the cries and jests of the sellers, were like a fair—and that, a fair held by monks. The article which they puffed off and offered at the lowest price, was, they said, the salvation of souls. These dealers travelled through the country in a handsome carriage, with three outriders, made a great show, and spent a great deal of money. . . . When the cavalcade was approaching a town, a deputy was dispatched to the magistrate: 'The grace of God and St. Peter is before your gates,' said the envoy; and immediately all the place was in commotion. The clergy, the priests, the nuns, the council, the schoolmasters, the schoolboys, the trade corporations with their banners, men and women, young and old, went to meet the merchants, bearing lighted torches in their hands, advancing to the sound of music and of all the bells, 'so that,' says a historian, 'they could not have received God Himself in greater state.' The salutations ended, the whole cortége moved towards the church, the Pope's bull of grace being carried in advance on a velvet cushion, or on a cloth of gold. The chief indulgence-merchant followed next, holding in his hand a red wooden cross. In this order the whole procession moved along, with singing, prayers, and incense. The organ pealed, and loud music greeted the hawker monk and those who accompanied him, as they entered the temple. The cross he bore was placed in front of the altar; the Pope's arms were suspended from it. . . . One person especially attracted attention at these sales. It was he who carried the great red cross and played the principal part. He wore the garb of the Dominicans. He had an arrogant bearing and a thundering voice, and he was in full vigour, though he had reached his sixty-third year. This man, the son of a goldsmith of Leipsic, named Dietz, was called John Dietzel, or Tetzel. He had received numerous ecclesiastical honours. He was Bachelor in Theology, prior of the Dominicans, apostolic commissioner and inquisitor, and since the year 1502 he had filled the office of vendor of indulgences. The skill he had acquired soon caused him to be named commissioner-in-chief. . . . The cross having been elevated and the Pope's arms hung upon it, Tetzel ascended the pulpit, and with a confident air began to extol the worth of indulgences, in presence of the crowd whom the ceremony had attracted to the sacred spot. The people listened with open mouths. Here is a specimen of one of his harangues:—'Indulgences,' he said, 'are the most precious and sublime gifts of God. This cross (pointing to the red cross) has as much efficacy as the cross of Jesus Christ itself. Come, and I will give you letters furnished with seals, by which, even the sins that you may have a wish to commit hereafter, shall be all forgiven you. I would not exchange my privileges for those of St. Peter in heaven; for I have saved more souls by my indulgences than the Apostle by his discourses. There is no sin so great, that an indulgence cannot remit it. Repentance is not necessary. But, more than that; indulgences not only save the living, they save the dead also. Priest! noble! merchant! woman! young girl! young man!—hearken to your parents and your friends who are dead, and who cry to you from the depths of the abyss: "We are enduring horrible tortures! A small alms would deliver us. You can give it, and you will not!"' The hearers shuddered at these words, pronounced in the formidable voice of the charlatan monk. 'The very instant,' continued Tetzel, 'the piece of money chinks at the bottom of the strong box, the soul is freed from purgatory, and flies to heaven.' . . . Such were the discourses heard by astonished Germany in the days when God was raising up Luther. The sermon ended, the indulgence was considered as 'having solemnly established its throne' in that place. Confessionals were arranged, adorned with the Pope's arms; and the people flocked in crowds to the confessors. They were told, that, in order to obtain the full pardon of all their sins, and to deliver the souls of others from purgatory, it was not necessary for them to have contrition of heart, or to make confession by mouth; only, let them be quick and bring money to the box. Women and children, poor people, and those who lived on alms, all of them soon found the needful to satisfy the confessor's demands. The confession being over—and it did not require much time—the faithful hurried to the sale, which was conducted by a single monk. His counter stood near the cross. He fixed his sharp eyes upon all who approached him, scrutinized their manners, their bearing, their dress, and demanded a sum proportioned to the appearance of each. Kings, queens, princes, archbishops, bishops, had to pay, according to regulation, twenty-five ducats; abbots, counts, and barons, ten; and so on, or according to the discretion of the commissioner. For particular sins, too, both Tetzel in Germany, and Samson in Switzerland, had a special scale of prices."—J. N. Merle D'Aubigne, *The Story of the Reformation, pt.* 1, *ch.* 6 (*or Hist. of the Reformation, bk.* 3, *ch.* 1).

Also in: M. J. Spalding, *Hist. of the Protestant Reformation, pt.* 2, *ch.* 3.

A. D. 1517.—Luther's attack upon the Indulgences.—His 95 Theses nailed to the Wittenberg Church.—The silent support of Elector Frederick of Saxony.—The satisfaction of awakened Germany.—"Wittenberg was an old-fashioned town in Saxony, on the Elbe. Its main street was parallel with the broad river, and within its walls, at one end of it, near the Elster gate, lay the University, founded by the good Elector—Frederic of Saxony—of which Luther was a professor; while at the other end of it was the palace of the Elector and the palace church of All Saints. The great parish church lifted its two towers from the centre of the town, a little back from the main street. This was the town in which Luther had been preaching for

years, and towards which Tetzel, the seller of indulgences, now came, just as he did to other towns, vending his 'false pardons'—granting indulgences for sins to those who could pay for them, and offering to release from purgatory the souls of the dead, if any of their friends would pay for their release. As soon as the money chinked in his money-box, the souls of their dead friends would be let out of purgatory. This was the gospel of Tetzel. It made Luther's blood boil. He knew that what the Pope wanted was people's money, and that the whole thing was a cheat. This his Augustinian theology had taught him, and he was not a man to hold back when he saw what ought to be done. He did see it. On the day [October 31] before the festival of All Saints, on which the relics of the Church were displayed to the crowds of country people who flocked into the town, Luther passed down the long street with a copy of ninety-five theses or Statements [see text below] against indulgences in his hand, and nailed them upon the door of the palace church ready for the festival on the morrow. Also on All Saints' day he read them to the people in the great parish church. It would not have mattered much to Tetzel or the Pope that the monk of Wittenberg had nailed up his papers on the palace church, had it not been that he was backed by the Elector of Saxony."—F. Seebohm, *The Era of the Protestant Revolution, pt.* 2, *ch.* 3 (*c*).—"As the abuse complained of had a double character, religious and political, or financial, so also political events came in aid of the opposition emanating from religious ideas. Frederick of Saxony [on the occasion of an indulgence proclaimed in 1501] . . . had kept the money accruing from it in his own dominions in his possession, with the determination not to part with it, till an expedition against the infidels, which was then contemplated, should be actually undertaken; the pope and, on the pope's concession, the emperor, had demanded it of him in vain: he held it for what it really was — a tax levied on his subjects; and after all the projects of a war against the Turks had come to nothing, he had at length applied the money to his university. Nor was he now inclined to consent to a similar scheme of taxation. . . . The sale of indulgences at Jüterbock and the resort of his subjects thither, was not less offensive to him on financial grounds than to Luther on spiritual. Not that the latter were in any degree excited by the former; this it would be impossible to maintain after a careful examination of the facts; on the contrary, the spiritual motives were more original, powerful, and independent than the temporal, though these were important, as having their proper source in the general condition of Germany. The point whence the great events arose which were soon to agitate the world, was the coincidence of the two. There was . . . no one who represented the interests of Germany in the matter. There were innumerable persons who saw through the abuse of religion, but no one who dared to call it by its right name and openly to denounce and resist it. But the alliance between the monk of Wittenberg and the sovereign of Saxony was formed; no treaty was negotiated; they had never seen each other; yet they were bound together by an instinctive mutual understanding. The intrepid monk attacked the enemy; the prince did not promise him his aid — he did not even encourage him; he let things take their course. . . . Luther's daring assault was the shock which awakened Germany from her slumber. That a man should arise who had the courage to undertake the perilous struggle, was a source of universal satisfaction, and as it were tranquillised the public conscience. The most powerful interests were involved in it; — that of sincere and profound piety, against the most purely external means of obtaining pardon of sins; that of literature, against fanatical persecutors, of whom Tetzel was one; the renovated theology against the dogmatic learning of the schools, which lent itself to all these abuses; the temporal power against the spiritual, whose usurpations it sought to curb; lastly, the nation against the rapacity of Rome."—L. Ranke, *Hist. of the Reformation in Germany, bk.* 2, *ch.* 1 (*v.* 1).

Also in: J. Köstlin, *Life of Luther, pt.* 3, *ch.* 1.—C. Beard, *Martin Luther and the Reformation, ch.* 5.—See, also, Germany: A. D. 1517–1523.

A. D. 1517.—The Ninety-five Theses of Luther.—The following is a translation of the ninety-five theses: "In the desire and with the purpose of elucidating the truth, a disputation will be held on the underwritten propositions at Wittemberg, under the presidency of the Reverend Father Martin Luther, Monk of the Order of St. Augustine, Master of Arts and of Sacred Theology, and ordinary Reader of the same in that place. He therefore asks those who cannot be present and discuss the subject with us orally, to do so by letter in their absence. In the name of our Lord Jesus Christ. Amen. **1.** Our Lord and Master Jesus Christ in saying: 'Repent ye,' etc., intended that the whole life of believers should be penitence. **2.** This word cannot be understood of sacramental penance, that is, of the confession and satisfaction which are performed under the ministry of priests. **3.** It does not, however, refer solely to inward penitence; nay such inward penitence is naught, unless it outwardly produces various mortifications of the flesh. **4.** The penalty thus continues as long as the hatred of self — that is, true inward penitence — continues; namely, till our entrance into the kingdom of heaven. **5.** The Pope has neither the will nor the power to remit any penalties, except those which he has imposed by his own authority, or by that of the canons. **6.** The Pope has no power to remit any guilt, except by declaring and warranting it to have been remitted by God; or at most by remitting cases reserved for himself; in which cases, if his power were despised, guilt would certainly remain. **7.** God never remits any man's guilt, without at the same time subjecting him, humbled in all things, to the authority of his representative the priest. **8.** The penitential canons are imposed only on the living, and no burden ought to be imposed on the dying, according to them. **9.** Hence the Holy Spirit acting in the Pope does well for us, in that, in his decrees, he always makes exception of the article of death and of necessity. **10.** Those priests act wrongly and unlearnedly, who, in the case of the dying, reserve the canonical penances for purgatory. **11.** Those tares about changing of the canonical penalty into the penalty of purgatory seem surely to have been sown while the bishops were asleep. **12.** Formerly the canonical penalties were imposed not after, but before absolution, as tests of true contrition.

13. The dying pay all penalties by death, and are already dead to the canon laws, and are by right relieved from them. 14. The imperfect soundness or charity of a dying person necessarily brings with it great fear, and the less it is, the greater the fear it brings. 15. This fear and horror is sufficient by itself, to say nothing of other things, to constitute the pains of purgatory, since it is very near to the horror of despair. 16. Hell, purgatory, and heaven appear to differ as despair, almost despair, and peace of mind differ. 17. With souls in purgatory it seems that it must needs be that, as horror diminishes, so charity increases. 18. Nor does it seem to be proved by any reasoning or any scriptures, that they are outside of the state of merit or of the increase of charity. 19. Nor does this appear to be proved, that they are sure and confident of their own blessedness, at least all of them, though we may be very sure of it. 20. Therefore the Pope, when he speaks of the plenary remission of all penalties, does not mean simply of all, but only of those imposed by himself. 21. Thus those preachers of indulgences are in error who say that, by the indulgences of the Pope, a man is loosed and saved from all punishment. 22. For in fact he remits to souls in purgatory no penalty which they would have had to pay in this life according to the canons. 23. If any entire remission of all penalties can be granted to any one, it is certain that it is granted to none but the most perfect, that is, to very few. 24. Hence the greater part of the people must needs be deceived by this indiscriminate and high-sounding promise of release from penalties. 25. Such power as the Pope has over purgatory in general, such has every bishop in his own diocese, and every curate in his own parish, in particular. 26. The Pope acts most rightly in granting remission to souls, not by the power of the keys (which is of no avail in this case) but by the way of suffrage. 27. They preach man, who say that the soul flies out of purgatory as soon as the money thrown into the chest rattles. 28. It is certain that, when the money rattles in the chest, avarice and gain may be increased, but the suffrage of the Church depends on the will of God alone. 29. Who knows whether all the souls in purgatory desire to be redeemed from it, according to the story told of Saints Severinus and Paschal. 30. No man is sure of the reality of his own contrition, much less of the attainment of plenary remission. 31. Rare as is a true penitent, so rare is one who truly buys indulgences — that is to say, most rare. 32. Those who believe that, through letters of pardon, they are made sure of their own salvation, will be eternally damned along with their teachers. 33. We must especially beware of those who say that these pardons from the Pope are that inestimable gift of God by which man is reconciled to God. 34. For the grace conveyed by these pardons has respect only to the penalties of sacramental satisfaction, which are of human appointment. 35. They preach no Christian doctrine, who teach that contrition is not necessary for those who buy souls out of purgatory or buy confessional licences. 36. Every Christian who feels true compunction has of right plenary remission of pain and guilt, even without letters of pardon. 37. Every true Christian, whether living or dead, has a share in all the benefits of Christ and of the Church, given him by God, even without letters of pardon. 38. The remission, however, imparted by the Pope is by no means to be despised, since it is, as I have said, a declaration of the Divine remission. 39. It is a most difficult thing, even for the most learned theologians, to exalt at the same time in the eyes of the people the ample effect of pardons and the necessity of true contrition. 40. True contrition seeks and loves punishment; while the ampleness of pardons relaxes it, and causes men to hate it, or at least gives occasion for them to do so. 41. Apostolic pardons ought to be proclaimed with caution, lest the people should falsely suppose that they are placed before other good works of charity. 42. Christians should be taught that it is not the mind of the Pope that the buying of pardons is to be in any way compared to works of mercy. 43. Christians should be taught that he who gives to a poor man, or lends to a needy man, does better than if he bought pardons. 44. Because, by a work of charity, charity increases, and the man becomes better; while, by means of pardons, he does not become better, but only freer from punishment. 45. Christians should be taught that he who sees any one in need, and, passing him by, gives money for pardons, is not purchasing for himself the indulgences of the Pope, but the anger of God. 46. Christians should be taught that, unless they have superfluous wealth, they are bound to keep what is necessary for the use of their own households, and by no means to lavish it on pardons. 47. Christians should be taught that, while they are free to buy pardons, they are not commanded to do so. 48. Christians should be taught that the Pope, in granting pardons, has both more need and more desire that devout prayer should be made for him, than that money should be readily paid. 49. Christians should be taught that the Pope's pardons are useful, if they do not put their trust in them, but most hurtful, if through them they lose the fear of God. 50. Christians should be taught that, if the Pope were acquainted with the exactions of the preachers of pardons, he would prefer that the Basilica of St. Peter should be burnt to ashes, than that it should be built up with the skin, flesh, and bones of his sheep. 51. Christians should be taught that, as it would be the duty, so it would be the wish of the Pope, even to sell, if necessary, the Basilica of St. Peter, and to give of his own money to very many of those from whom the preachers of pardons extract money. 52. Vain is the hope of salvation through letters of pardon, even if a commissary — nay the Pope himself — were to pledge his own soul for them. 53. They are enemies of Christ and of the Pope, who, in order that pardons may be preached, condemn the word of God to utter silence in other churches. 54. Wrong is done to the word of God when, in the same sermon, an equal or longer time is spent on pardons that on it. 55. The mind of the Pope necessarily is that, if pardons, which are a very small matter, are celebrated with single bells, single processions, and single ceremonies, the Gospel, which is a very great matter, should be preached with a hundred bells, a hundred processions, and a hundred ceremonies. 56. The treasures of the Church, whence the Pope grants indulgences, are neither sufficiently named nor known among the people of Christ. 57. It is

clear that they are at least not temporal treasures, for these are not so readily lavished, but only accumulated, by many of the preachers. **58.** Nor are they the merits of Christ and of the saints, for these, independently of the Pope, are always working grace to the inner man, and the cross, death, and hell to the outer man. **59.** St. Lawrence said that the treasures of the Church are the poor of the Church, but he spoke according to the use of the word in his time. **60.** We are not speaking rashly when we say that the keys of the Church, bestowed through the merits of Christ, are that treasure. **61.** For it is clear that the power of the Pope is alone sufficient for the remission of penalties and of reserved cases. **62.** The true treasure of the Church is the Holy Gospel of the glory and grace of God. **63.** This treasure, however, is deservedly most hateful, because it makes the first to be last. **64.** While the treasure of indulgences is deservedly most acceptable, because it makes the last to be first. **65.** Hence the treasures of the Gospel are nets, wherewith of old they fished for the men of riches. **66.** The treasures of indulgences are nets, wherewith they now fish for the riches of men. **67.** Those indulgences, which the preachers loudly proclaim to be the greatest graces, are seen to be truly such as regards the promotion of gain. **68.** Yet they are in reality in no degree to be compared to the grace of God and the piety of the cross. **69.** Bishops and curates are bound to receive the commissaries of apostolic pardons with all reverence. **70.** But they are still more bound to see to it with all their eyes, and take heed with all their ears, that these men do not preach their own dreams in place of the Pope's commission. **71.** He who speaks against the truth of apostolic pardons, let him be anathema and accursed. **72.** But he, on the other hand, who exerts himself against the wantonness and licence of speech of the preachers of pardons, let him be blessed. **73.** As the Pope justly thunders against those who use any kind of contrivance to the injury of the traffic in pardons. **74.** Much more is it his intention to thunder against those who, under the pretext of pardons, use contrivances to the injury of holy charity and of truth. **75.** To think that Papal pardons have such power that they could absolve a man even if — by an impossibility — he had violated the Mother of God, is madness. **76.** We affirm on the contrary that Papal pardons cannot take away even the least of venial sins, as regards its guilt. **77.** The saying that, even if St. Peter were now Pope, he could grant no greater graces, is blasphemy against St. Peter and the Pope. **78.** We affirm on the contrary that both he and any other Pope has greater graces to grant, namely, the Gospel, powers, gifts of healing, etc. (1 Cor. xii. 9). **79.** To say that the cross set up among the insignia of the Papal arms is of equal power with the cross of Christ, is blasphemy. **80.** Those bishops, curates, and theologians who allow such discourses to have currency among the people, will have to render an account. **81.** This licence in the preaching of pardons makes it no easy thing, even for learned men, to protect the reverence due to the Pope against the calumnies, or, at all events, the keen questionings of the laity. **82.** As for instance: — Why does not the Pope empty purgatory for the sake of most holy charity and of the supreme necessity of souls — this being the most just of all reasons — if he redeems an infinite number of souls for the sake of that most fatal thing money, to be spent on building a basilica — this being a very slight reason? **83.** Again; why do funeral masses and anniversary masses for the deceased continue, and why does not the Pope return, or permit the withdrawal of the funds bequeathed for this purpose, since it is a wrong to pray for those who are already redeemed? **84.** Again; what is this new kindness of God and the Pope, in that for money's sake, they permit an impious man and an enemy of God to redeem a pious soul which loves God, and yet do not redeem that same pious and beloved soul, out of free charity, on account of its own need? **85.** Again; why is it that the penitential canons, long since abrogated and dead in themselves in very fact and not only by usage, are yet still redeemed with money, through the granting of indulgences, as if they were full of life? **86.** Again; why does not the Pope, whose riches are at this day more ample than those of the wealthiest of the wealthy, build the one basilica of St. Peter with his own money, rather than with that of poor believers? **87.** Again; what does the Pope remit or impart to those who, through perfect contrition, have a right to plenary remission and participation? **88.** Again; what greater good would the Church receive if the Pope, instead of once, as he does now, were to bestow these remissions and participations a hundred times a day on any one of the faithful? **89.** Since it is the salvation of souls, rather than money, that the Pope seeks by his pardons, why does he suspend the letters and pardons granted long ago, since they are equally efficacious. **90.** To repress these scruples and arguments of the laity by force alone, and not to solve them by giving reasons, is to expose the Church and the Pope to the ridicule of their enemies, and to make Christian men unhappy. **91.** If then pardons were preached according to the spirit and mind of the Pope, all these questions would be resolved with ease; nay, would not exist. **92.** Away then with all those prophets who say to the people of Christ: 'Peace, peace,' and there is no peace. **93.** Blessed be all those prophets, who say to the people of Christ: 'The cross, the cross,' and there is no cross. **94.** Christians should be exhorted to strive to follow Christ their head through pains, deaths, and hells. **95.** And thus trust to enter heaven through many tribulations, rather than in the security of peace."—H. Wace and C. A. Buchheim, *First Principles of the Reformation, pp.* 6–13.

A. D. 1517-1521.— Favoring circumstances under which the Reformation in Germany gained ground.—The Bull "Exurge Domine."—Excommunication of Luther.—The imperial summons from Worms.—"It was fortunate for Luther's cause that he lived under a prince like the Elector of Saxony. Frederick, indeed, was a devout catholic; he had made a pilgrimage to Palestine, and had filled All Saints' Church at Wittenberg with relics for which he had given large sums of money. His attention, however, was now entirely engrossed by his new university, and he was unwilling to offer up to men like Tetzel so great an ornament of it as Dr. Martin Luther, since whose appointment at Wittenberg the number of students had so wonderfully increased as to throw the universities of

Erfurt and Leipsic quite into the shade. . . . As one of the principal Electors he was completely master in his own dominions, and indeed throughout Germany he was as much respected as the Emperor; and Maximilian, besides his limited power, was deterred by his political views from taking any notice of the quarrel. Luther had thus full liberty to prepare the great movement that was to ensue. . . . The contempt entertained by Pope Leo X. for the whole affair was also favourable to Luther; for Frederick might not at first have been inclined to defend him against the Court of Rome. . . . The Court of Rome at length became more sensible of the importance of Luther's innovations and in August 1518, he was commanded either to recant, or to appear and answer for his opinions at Rome, where Silvester Prierias and the bishop Ghenucci di Arcoli had been appointed his judges. Luther had not as yet dreamt of throwing off his allegiance to the Roman See. In the preceding May he had addressed a letter to the Pope himself, stating his views in a firm but modest and respectful tone, and declaring that he could not retract them. The Elector Frederick, at the instance of the university of Wittenberg, which trembled for the life of its bold and distinguished professor, prohibited Luther's journey to Rome, and expressed his opinion that the question should be decided in Germany by impartial judges. Leo consented to send a legate to Augsburg to determine the cause, and selected for that purpose Cardinal Thomas di Vio, better known by the name of Cajetanus, derived from his native city of Gaeta. . . . Luther set out for Augsburg on foot provided with several letters of recommendation from the Elector, and a safe conduct from the Emperor Maximilian. . . . Luther appeared before the cardinal for the first time, October 12th, at whose feet he fell; but it was soon apparent that no agreement could be expected. . . . Cajetanus, who had at first behaved with great moderation and politeness, grew warm, demanded an unconditional retraction, forbade Luther again to appear before him till he was prepared to make it, and threatened him with the censures of the Church. The fate of Huss stared Luther in the face, and he determined to fly. His patron Staupitz procured him a horse, and on the 20th of October, Langemantel, a magistrate of Augsburg, caused a postern in the walls to be opened for him before day had well dawned. . . . Cajetanus now wrote to the Elector Frederick complaining of Luther's refractory departure from Augsburg, and requiring either that he should be sent to Rome or at least be banished from Saxony. . . . So uncertain were Luther's prospects that he made preparations for his departure. . . . At length, just on the eve of his departure, he received an intimation from Frederick that he might remain at Wittenberg. Before the close of the year he gained a fresh accession of strength by the arrival of Melanchthon, a pupil of Reuchlin, who had obtained the appointment of Professor of Greek in the university. Frederick offered a fresh disputation at Wittenberg; but Leo X. adopted a course more consonant with the pretensions of an infallible Church by issuing a Bull dated November 9th 1518, which, without adverting to Luther or his opinions, explained and enforced the received doctrine of indulgences. It failed, however, to produce the desired effect. . . . Leo now tried the effects of seduction. Carl Von Miltitz, a Saxon nobleman, canon of Mentz, Trèves, and Meissen, . . . was despatched to the Elector Frederick with the present of a golden rose, and with instructions to put an end, as best he might, to the Lutheran schism. On his way through Germany, Miltitz soon perceived that three fourths of the people were in Luther's favour; nor was his reception at the Saxon Court of a nature to afford much encouragement. . . . Miltitz saw the necessity for conciliation. Having obtained an interview with Luther at Altenburg, Miltitz persuaded him to promise that he would be silent, provided a like restraint were placed upon his adversaries. . . . Luther was even induced to address a letter to the Pope, dated from Altenburg, March 3rd 1519, in which, in humble terms, he expressed his regret that his motives should have been misinterpreted, and solemnly declared that he did not mean to dispute the power and authority of the Pope and the Church of Rome, which he considered superior to everything except Jesus Christ alone. . . . The truce effected by Miltitz lasted only a few months. It was broken by a disputation to which Dr. Eck challenged Bodenstein, a Leipsic professor, better known by the name of Carlstadt. . . . The Leipsic disputation was preceded and followed by a host of controversies. The whole mind of Germany was in motion, and it was no longer with Luther alone that Rome had to contend. All the celebrated names in art and literature sided with the Reformation; Erasmus, Ulrich von Hutten, Melanchthon, Lucas Cranach, Albert Dürer, and others. Hans Sachs, the Meistersänger of Nuremberg, composed in his honour the pretty song called 'the Wittenberg Nightingale.' Silvester von Schaumburg and Franz von Sickingen invited Luther to their castles, in case he were driven from Saxony; and Schaumburg declared that 100 more Franconian knights were ready to protect him. . . . The Elector Frederick became daily more convinced that his doctrines were founded in Scripture. . . . Meanwhile, Luther had made great strides in his opinions since the publication of his Theses. . . . He had begun to impugn many of the principles of the Romish church; and so far from any longer recognising the paramount authority of the Pope, or even of a general council, he was now disposed to submit to no rule but the Bible. The more timid spirits were alarmed at his boldness, and even Frederick himself exhorted him to moderation. It must be acknowledged, indeed, that Luther sometimes damaged his cause by the intemperance of his language; an instance of which is afforded by the remarkable letter he addressed to Leo X., April 6th 1520, as a dedication to his treatise 'De Libertate Christiana.' . . . The letter just alluded to was, perhaps, the immediate cause of the famous Bull, 'Exurge Domine,' which Leo fulminated against Luther, June 15th 1520. The Bull, which is conceived in mild terms, condemned forty-one propositions extracted from Luther's works, allowed him sixty days to recant, invited him to Rome, if he pleased to come, under a safe conduct, and required him to cease from preaching and writing, and to burn his published treatises. If he did not conform within the above period, he was condemned as a notorious and irreclaimable heretic; all princes and magistrates were required to seize him and his adherents, and to send them

to Rome; and all places that gave them shelter were threatened with an interdict. The Bull was forwarded to Archbishop Albert of Mentz; but in North Germany great difficulty was found in publishing it. . . . On December 10th Luther consummated his rebellion by taking that final step which rendered it impossible for him to recede. On the banks of the Elbe before the Elster Gate of Wittenberg, . . . Luther, in the presence of a large body of professors and students, solemnly committed with his own hands to the flames the Bull by which he had been condemned, together with the code of the canon law, and the writings of Eck and Emser, his opponents. . . . On January 3rd 1521, Luther and his followers were solemnly excommunicated by Leo with bell, book, and candle, and an image of him, together with his writings, was committed to the flames. . . . At the Diet of Worms which was held soon after, the Emperor [Charles V., who succeeded Maximilian in 1519] having ordered that Luther's books should be delivered up to the magistrates to be burnt, the States represented to him the uselessness and impolicy of such a step, pointing out that the doctrines of Luther had already sunk deep into the hearts of the people; and they recommended that he should be summoned to Worms and interrogated whether he would recant without any disputation. . . . In compliance with the advice of the States, the Emperor issued a mandate, dated March 6th 1521, summoning Luther to appear at Worms within twenty-one days. It was accompanied with a safe conduct."—T. H. Dyer, *Hist. of Modern Europe, bk.* 2, *ch.* 3 (*v.* 1).

Also in: L. von Ranke, *Hist. of the Reformation in Germany, bk.* 2 (*v.* 1).—P. Bayne, *Martin Luther: his Life and Work, bk.* 5, *ch.* 3—*bk.* 8, *ch.* 6 (*v.* 1–2).—J. E. Darras, *Hist. of the Church, 7th period, ch.* 1 (*v.* 4).—P. Schaff, *Hist. of the Christian Church, v.* 6, *ch.* 4.

A. D. 1519-1524.—The sale of Indulgences in Switzerland.—Beginning of the Reformation under Zwingli.—Near the close of the year 1518, Ulric Zwingle, or Zwingli, or Zuinglius, already much respected for his zealous piety and his learning, "was appointed preacher in the collegiate church at Zurich. The crisis of his appearance on this scene was so extraordinary as to indicate to every devout mind a providential dispensation, designed to raise up a second instrument in the work of reformation, and that, almost by the same means which had been employed to produce the first. One Bernhard Samson, or Sanson, a native of Milan, and a Franciscan monk, selected this moment to open a sale of indulgences at Zurich. He was the Tetzel of Switzerland. He preached through many of its provinces, exercising the same trade, with the same blasphemous pretensions and the same clamorous effrontery; and in a land of greater political freedom his impostures excited even a deeper and more general disgust. . . . He encountered no opposition till he arrived at Zurich. But here appears a circumstance which throws a shade of distinction between the almost parallel histories of Samson and Tetzel. The latter observed in his ministration all the necessary ecclesiastical forms; the former omitted to present his credentials to the bishop of the diocese, and acted solely on the authority of the pontifical bulls. Hugo, Bishop of Constance, was offended at this disrespectful temerity, and immediately directed Zwingle and the other pastors to exclude the stranger from their churches. The first who had occasion to show obedience to this mandate was John Frey, minister of Staufberg. Bullinger, Dean of Bremgarten, was the second. From Bremgarten, after a severe altercation which ended by the excommunication of that dignitary, Samson proceeded to Zurich. Meanwhile Zwingle had been engaged for about two months in rousing the indignation of the people against the same object; and so successfully did he support the instruction of the Bishop, and such efficacy was added to his eloquence by the personal unpopularity of Samson, that the senate determined not so much as to admit him within the gates of the city. A deputation of honour was appointed to welcome the pontifical legate without the walls. He was then commanded to absolve the Dean from the sentence launched against him, and to depart from the canton. He obeyed, and presently turned his steps towards Italy and repassed the mountains. This took place at the end of February, 1519. The Zurichers immediately addressed a strong remonstrance to the Pope, in which they denounced the misconduct of his agent. Leo replied, on the last of April, with characteristic mildness; for though he maintained, as might be expected, the Pope's authority to grant those indulgences, . . . yet he accorded the prayer of the petition so far as to recall the preacher, and to promise his punishment, should he be convicted of having exceeded his commission. . . . But Zwingle's views were not such as long to be approved by an episcopal reformer in that [the Roman] church. . . . He began to invite the Bishop, both by public and private solicitations, with perfect respect but great earnestness, to give his adhesion to the evangelical truth . . . and to permit the free preaching of the gospel throughout his diocese. . . . From the beginning of his preaching at Zurich it was his twofold object to instruct the people in the meaning, design, and character of the scriptural writings; and at the same time to teach them to seek their religion only there. His very first proceeding was to substitute the gospel of St. Matthew, as the text-book of his discourses, for the scraps of Scripture exclusively treated by the papal preachers; and he pursued this purpose by next illustrating the Acts of the Apostles, and the epistles of Paul and Peter. He considered the doctrine of justification by faith as the corner-stone of Christianity, and he strove to draw away his hearers from the gross observances of a pharasaical church to a more spiritual conception of the covenant of their redemption. . . . His success was so considerable, that at the end of 1519 he numbered as many as 2,000 disciples; and his influence so powerful among the chiefs of the commonwealth, that he procured, in the following year, an official decree to the effect: That all pastors and ministers should thenceforward reject the unfaithful devices and ordinances of men, and teach with freedom such doctrines only as rested on the authority of the prophecies, gospels, and apostolical epistles."—G. Waddington, *Hist. of the Reformation, ch.* 27 (*v.* 2).—"With unflagging zeal and courage Zwingli followed his ideal in politics, viz., to rear a republic on the type of the Greek free states of old, with perfect national independence. Thanks to his influence Zurich in 1521 abolished 'Reis-

laufen,' and the system of foreign pay [mercenary military service]. This step, however, brought down on the head of Zurich the wrath of the twelve sister republics, which had just signed a military contract with Francis I. . . . It was only in 1522 that he began to launch pamphlets against the abuses in the Church-fasting, celibacy of the clergy and the like. On the 29th of January, 1523, Zwingli obtained from the Council of Zurich the opening of a public religious discussion in presence of the whole of the clergy of the canton, and representatives of the Bishop of Constance, whose assistance in the debate the Council had invited. In 67 theses, remarkable for their penetration and clearness, he sketched out his confession of faith and plan of reform. . . . On the 25th of October, 1523, a second discussion initiated the practical consequences of the reformed doctrine — the abrogation of the mass and image worship. Zwingli's system was virtually that of Calvin, but was conceived in a broader spirit, and carried out later on in a far milder manner by Bullinger. . . . The Council gave the fullest approval to the Reformation. In 1524 Zwingli married Anne Reinhard, the widow of a Zurich nobleman (Meyer von Knonau), and so discarded the practice of celibacy obtaining amongst priests. . . . In 1524 Zwingli began to effect the most sweeping changes with the view of overthrowing the whole fabric of mediæval superstition. In the direction of reform he went far beyond Luther, who had retained oral confession, altar pictures, &c. The introduction of his reforms in Zurich called forth but little opposition. True, there were the risings of the Anabaptists, but these were the same everywhere. . . . Pictures and images were removed from the churches, under government direction. . . . At the Landgemeinden [parish gatherings] called for the purpose, the people gave an enthusiastic assent to his doctrines, and declared themselves ready 'to die for the gospel truth.' Thus a national Church was established, severed from the diocese of Constance, and placed under the control of the Council of Zurich and a clerical synod. The convents were turned into schools, hospitals, and poorhouses." —Mrs. L. Hug and R. Stead, *Switzerland, ch.* 22.

Also in: H. Stebbing, *Hist. of the Reformation, ch.* 7 (*v.* 1).—C. Beard, *The Reformation* (*Hibbert Lect's*, 1883), *lect.* 7.—J. H. Merle D'Aubigné, *Hist. of the Reformation, bk.* 8 *and* 11 (*v.* 2–3).—M. J. Spalding, *Hist. of the Protestant Reformation, pt.* 2, *ch.* 5.—P. Schaff, *Hist. of the Christian Church, v.* 7, *ch.* 1–3.

A. D. 1521-1522.—Luther before the Diet at Worms.—His friendly abduction and concealment at Wartburg.— His translation of the Bible.—"On the 2nd of April [1521], the Tuesday after Easter, Luther set out on his momentous journey. He travelled in a cart with three of his friends, the herald riding in front in his coat of arms. . . . The Emperor had not waited for his appearance to order his books to be burnt. When he reached Erfurt on the way the sentence had just been proclaimed. The herald asked him if he still meant to go on. 'I will go,' he said, 'if there are as many devils in Worms as there are tiles upon the house-tops. Though they burnt Huss, they could not burn the truth.' The Erfurt students, in retaliation, had thrown the Bull into the water. The Rector and the heads of the university gave Luther a formal reception as an old and honoured member; he preached at his old convent, and he preached again at Gotha and at Eisenach. Caietan had protested against the appearance in the Diet of an excommunicated heretic. The Pope himself had desired that the safe-conduct should not be respected, and the bishops had said that it was unnecessary. Manœuvres were used to delay him on the road till the time allowed had expired. But there was a fierce sense of fairness in the lay members of the Diet, which it was dangerous to outrage. Franz von Sickingen hinted that if there was foul play it might go hard with Cardinal Caietan — and Von Sickingen was a man of his word in such matters. On the 16th of April, at ten in the morning, the cart entered Worms, bringing Luther in his monk's dress, followed and attended by a crowd of cavaliers. The town's people were all out to see the person with whose name Germany was ringing. As the cart passed through the gates the warder on the walls blew a blast upon his trumpet. . . . Luther needed God to stand by him, for in all that great gathering he could count on few assured friends. The princes of the empire were resolved that he should have fair play, but they were little inclined to favour further a disturber of the public peace. The Diet sate in the Bishop's palace, and the next evening Luther appeared. The presence in which he found himself would have tried the nerves of the bravest of men: the Emperor, sternly hostile, with his retinue of Spanish priests and nobles; the archbishops and bishops, all of opinion that the stake was the only fitting place for so insolent a heretic; the dukes and barons, whose stern eyes were little likely to reveal their sympathy, if sympathy any of them felt. One of them only, George of Frundsberg, had touched Luther on the shoulder as he passed through the ante-room. 'Little monk, little monk,' he said, 'thou hast work before thee, that I, and many a man whose trade is war, never faced the like of. If thy heart is right, and thy cause good, go on in God's name. He will not forsake thee.' A pile of books stood on a table when he was brought forward. An officer of the court read the titles, asked if he acknowledged them, and whether he was ready to retract them. Luther was nervous, not without cause. He answered in a low voice that the books were his. To the other question he could not reply at once. He demanded time. His first appearance had not left a favourable impression; he was allowed a night to consider. The next morning, April 18, he had recovered himself; he came in fresh, courageous, and collected. His old enemy, Eck, was this time the spokesman against him, and asked what he was prepared to do. He said firmly that his writings were of three kinds: some on simple Gospel truth, which all admitted, and which of course he could not retract; some against Papal laws and customs, which had tried the consciences of Christians and had been used as excuses to oppress and spoil the German people. If he retracted these he would cover himself with shame. In a third sort he had attacked particular persons, and perhaps had been too violent. Even here he declined to retract simply, but would admit his fault if fault could be proved. He gave his answers in a clear strong voice, in Latin first, and then in German. There was a pause, and then Eck said that he had spoken disrespectfully; his heresies

had been already condemned at the Council at Constance; let him retract on these special points, and he should have consideration for the rest. He required a plain Yes or No from him, 'without horns.' The taunt roused Luther's blood. His full brave self was in his reply. 'I will give you an answer,' he said, 'which has neither horns nor teeth. Popes have erred and councils have erred. Prove to me out of Scripture that I am wrong, and I submit. Till then my conscience binds me. Here I stand. I can do no more. God help me. Amen.' All day long the storm raged. Night had fallen, and torches were lighted in the hall before the sitting closed. Luther was dismissed at last; it was supposed, and perhaps intended, that he was to be taken to a dungeon. But the hearts of the lay members of the Diet had been touched by the courage which he had shown. They would not permit a hand to be laid on him. . . . When he had reached his lodging again, he flung up his hands. 'I am through!' he cried. 'I am through! If I had a thousand heads they should be struck off one by one before I would retract.' The same evening the Elector Frederick sent for him, and told him he had done well and bravely. But though he had escaped so far, he was not acquitted. Charles conceived that he could be now dealt with as an obstinate heretic. At the next session (the day following), he informed the Diet that he would send Luther home to Wittenberg, there to be punished as the Church required. The utmost that his friends could obtain was that further efforts should be made. The Archbishop of Treves was allowed to tell him that if he would acknowledge the infallibility of councils, he might be permitted to doubt the infallibility of the Pope. But Luther stood simply upon Scripture. There, and there only, was infallibility. The Elector ordered him home at once, till the Diet should decide upon his fate. . . . A majority in the Diet, it was now clear, would pronounce for his death. If he was sentenced by the Great Council of the Empire, the Elector would be no longer able openly to protect him. It was decided that he should disappear, and disappear so completely that no trace of him should be discernible. On his way back through the Thuringian Forest, three or four miles from Altenstein, a party of armed men started out of the wood, set upon his carriage, seized and carried him off to Wartburg Castle. There he remained, passing by the name of the Ritter George, and supposed to be some captive knight. The secret was so well kept, that even the Elector's brother was ignorant of his hiding place. Luther was as completely lost as if the earth had swallowed him. . . . On the 8th of May the Edict of Worms was issued, placing him under the ban of the empire; but he had become 'as the air invulnerable,' and the face of the world had changed before he came back to it. . . . Luther's abduction and residence at Wartburg is the most picturesque incident in his life. He dropped his monk's gown, and was dressed like a gentleman; he let his beard grow and wore a sword. . . . The revolution, deprived of its leader, ran wild meanwhile. An account of the scene at Worms, with Luther's speeches, and wood cut illustrations, was printed on broadsheets and circulated in hundreds of thousands of copies. The people were like schoolboys left without a master. Convents and monasteries dissolved by themselves; monks and nuns began to marry; there was nothing else for the nuns to do, turned as they were adrift without provision. The Mass in most of the churches in Saxony was changed into a Communion. But without Luther it was all chaos, and no order could be taken. So great was the need of him, that in December he went to Wittenberg in disguise; but it was not yet safe for him to remain there. He had to retreat to his castle again, and in that compelled retreat he bestowed on Germany the greatest of all the gifts which he was able to offer. He began to translate the Bible into clear vernacular German. . . . He had probably commenced the work at the beginning of his stay at the castle. In the spring of 1522 the New Testament was completed. In the middle of March, the Emperor's hands now being fully occupied, the Elector sent him word that he need not conceal himself any longer; and he returned finally to his home and his friends. The New Testament was printed in November of that year, and became at once a household book in Germany. . . . The Old Testament was taken in hand at once, and in two years half of it was roughly finished." — J. A. Froude, *Luther: a Short Biog., pp.* 28–35.

Also in: G. Waddington, *Hist. of the Reformation, ch.* 13–14 (*v.* 1). — W. Robertson, *Hist. of the Reign of Charles V., bk.* 2 (*v.* 1). — C. Beard, *Martin Luther and the Reformation, ch.* 9. — J. Köstlin, *Life of Luther, pt.* 3, *ch.* 9.

A. D. 1521-1535.—Beginning of the Protestant Reform movement in France.—Hesitation of Francis I.—His final persecution of the Reformers. — "The long contest for Gallican rights had lowered the prestige of the popes in France, but it had not weakened the Catholic Church, which was older than the monarchy itself, and, in the feeling of the people, was indissolubly associated with it. The College of the Sorbonne, or the Theological Faculty at Paris, and the Parliament, which had together maintained Gallican liberty, were united in stern hostility to all doctrinal innovations. . . . In Southern France a remnant of the Waldenses had survived, and the recollection of the Catharists was still preserved in popular songs and legends. But the first movements towards reform emanated from the Humanist culture. A literary and scientific spirit was awakened in France through the lively intercourse with Italy which subsisted under Louis XII. and Francis I. By Francis especially, Italian scholars and artists were induced in large numbers to take up their abode in France. Frenchmen likewise visited Italy and brought home the classical culture which they acquired there. Among the scholars who cultivated Greek was Budæus, the foremost of them, whom Erasmus styled the 'wonder of France.' After the 'Peace of the Dames' was concluded at Cambray, in 1529, when Francis surrendered Italy to Charles V., a throng of patriotic Italians who feared or hated the Spanish rule, streamed over the Alps and gave a new impulse to literature and art. Poets, artists, and scholars found in the king a liberal and enthusiastic patron. The new studies, especially Hebrew and Greek, were opposed by all the might of the Sorbonne, the leader of which was the Syndic, Beda. He and his associates were on the watch for heresy, and every author who was suspected of overstepping the bounds of ortho-

doxy was immediately accused and subjected to persecution. Thus two parties were formed, the one favorable to the new learning, and the other inimical to it and rigidly wedded to the traditional theology. The Father of the French Reformation, or the one more entitled to this distinction than any other, is Jacques Lefèvre. . . . Lefèvre was honored among the Humanists as the restorer of philosophy and science in the University. Deeply imbued with a religious spirit, in 1509 he put forth a commentary on the Psalms, and in 1512 a commentary on the Epistles of Paul. As early as about 1512, he said to his pupil Farel: 'God will renovate the world, and you will be a witness of it'; and in the last named work, he says that the signs of the times betoken that a renovation of the Church is near at hand. He teaches the doctrine of gratuitous justification, and deals with the Scriptures as the supreme and sufficient authority. But a mystical, rather than a polemical vein characterizes him; and while this prevented him from breaking with the Church, it also blunted the sharpness of the opposition which his opinions were adapted to produce. One of his pupils was Briçonnet, Bishop of Meaux, who held the same view of justification with Lefèvre, and fostered the evangelical doctrine in his diocese. The enmity of the Sorbonne to Lefèvre and his school took a more aggressive form when the writings of Luther began to be read in the University and elsewhere. . . . The Sorbonne [1521] formally condemned a dissertation of Lefèvre on a point of evangelical history, in which he had controverted the traditional opinion. He, with Farel, Gérard Roussel, and other preachers, found an asylum with Briçonnet. Lefèvre translated the New Testament from the Vulgate, and, in a commentary on the Gospels, explicitly pronounced the Bible the sole rule of faith, which the individual might interpret for himself, and declared justification to be through faith alone, without human works or merit. It seemed as if Meaux aspired to become another Wittenberg. At length a commission of parliament was appointed to take cognizance of heretics in that district. Briçonnet, either intimidated, as Beza asserts, or recoiling at the sight of an actual secession from the Church, joined in the condemnation of Luther and of his opinions, and even acquiesced in the persecution which fell upon Protestantism within his diocese. Lefèvre fled to Strasburg, was afterwards recalled by Francis I., but ultimately took up his abode in the court of the King's sister, Margaret, the Queen of Navarre. Margaret, from the first, was favorably inclined to the new doctrines. There were two parties at the court. The mother of the King, Louisa of Savoy, and the Chancellor Duprat, were allies of the Sorbonne. . . . Margaret, on the contrary, a versatile and accomplished princess, cherished a mystical devotion which carried her beyond Briçonnet in her acceptance of the teaching of the Reformers. . . . Before the death of her first husband, the Duke of Alençon, and while she was a widow, she exerted her influence to the full extent in behalf of the persecuted Protestants, and in opposition to the Sorbonne. After her marriage to Henry d'Albret, the King of Navarre, she continued, in her own little court and principality, to favor the reformed doctrine and its professors [see NAVARRE: A. D. 1528–1563]. . . . The drift of her influence appears in the character of her daughter, the heroic Jeanne d'Albret, the mother of Henry IV., and in the readiness of the people over whom Margaret immediately ruled to receive the Protestant faith. . . . Francis I., whose generous patronage of artists and men of letters gave him the title of 'Father of Science,' had no love for the Sorbonne, for the Parliament, or for the monks. He entertained the plan of bringing Erasmus to Paris, and placing him at the head of an institution of learning. He read the Bible with his mother and sister, and felt no superstitious aversion to the leaders of reform. . . . The revolt of the Constable Bourbon [see FRANCE: A. D. 1520–1523] made it necessary for Francis to conciliate the clergy; and the battle of Pavia, followed by the captivity of the King, and the regency of his mother, gave a free rein to the persecutors. An inquisitorial court, composed partly of laymen, was ordained by Parliament. Heretics were burned at Paris and in the provinces. Louis de Berquin, who combined a culture which won the admiration of Erasmus, with the religious earnestness of Luther, was thrown into prison." Three times the King interposed and rescued him from the persecutors; but at last, in November, 1529, Berquin was hanged and burned.—G. P. Fisher, *The Reformation, ch.* 8.—"Such scenes [as the execution of Berquin], added to the preaching and dissemination of the Scriptures and religious tracts, caused the desire for reform to spread far and wide. In the autumn of 1534, a violent placard against the mass was posted about Paris, and one was even fixed on the king's own chamber. The cry was soon raised, 'Death! death to the heretics!' Francis had long dallied with the Reformation. . . . Now . . . he develops into what was quite contrary to his disposition, a cruel persecutor. A certain bourgeois of Paris, unaffected by any heretical notions, kept in those days a diary of what was going on in Paris, and from this precious document . . . we learn that between the 13th of November, 1534, and the 13th of March, 1535, twenty so-called Lutherans were put to death in Paris. . . . The panic caused by the Anabaptist outbreak at Munster may perhaps account for the extreme cruelty, . . . as the siege was in actual progress at the time. It was to defend the memories of the martyrs of the 29th of January, 1535, and of others who had suffered elsewhere, and to save, if possible, those menaced with a similar fate, that Calvin wrote his 'Institution of the Christian Religion.' A timid, feeble-bodied young student, he had fled from France [1535], in the hope of finding some retreat where he might lose himself in the studies he loved. Passing through Geneva [1536] with the intention of staying there only for a night, he met the indefatigable, ubiquitous, enterprising, courageous Farel, who, taking him by the hand, adjured him to stop and carry on the work in that city. Calvin shrank instinctively, but . . . was forced to yield. . . . Calvin once settled at Geneva had no more doubt about his calling than if he had been Moses himself."—R. Heath, *The Reformation in France, bk.* 1, *ch.* 2–3.

ALSO IN: H. M. Baird, *Hist. of the Rise of the Huguenots of France, ch.* 2–4 (*v.* 1).—R. T. Smith, *The Church in France, ch.* 12.

A. D. 1521-1555.—Beginnings of the Reformation in the Netherlands. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1521–1555.

A. D. 1522.—Election of Adrian VI.

A. D. 1522-1525.—The deepening and strengthening of the Lutheran Reformation and its systematic organization.—The two diets of Nuremberg.—The Catholic League of Ratisbon.—The formal adoption of the Reformed Religion in Northern Germany.—"Fortunately for the reformation, the emperor was prevented from executing the edict of Worms by his absence from Germany, by the civil commotions in Spain, and still more by the war with Francis I., which extended into Spain, the Low Countries, and Italy, and for above eight years involved him in a continued series of contests and negotiations at a distance from Germany. His brother, Ferdinand, on whom, as joint president of the council of regency, the administration of affairs devolved, was occupied in quelling the discontents in the Austrian territories, and defending his right to the crowns of Hungary and Bohemia; and thus the government of the empire was left to the council of regency, of which several members were inclined to favour innovation. In consequence of these circumstances, the Lutherans were enabled to overcome the difficulties to which innovators of every kind are exposed; and they were no less favoured by the changes at the court of Rome. Leo dying in 1521, Adrian, his successor, who, by the influence of Charles, was raised to the pontifical chair, on the 9th of January, 1522, saw and lamented the corruptions of the church, and his ingenuous, but impolitic confessions, that the whole church, both in its head and members, required a thorough reformation, strengthened the arguments of his opponents. . . . Nothing, perhaps, proved more the surprising change of opinion in Germany, the rapid increase of those whom we shall now distinguish by the name of Lutherans, and the commencement of a systematic opposition to the church of Rome, than the transactions of the two diets of Nuremberg, which were summoned by the archduke Ferdinand, principally for the purpose of enforcing the execution of the edict of Worms. In a brief dated in November, 1522, and addressed to the first diet, pope Adrian, after severely censuring the princes of the empire for not carrying into execution the edict of Worms, exhorted them, if mild and moderate measures failed, to cut off Luther from the body of the church, as a gangrened and incurable member. . . . At the same time, with singular inconsistency, he acknowledged the corruptions of the Roman court as the source of the evils which overspread the church, [and] promised as speedy a reformation as the nature of the abuses would admit. . . . The members of the diet, availing themselves of his avowal, advised him to assemble a council in Germany for the reformation of abuses, and drew up a list of a hundred grievances which they declared they would no longer tolerate, and, if not speedily delivered from such burdens, would procure relief by the authority with which God had intrusted them. . . . The recess of the diet, published in March, 1523, was framed with the same spirit; instead of threats of persecution, it only enjoined all persons to wait with patience the determination of a free council, forbade the diffusion of doctrines likely to create disturbances, and subjected all publications to the approbation of men of learning and probity appointed by the magistrate. Finally, it declared, that as priests who had married, or monks who had quitted their convents, were not guilty of a civil crime, they were only amenable to an ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and liable at the discretion of the ordinary to be deprived of their ecclesiastical privileges and benefices. The Lutherans derived their greatest advantages from these proceedings, as the gross corruptions of the church of Rome were now proved by the acknowledgment of the pontiff himself. . . . From this period they confidently appealed to the confession of the pontiff, and as frequently quoted the hundred grievances which were enumerated in a public and authentic act of the Germanic body. They not only regarded the recess as a suspension of the edict of Worms, but construed the articles in their own favour. . . . Hitherto the innovators had only preached against the doctrines and ceremonies of the Roman church, without exhibiting a regular system of their own." But now "Luther was persuaded, at the instances of the Saxon clergy, to form a regular system of faith and discipline; he translated the service into the German tongue, modified the form of the mass, and omitted many superstitious ceremonies; but he made as few innovations as possible, consistently with his own principles. To prevent also the total alienation or misuse of the ecclesiastical revenues, he digested a project for their administration, by means of an annual committee, and by his writings and influence effected its introduction. Under this judicious system the revenues of the church, after a provision for the clergy, were appropriated for the support of schools; for the relief of the poor, sick, and aged, of orphans and widows; for the reparation of churches and sacred buildings; and for the erection of magazines and the purchase of corn against periods of scarcity. These regulations and ordinances, though not established with the public approbation of the elector, were yet made with his tacit acquiescence, and may be considered as the first institution of a reformed system of worship and ecclesiastical polity; and in this institution the example of the churches of Saxony was followed by all the Lutheran communities in Germany. The effects of these changes were soon visible, and particularly at the meeting of the second diet of Nuremberg, on the 10th of January, 1524. Faber, canon of Strasburgh, who had been enjoined to make a progress through Germany for the purpose of preaching against the Lutheran doctrines, durst not execute his commission, although under the sanction of a safe conduct from the council of regency. Even the legate Campegio could not venture to make his public entry into Nuremberg with the insignia of his dignity, . . . for fear of being insulted by the populace. . . . Instead, therefore, of annulling the acts of the preceding diet, the new assembly pursued the same line of conduct. . . . The recess was, if possible, still more galling to the court of Rome, and more hostile to its prerogatives than that of the former diet. . . . The Catholics, thus failing in their efforts to obtain the support of the diet, on the 6th of July, 1524, entered into an association at Ratisbon, under the auspices of Campegio, in which the archduke Ferdinand, the duke of Bavaria, and most of the German bishops concurred, for enforcing the edict of Worms. At the same time, to conciliate the Germans, the legate published 29 articles for

the amendment of some abuses; but these being confined to points of minor importance, and regarding only the inferior clergy, produced no satisfaction, and were attended with no effect. Notwithstanding this formidable union of the Catholic princes, the proceedings of the diet of Nuremberg were but the prelude to more decisive innovations, which followed each other with wonderful rapidity. Frederic the Wise, elector of Saxony, dying in 1525, was succeeded by his brother, John the Constant, who publicly espoused and professed the Lutheran doctrines. The system recently digested by Luther, with many additional alterations, was introduced by his authority, and declared the established religion; and by his order the celebrated Melanchthon drew up an apology in defence of the reformed tenets for the princes who adopted them. Luther himself, who had in the preceding year thrown off the monastic habit, soon after the accession of the new sovereign ventured to give the last proof of his emancipation from the fetters of the church of Rome, by espousing, on the 13th of July, 1525, Catherine Bora, a noble lady, who had escaped from the nunnery at Nimptschen, and taken up her residence at Wittemberg. The example of the elector of Saxony was followed by Philip, landgrave of Hesse Cassel, a prince of great influence and distinguished civil and military talents; by the dukes of Mecklenburgh, Pomerania, and Zell; and by the imperial cities of Nuremberg, Strasburgh, Frankfort, Nordhausen, Magdeburgh, Brunswick, Bremen, and others of less importance. . . . Albert, margrave of Brandenburgh, grandmaster of the Teutonic order, . . . in 1525, renounced his vow of celibacy, made a public profession of the Lutheran tenets, and, with the consent of Sigismond, king of Poland, secularised Eastern Prussia."—W. Coxe, *Hist. of the House of Austria, ch.* 28 (*v.* 1).

Also in: L. von Ranke, *Hist. of the Reformation in Germany, bk.* 3, *ch.* 2–5 (*v.* 2).—P. Bayne, *Martin Luther: his Life and Work, bk.* 10–13 (*v.* 2).—L. Häusser, *The Period of the Reformation, ch.* 5–6.

A. D. 1523.—Election of Clement VII.

A. D. 1523-1527.—The double-dealings of Pope Clement VII. with the emperor and the king of France.—Imperial revenge.—The sack of Rome. See Italy: A. D. 1523–1527, and 1527.

A. D. 1524.—Institution of the Order of the Theatines. See Theatines.

A. D. 1525-1529.—The League of Torgau.—Contradictory action of the Diets at Spires.—The Protest of Lutheran princes which gave rise to the name "Protestants."—"At the Diet of Nuremberg it had been determined to hold an assembly shortly after at Spires for the regulation of ecclesiastical affairs. The princes were to procure beforehand from their councillors and scholars a statement of the points in dispute. The grievances of the nation were to be set forth, and remedies were to be sought for them. The nation was to deliberate and act on the great matter of religious reform. The prospect was that the evangelical party would be in the majority. The papal court saw the danger that was involved in an assembly gathered for such a purpose, and determined to prevent the meeting. At this moment war was breaking out between Charles and Francis. Charles had no inclination to offend the Pope. He forbade the assembly at Spires, and, by letters addressed to the princes individually, endeavored to drive them into the execution of the edict of Worms. In consequence of these threatening movements, the Elector of Saxony and the Landgrave of Hesse entered into the defensive league of Torgau, in which they were joined by several Protestant communities. The battle of Pavia and the capture of Francis I. [see France: A. D. 1523–1525] were events that appeared to be fraught with peril to the Protestant cause. In the Peace of Madrid (January 14, 1526) both sovereigns avowed the determination to suppress heresy. But the dangerous preponderance obtained by the Emperor created an alarm throughout Europe; and the release of Francis was followed by the organization of a confederacy against Charles, of which Clement was the leading promoter [see Italy: A. D. 1523–1527]. This changed the imperial policy in reference to the Lutherans. The Diet of Spires in 1526 unanimously resolved that, until the meeting of a general council, every state should act in regard to the edict of Worms as it might answer to God and his imperial majesty. Once more Germany refused to stifle the Reformation, and adopted the principle that each of the component parts of the Empire should be left free to act according to its own will. It was a measure of the highest importance to the cause of Protestantism. It is a great landmark in the history of the German Reformation. The war of the Emperor and the Pope involved the necessity of tolerating the Lutherans. In 1527, an imperial army, composed largely of Lutheran infantry, captured and sacked the city of Rome. For several months the Pope was held a prisoner. For a number of years the position of Charles with respect to France and the Pope, and the fear of Turkish invasion, had operated to embolden and greatly strengthen the cause of Luther. But now that the Emperor had gained a complete victory in Italy, the Catholic party revived its policy of repression."—G. P. Fisher, *The Reformation, ch.* 4.—"While Charles and Clement were arranging matters in 1529, a new Diet was held at Spires, and the reactionists exerted themselves to obtain a reversal of that ordinance of the Diet of 1526 which had given to the reformed doctrines a legal position in Germany. Had it been possible, the Papist leaders would have forced back the Diet on the old Edict of Worms, but in this they were baffled. Then they took up another line of defence and aggression. Where the Worms Edict had been enforced, it was, they urged, to be maintained; but all further propagation of the reformed doctrines, all religious innovation whatever, was to be forbidden, pending the assemblage of a General Council. . . . This doom of arrest and paralysis —this imperious mandate, 'Hitherto shall ye come, but no further,'— could not be brooked by the followers of Luther. They possessed the advantage of being admirably led. Philip of Hesse supplied some elements of sound counsel that were wanting in Luther himself. . . . Luther regarded with favour . . . the doctrine of passive obedience. It was too much his notion that devout Germans, if their Emperor commanded them to renounce the truth, should simply die at the stake without a murmur. . . . The most ripe and recent inquiries seem to prove that it was about this very time, when the Evangelical

Princes and Free Cities of Germany were beginning to put shoulder to shoulder and organise resistance, in arms if necessary, to the Emperor and the Pope, that Luther composed 'Ein' feste Burg ist unser Gott,' a psalm of trust in God, and in God only, as the protector of Christians. He took no fervent interest, however, in the Diet; and Philip and his intrepid associates derived little active support from him. These were inflexibly determined that the decree of the majority should not be assented to. Philip of Hesse, John of Saxony, Markgraf George the Pious of Brandenburg-Anspach, the Dukes of Lunenburg and Brunswick, the Prince of Anhalt, and the representatives of Strasburg, Nürnberg, and twelve other free cities [Ulm, Constance, Reutlingen, Windsheim, Memmingen, Lindau, Kempten, Heilbron, Isna, Weissemburgh, Nordlingen, and St. Gallen], entered a solemn protest against the Popish resolution. They were called Protestants. The name, as is customary with names that felicitously express and embody facts, was caught up in Germany and passed into every country in Europe and the world."—P. Bayne, *Martin Luther, his Life and Work, bk.* 14, *ch.* 4 (*v.* 2).

Also in: L. von Ranke, *Hist. of the Reformation in Germany, bk.* 4–5 (*v.* 2–3).—J. H. Merle D' Aubigné, *Hist. of the Reformation, bk.* 10, *ch.* 14, *and bk.* 13, *ch.* 1–6 (*v.* 3–4).—J. Alzog, *Manual of Universal Church Hist., sect.* 311 (*v.* 3).

A. D. 1527-1533.—The rupture with England. See England: A. D. 1527–1534.

A. D. 1530-1531.—The Diet at Augsburg.—Presentation and condemnation of the Protestant Confession of Faith.—The breach with the Reformation complete.—"In the year 1530, Charles V., seeing France prostrate, Italy quelled, and Solyman driven within his own boundaries, determined upon undertaking the decision of the great question of the Reformation. The two conflicting parties were summoned, and met at Augsburg. The sectaries of Luther, known by the general name of protestants, were desirous to be distinguished from the other enemies of Rome, the excesses committed by whom would have thrown odium upon their cause; to be distinguished from the Zwinglian republicans of Switzerland, odious to the princes and to the nobles; above all, they desired not to be confounded with the anabaptists, proscribed by all as the enemies of society and of social order. Luther, over whom there was still suspended the sentence pronounced against him at Worms, whereby he was declared a heretic, could not appear at Augsburg; his place was supplied by the learned and pacific Melancthon, a man timid and gentle as Erasmus, whose friend he continued to be, despite of Luther. The elector, however, conveyed the great reformer as near to the place of convocation as regard to his friend's personal safety rendered advisable. He had him stationed in the strong fortress of Coburg. From this place, Luther was enabled to maintain with ease and expedition a constant intercourse with the protestant ministers. . . . Melancthon believed in the possibility of effecting a reconciliation between the two parties. Luther, at a very early period of the schism, saw that they were utterly irreconcilable. In the commencement of the Reformation, he had frequently had recourse to conferences and to public disputations. It was then of moment to him to resort to every effort, to try, by all the means in his power, to preserve the bond of Christianity, before he abandoned all hope of so doing. But towards the close of his life, dating from the period of the Diet of Augsburg, he openly discouraged and disclaimed these wordy contests, in which the vanquished would never avow his defeat. On the 26th of August, 1530, he writes: 'I am utterly opposed to any effort being made to reconcile the two doctrines; for it is an impossibility, unless, indeed, the pope will consent to abjure papacy. Let it suffice us that we have established our belief upon the basis of reason, and that we have asked for peace. Why hope to convert them to the truth?' And on the same day (26th August), he tells Spalatin: 'I understand you have undertaken a notable mission — that of reconciling Luther and the pope. But the pope will not be reconciled and Luther refuses. Be mindful how you sacrifice both time and trouble.' . . . These prophecies were, however, unheeded: the conferences took place, and the protestants were required to furnish their profession of faith. This was drawn up by Melancthon." The Confession, as drawn up by Melancthon, was adopted and signed by five electors, 30 ecclesiastical princes, 23 secular princes, 22 abbots, 32 counts and barons, and 39 free and imperial cities, and has since been known as the Augsburg Confession.—J. Michelet, *Life of Luther* (*tr. by W. Hazlitt*), *bk.* 3, *ch.* 1.—"A difficulty now arose as to the public reading of the Confession in the Diet. The Protestant princes, who had severally signed it, contended against the Catholic princes, that, in fairness, it should be read; and, against the emperor, that, if read at all, it should be read in German, and not in Latin. They were successful in both instances, and the Confession was publicly read in German by Bayer, one of the two chancellors of the Elector of Saxony, during the afternoon session of June 25, held in the chapel of the imperial palace. Campeggio, the Papal Legate, was absent. The reading occupied two hours, and the powerful effect it produced was, in a large measure, due to the rich, sonorous voice of Bayer, and to his distinct articulation and the musical cadence of his periods. Having finished, he handed the Confession to the Emperor, who submitted it for examination to Eck, Conrad Wimpina, Cochlæus, John Faber, and others of the Catholic theologians present in the Diet." These prepared a "Confutation" which was "finally agreed upon and read in a public session of the Diet, held August 3rd, and with which the Emperor and the Catholic princes expressed themselves fully satisfied. The Protestant princes were commanded to disclaim their errors, and return to the allegiance of the ancient faith, and 'should you refuse,' the Emperor added, 'we shall regard it a conscientious duty to proceed as our coronation oath and our office of protector of Holy Church require.' This declaration roused the indignant displeasure of the Protestant princes. Philip of Hesse . . . excited general alarm by abruptly breaking off the transactions, lately entered upon between the princes and the bishops, and suddenly quitting Augsburg. Charles V. now ordered the controverted points to be discussed in his presence, and appointed seven Protestants and an equal number of Catholics to put forward and defend the views of their respective parties." Subsequently Melanc-

thon "prepared and published his 'Apology for the Augsburg Confession,' which was intended to be an answer to the 'Confutation' of the Catholic theologians. The Protestant princes laid a copy of the 'Apology' before the emperor, who rejected both it and the Confession. . . . After many more fruitless attempts to bring about a reconciliation, the emperor, on the 22nd of September, the day previous to that fixed for the departure of the Elector of Saxony, published an edict, in which he stated, among other things, that 'the Protestants have been refuted by sound and irrefragable arguments drawn from Holy Scripture.' 'To deny free-will,' he went on to say, 'and to affirm that faith without works avails for man's salvation, is to assert what is absurdly erroneous; for, as we very well know from past experience, were such doctrines to prevail, all true morality would perish from the earth. But that the Protestants may have sufficient time to consider their future course of action, we grant them from this to the 15th of April of next year for consideration.' On the following day, Joachim, Elector of Brandenburg, speaking in the emperor's name, addressed the evangelic princes and deputies of the Protestant cities as follows: 'His majesty is extremely amazed at your persisting in the assertion that your doctrines are based on Holy Scripture. Were your assertion true, then would it follow that his Majesty's ancestors, including so many kings and emperors, as well as the ancestors of the Elector of Saxony, were heretics!' . . . The Protestant princes forthwith took their leave of the emperor. On the 13th of October, the 'Recess,' or decree of the Diet, was read to the Catholic States, which on the same day entered into a Catholic League. On the 17th of the same month, sixteen of the more important German cities refused to aid the emperor in repelling the Turks, on the ground that peace had not yet been secured to Germany. The Zwinglian and Lutheran cities were daily becoming more sympathetic and cordial in their relations to each other. Charles V. informed the Holy See, October 23, of his intention of drawing the sword in defence of the faith. The 'Recess' was read to the Protestant princes November 11, and rejected by them on the day following, and the deputies of Hesse and Saxony took their departure immediately after. . . . The decree was rather more severe than the Protestants had anticipated, inasmuch as the emperor declared that he felt it to be his conscientious duty to defend the ancient faith, and that 'the Catholic princes had promised to aid him to the full extent of their power.' . . . The appointment of the emperor's brother, Ferdinand, as King of the Romans (1531), gave deep offence to the Protestant princes, who now expressed their determination of withholding all assistance from the emperor until the 'Recess' of Augsburg should have been revoked. Assembling at Smalkald, . . . they entered into an alliance offensive and defensive, known as the League of Smalkald, on March 29, 1531, to which they severally bound themselves to remain faithful for a period of six years."—J. Alzog, *Manual of Universal Church Hist., sect.* 312 (*v.* 3).

Also in: H. Worsley, *Life of Luther, ch.* 7 (*v.* 2).—F. A. Cox, *Life of Melancthon, ch.* 8 (giving the text of the "Augsburg Confession").—See, also, Germany: A. D. 1530–1532.

A. D. 1530-1532. — Protestant League of Smalkalde and alliance with the king of France.—The Pacification of Nuremberg. See Germany: A. D. 1530–1532.

A. D. 1533.—Treaty of Pope Clement VII. with Francis I. of France, for the marriage of Catherine d' Medici. See France: A. D. 1532–1547.

A. D. 1533-1546.—Mercenary aspects of the Reformation in Germany.—The Catholic Holy League.—Preparations for war. See Germany: A. D. 1533–1546.

A. D. 1534.—Election of Paul III.

A. D. 1534-1540.—Beginnings of the Counter-Reformation.—"A well-known sentence in Macaulay's Essay on Ranke's 'History of the Popes' asserts, correctly enough, that in a particular epoch of history 'the Church of Rome, having lost a large part of Europe, not only ceased to lose, but actually regained nearly half of what she had lost.' Any fairly correct use of the familiar phrase 'the Counter-Reformation' must imply that this remarkable result was due to a movement pursuing two objects, originally distinct, though afterwards largely blended, viz., the regeneration of the Church of Rome, and the recovery of the losses inflicted upon her by the early successes of Protestantism. . . . The earliest continuous endeavour to regenerate the Church of Rome without impairing her cohesion dates from the Papacy of Paul III. [1534–1549], within which also falls the outbreak of the first religious war of the century [see Germany: A. D. 1546–1552]. Thus the two impulses which it was the special task of the Counter-Reformation to fuse were brought into immediate contact. The onset of the combat is marked by the formal establishment of the Jesuit Order [1540] as a militant agency devoted alike to both the purposes of the Counter-Reformation, and by the meeting of the Council of Trent [1545] under conditions excluding from its programme the task of conciliation."—A. W. Ward, *The Counter Reformation, pp. vii–viii.*—"I intend to use this term Counter-Reformation to denote the reform of the Catholic Church, which was stimulated by the German Reformation, and which, when the Council of Trent had fixed the dogmas and discipline of Latin Christianity, enabled the Papacy to assume a militant policy in Europe, whereby it regained a large portion of the provinces that had previously lapsed to Lutheran and Calvinistic dissent. . . . The centre of the world-wide movement which is termed the Counter-Reformation was naturally Rome. Events had brought the Holy See once more into a position of prominence. It was more powerful as an Italian State now, through the support of Spain and the extinction of national independence, than at any previous period of history. In Catholic Christendom its prestige was immensely augmented by the Council of Trent. At the same epoch, the foreigners who dominated Italy, threw themselves with the enthusiasm of fanaticism into this Revival. Spain furnished Rome with the militia of the Jesuits and with the engines of the Inquisition. The Papacy was thus able to secure successes in Italy which were elsewhere only partially achieved. . . . In order to understand the transition of Italy from the Renaissance to the Counter-Reformation manner, it will be well to concentrate attention on the history of the Papacy

during the eight reigns [1534–1605] of Paul III., Julius III., Paul IV., Pius IV., Pius V., Gregory XIII., Sixtus V., and Clement VIII. In the first of these reigns we hardly notice that the Renaissance has passed away. In the last we are aware of a completely altered Italy."—J. A. Symonds, *Renaissance in Italy: The Catholic Reaction, ch.* 2, *with foot-note* (*v.* 1).

A. D. 1537-1563.—Popular weakness of the Reformation movement in Italy.—Momentary inclination towards the Reform at Rome.—Beginning of the Catholic Reaction.—The Council of Trent and its consolidating work.—"The conflict with the hierarchy did not take the same form in Italy as elsewhere. . . . There is no doubt that the masses saw no cause for discontent under it. We have proof that the hierarchy was popular—that among the people, down to the lowest grades, the undiminished splendour of the Papacy was looked upon as a pledge of the power of Italy. But this did not prevent reform movements from taking place. The Humanistic school had its home here; its opposition tendencies had not spared the Church any more than Scholasticism; it had everywhere been the precursor and ally of the intellectual revolt, and not the least in Italy. There were from the first eminent individuals at Venice, Modena, Ferrara, Florence, even in the States of the Church themselves, who were more or less followers of Luther. The cardinals Contarini and Morone, Bembo and Sadolet, distinguished preachers like Peter Martyr, Johann Valdez, and Bernardino Occhino, and from among the princely families an intellectual lady, Renata of Ferrara, were inclined to the new doctrines. But they were leaders without followers; the number of their adherents among the masses was surprisingly small. The Roman Curia, under the Pontificate of Paul III.,1534–49, vacillated in its policy for a time; between 1537–41, the prevailing sentiments were friendly and conciliatory towards Reform. . . . They were, in fact, gravely entertaining the question at Rome, whether it would not be better to come to terms with Reform, to adopt the practicable part of its programme, and so put an end to the schism which was spreading so fast in the Church. . . . An honest desire then still prevailed to effect a reconciliation. Contarini was in favour of it with his whole soul. But it proceeded no further than the attempt; for once the differences seemed likely to be adjusted, so far as this was possible; but in 1542, the revulsion took place, which was never again reversed. Only one result remained. The Pope could no longer refuse to summon a council. The Emperor had been urging it year after year; the Pope had acceded to it further than any of his predecessors had done; and, considering the retreat which now took place, this concession was the least that could be demanded. At length, therefore, three years after it was convened, in May, 1542, the council assembled at Trent in December, 1545. It was the Emperor's great desire that a council should be held in Germany, that thus the confidence of the Germans in the supreme tribunal in the great controversy might be gained; but the selection of Trent, which nominally belonged to Germany, was the utmost concession that could be obtained. The intentions of the Emperor and the Pope with regard to the council were entirely opposed to each other. The Pope was determined to stifle all opposition in the bud, while the Emperor was very desirous of having a counterpoise to the Pope's supremacy in council, provided always that it concurred in the imperial programme. . . . The assembly consisted of Spanish and Italian monks in overwhelming majority, and this was decisive as to its character. When consulted as to the course of business, the Emperor had expressed a wish that those questions on which agreement between the parties was possible should first be discussed. There were a number of questions on which they were agreed, as, for example, Greek Christianity. Even now there are a number of points on which Protestants and Catholics are agreed, and differ from the Eastern Church. If these questions were considered first, the attendance of the Protestants would be rendered very much easier; it would open the door as widely as possible, they would probably come in considerable numbers, and might in time take a part which at least might not be distasteful to the Emperor, and might influence his ideas on Church reform. The thought that they were heretics was half concealed. But Rome was determined to pursue the opposite course, and at once to agitate those questions on which there was the most essential disagreement, and to declare all who would not submit to be incorrigible heretics. . . . The first subjects of discussion were, the authority of the Scriptures in the text of the Vulgate, ecclesiastical tradition, the right of interpretation, the doctrine of justification. These were the questions on which the old and new doctrines were irreconcilably at variance; all other differences were insignificant in comparison. And these questions were decided in the old Roman Catholic sense; not precisely as they had been officially treated in 1517—for the stream of time had produced some little effect—but in the main the old statutes were adhered to, and everything rejected which departed from them. This conduct was decisive. . . . Nevertheless some reforms were carried out. Between the time of meeting and adjournment, December, 1545, to the spring of 1547, the following were the main points decided on:—1. The bishops were to provide better teachers and better schools. 2. The bishops should themselves expound the word of God. 3. Penalties were to be enforced for the neglect of their duties, and various rules were laid down as to the necessary qualifications for the office of a bishop. Dispensations, licenses, and privileges were abolished. The Church was therefore to be subjected to a reform which abolished sundry abuses, without conceding any change in her teaching. The course the council was taking excited the Emperor's extreme displeasure. . . . He organized a sort of opposition to Rome; his commissaries kept up a good understanding with the Protestants, and it was evident that he meant to make use of them for an attack on the Pope. This made Rome eager to withdraw the assembly from the influence of German bishops and imperial agents as soon as possible. A fever which had broken out at Trent, but had soon disappeared, was made a pretext for transferring the council to Bologna, in the spring of 1547. The imperial commissioners protested that the decrees of such a hole-and-corner council would be null and void. The contest remained undecided for years. Paul III. died in the midst of it, in November, 1549, and was succeeded by Cardinal del

CENTRAL EUROPE
AT THE ABDICATION OF CHARLES V (1556)
AUSTRIAN HABSBURGS
SPANISH HABSBURGS
VENETIAN POSSESSIONS
GENOESE POSSESSIONS
ECCLESIASTICAL STATES OF THE EMPIRE
STATES OF THE CHURCH
THE BOUNDARY OF THE EMPIRE IS SHOWN BY THE HEAVY RED LINE.
K. OF DENMARK
SCHLESWIG
HOLSTEIN
DUCHIES OF POMERANIA
MECKLENBURG
ELEC. OF BRANDENBURG
POLAND
EAST FRIESLAND
OLDENBURG
BREMEN
BISHOPRIC
FRIESLAND
GRONINGEN
OVERYSSEL
HOLLAND
ZEELAND
UTRECHT
GELDERLAND
MUNSTER
CLEVES
PADERBORN
WESTPHALIA
DUCHY OF BRUNSWICK
ABP. MAGDEBURG
HALBERSTADT
ELEC. OF SAXONY
SILESIA
FLANDERS
BRABANT
LIEGE
LUXEMBURG
HAINAULT
ARTOIS
DY. OF LUXEMBURG
DY. OF SAXONY
KINGDOM OF BOHEMIA
MORAVIA
PALATINATE
BAVARIA
ANSBACH
BAYREUTH
WURTEMBG
STRASBURG
AUSTRIA
SUNDGAU
CONSTANZ
SWISS CONFEDERATION
TYROL
SALZBURG
CARINTHIA
CARNIOLA
FRANCHE COMTE
DUCHY OF MILAN
REPUBLIC OF VENICE
DUCHY OF PARMA
DUCHY OF MODENA
DUCHY OF FLORENCE
REP. SIENA
STATI DEGLI PRESIDII
STATES OF THE CHURCH
KINGDOM OF NAPLES
SARDINIA
CORSICA
FRANCE
SPAIN
SAVOY
PRINCIPALITY OF PIEDMONT
GENOA
Paris
Rome
Naples
Vienna
Prague
Brussels
Amsterdam
Berlin
Hamburg
Munich
Dresden
Venice
Milan
Florence
Genoa
Lyons
Marseilles
Nice
Avignon
Orleans
Metz
Strasburg
Augsburg
Innsbruck
Trieste
Beneventa
Zurich
Bern
Basle
Besancon
Turin
Verona
Mantua
Parma
Modena
Ferrara
Pisa
Siena
Urbino
Ancona
Rimini
Ravenna
Bologna
Trent
Salzburg
Ratisbon
Nuremberg
Frankfort
Cologne
Treves
Mayence
Worms
Spires
Heidelberg
Wittenberg
Leipsic
Breslau
Posen
Danube
Rhine
Seine
Loire
Rhone
Meuse
Somme
Oise
Moselle
Po
Arno
Tiber
Save
Drave
Inn
Elbe
Oder
Weser
Ems
Maese
Scheldt
Aar
Ticino
Adige
Brenta
Piave
Tagliamento
Isonzo
Arno
Tiber
Volturno
Garigliano
Sangro
Ofanto
Aufidus
Tarentum
Brundusium
Otranto
Gulf of Venice
Gulf of Genoa
Gulf of Lyons
Gulf of Naples
Gulf of Tarentum
Gulf of Otranto
Lake Constance
Lake Geneva
Lake Como
Lake Garda
Lake Maggiore
Lake Lugano
Lake Iseo
Lake Trasimene
Lake Bolsena
Lake Vadimon
Lake Fucino
Lake Celano
Lake Averno
Lake Agnano
Lake Lucrino
Lake Fusaro
Lake Patria
Lake Licola
Lake Varano
Lake Lesina
Lake Salpi
Lake Orbitello
Lake Bracciano
Lake Vico
Lake Albano
Lake Nemi
Lake Garigliano
Lake Fondi
Lake Sabaudia
Lake Paola
Lake Terracina
Lake Lentini
Lake Pantano
Lake Lucrino
Lake Fusaro
Lake Patria
Lake Licola
Lake Varano
Lake Lesina
Lake Salpi
Lake Orbitello
Lake Bracciano
Lake Vico
Lake Albano
Lake Nemi
Lake Garigliano
Lake Fondi
Lake Sabaudia
Lake Paola
Lake Terracina
Lake Lentini
Lake Pantano


CENTRAL EUROPE
SHOWING THE DISTRIBUTION OF RELIGIONS ABOUT 1618.
REFORMED SECTS.
LUTHERAN
ZWINGLIAN
CALVINIST
UNITED BRETHREN
CATHOLIC
LANDS RECLAIMED BY THE CATHOLIC CHURCH
DURING THE COUNTER REFORMATION SHOWN THUS)
GREEK
MOHAMMEDAN
K. OF DENMARK
SCHLESWIG
HOLSTEIN
Schleswig
Kiel
Lubeck
Wismar
Hamburg
Lauenburg
MECKLENBURG
Stralsund
DUCHIE of Pomerania
Wagest
Colberg
Danzig
Thorn
Vistula
K'GDM of POLAND
Posen
Gnesen
BP. BREMEN
Bremen
Verden
Luneburg
ELEC. of BRANDENBURG
Berlin
Brunswick
ABP MAGDEBURG
Magdeburg
HALBERST
RIVAL
Cottbus
Liegnitz
Breslau
Oder
Oppeln
LUSATIA
SILESIA
BISHOPRIC
Osnaburg
Munster
MUNSTER
CLEVES
D. WEST-PHALIA
PADERBORN
Ville
ELEC. Leipzig of SAXONY
Dresden
Gotha
Eisenach
Weimar
SAXONY
Meiningen
Kassel
Fulda
Frankfurt
Hanau
Worms
Speyer
Eger
KINGDOM of BOHEMIA
Prague
Pilsen
Amiens
Soissons
Rheims
Paris
Verdun
Chalons
Metz
Strasburg
Zabern
Bamberg
Wurtzburg
UPPER PALATINATE
Ansbach
Ratisbon
Regensburg
Budweis
MORAVIA
Brunn
Danube
Linz
Vienna
Pressburg
Passau
Augsburg
Munich
Inn
AUSTRIA
Salzburg
ABP of SALZBURG
Innsbruck
TYROL
Kufstein
Brixen
Trent
Belluno
Udine
Save
Villach
Klagenfurt
CARINTHIA
STYRIA
Gratz
CARNIOLA
Trieste
Laybach
Nevers
Besancon
Constance
Zurich
SWISS CONFEDERATION
Charolais
Geneva
Lyons
Savoy
Aosta
Ivrea
DUCHY of Milan
MILAN
Turin
Piedmont
Genoa
Verona
Venice
Polato
Ravenna
Rimini
San Marino
Arezzo
Florence
Pisa
Lucca
Siena
GRAND DUCHY of TUSCANY
DUCHY of PARMA
DUCHY of MODENA
STATES of the CHURCH
Rome
CORSICA
SARDINIA
K'GDM of NAPLES
Benevento
Naples
Avignon
Arles
Nice
Rhone
FRANCE
SPAIN
NETHERLANDS
Utrecht
Amsterdam
Ghent
Antwerp
Namur
Liege
Cologne
Juliers
Treves
Metz
Luxemburg
Arras
Bp. of Strasburg
Duchy of Lorraine
Abp. of Treves
Palatinate of the Rhine
Duchy of Wurtemburg
Duchy of Bavaria
Sundgau
Franche Comte
Duchy of Savoy
Prin. of Piedmont
Duchy of Milan
Duchy of Parma
Duchy of Modena
Republic of Venice
Duchy of Carniola
Duchy of Styria
Kingdom of Hungary
Croatia
Dalmatia
Turkey
Duchy of Brabant
Duchy of Gelderland
Duchy of Cleves
Duchy of Juliers
Duchy of Luxemburg
Duchy of Lorraine
Duchy of Wurtemburg
Duchy of Bavaria
Duchy of Austria
Duchy of Styria
Duchy of Carinthia
Duchy of Carniola
Duchy of Tyrol
Duchy of Salzburg
Duchy of Brixen
Duchy of Trent
Duchy of Milan
Duchy of Parma
Duchy of Modena
Duchy of Tuscany
Duchy of Naples
Duchy of Sardinia
Duchy of Corsica
Duchy of Rome
Duchy of Venice
Duchy of Savoy
Duchy of Piedmont
Duchy of Genoa
Duchy of Monaco
Duchy of Lucca
Duchy of Siena
Duchy of Florence
Duchy of Pisa
Duchy of Arezzo
Duchy of Rimini
Duchy of Ravenna
Duchy of Polato
Duchy of Verona
Duchy of Mantua
Duchy of Ferrara
Duchy of Modena
Duchy of Parma
Duchy of Milan
Duchy of Savoy
Duchy of Piedmont
Duchy of Genoa
Duchy of Monaco
Duchy of Lucca
Duchy of Siena
Duchy of Florence
Duchy of Pisa
Duchy of Arezzo
Duchy of Rimini
Duchy of Ravenna
Duchy of Polato
Duchy of Verona
Duchy of Mantua
Duchy of Ferrara
2
4
6
8
10
12
14
16
18
54
52
50
48
46
44
42

Monte, one of the papal legates at the council, as Pope Julius III. The Emperor at length came to an understanding with him, and in May, 1551, the council was again opened at Trent. . . . The assembly remained Catholic; the Protestant elements, which were represented at first, all disappeared after the turn of affairs in 1552 [see GERMANY: A. D. 1546–1552; and 1552–1561]. After that there was no further thought of an understanding with the heretics. The results for reform were very small indeed. The proceedings were dragging wearily on when a fresh adjournment was announced in 1552. Pope Julius III. died in March, 1555. His successor, the noble Cardinal Cervin, elected as Marcellus II., died after only twenty-two days, and was succeeded by Cardinal Caraffa as Paul IV., 1555–9. . . . He was the Pope of the restoration. The warm Neapolitan blood flowed in his veins, and he was a fiery, energetic character. He was not in favour of any concessions or abatement, but for a complete breach with the new doctrines, and a thorough exclusiveness for the ancient Church. He was one of the ablest men of the time. As early as in 1542, he had advised that no further concessions should be made, but that the Inquisition, of which indeed he was the creator, should be restored. It was he who decidedly initiated the great Catholic reaction. He established the Spanish Inquisition in Italy, instituted the first Index, and gave the Jesuits his powerful support in the interests of the restoration. This turn of affairs was the answer to the German religious Peace. Since the Protestants no longer concerned themselves about Rome, Rome was about to set her house in order without them, and as a matter of course the council stood still." But in answer to demands from several Catholic princes, "the council was convened afresh by the next Pope, Pius IV. (1559–65), in November, 1560, and so the Council of Trent was opened for the third time in January, 1562. Then began the important period of the council, during which the legislation to which it has given a name was enacted. . . . The Curia reigned supreme, and, in spite of the remonstrances of the Emperor and of France, decided that the council should be considered a continuation of the previous ones, which meant—'All the decrees aimed against the Protestants are in full force; we have no further idea of coming to terms with them.' The next proceeding was to interdict books and arrange an Index [see below: A. D. 1559–1595]. . . . The restoration of the indisputable authority of the Pope was the ruling principle of all the decrees. . . . The great achievement of the council for the unity of the Catholic Church was this: it formed into a code of laws, on one consistent principle, that which in ancient times had been variable and uncertain, and which had been almost lost sight of in the last great revolution. Controverted questions were replaced by dogmas, doubtful traditions by definite doctrines; a uniformity was established in matters of faith and discipline which had never existed before, and an impregnable bulwark was thus erected against the sectarian spirit and the tendency to innovation. Still when this unity was established upon a solid basis, the universal Church of former times was torn asunder." The Council of Trent was closed December 4, 1563, 18 years after its opening.—L. Häusser, *Period of the Reformation, ch.* 19 *and* 16.

ALSO IN: J. A. Symonds, *Renaissance in Italy: The Catholic Reaction, ch.* 2–3 (*v.* 1).—L. von Ranke, *Hist. of the Popes, bk.* 2–3 (*v.* 1).—L. F. Bungener, *Hist. of the Council of Trent.*—T. R. Evans, *The Council of Trent.*—A. de Reumont, *The Carafas of Maddaloni, bk.* 1, *ch.* 3.

A. D. 1540.—The founding of the Order of the Jesuits. See JESUITS: A. D. 1540–1556.

A. D. 1545-1550.—Separation of Parma and Placentia from the States of the Church to form a duchy for the Pope's family.—The Farnese. See PARMA: A. D. 1545–1592.

A. D. 1550.—Election of Julius III.

A. D. 1555 (April).—Election of Marcellus II.

A. D. 1555 (May).—Election of Paul IV.

A. D. 1555-1603.—The aggressive age of the reinvigorated Church.—Attachment and subserviency to Spain.—Giovanni Piero Caraffa, founder of the Order of the Theatines, was raised to the papal chair in 1555, assuming the title of Paul IV. He "entered on his station with the haughty notions of its prerogatives which were natural to his austere and impetuous spirit. Hence his efforts in concert with France, unsuccessful as they proved, to overthrow the Spanish greatness, that he might extricate the popedom from the galling state of dependence to which the absolute ascendancy of that power in Italy had reduced it. Paul IV. is remarkable as the last pontiff who embarked in a contest which had now become hopeless, and as the first who, giving a new direction to the policy of the holy see, employed all the influence, the arts, and the resources of the Roman church against the protestant cause. He had, during the pontificate of Paul III. [1534–1549], already made himself conspicuous for his persecuting zeal. He had been the principal agent in the establishment of the inquisition at Rome, and had himself filled the office of grand inquisitor. He seated himself in the chair of St. Peter with the detestable spirit of that vocation; and the character of his pontificate responded to the violence of his temper. His mantle descended upon a long series of his successors. Pius IV., who replaced him on his death in 1559; Pius V., who received the tiara in the following year; Gregory XIII., who was elected in 1572, and died in 1585; Sixtus V., who next reigned until 1590; Urban VII., Gregory XIV., and Innocent IX., who each filled the papal chair only a few months; and Clement VIII., whose pontificate commenced in 1592 and extended beyond the close of the century [1603]: all pursued the same political and religious system. Resigning the hope, and perhaps the desire, of re-establishing the independence of their see, they maintained an intimate and obsequious alliance with the royal bigot of Spain; they seconded his furious persecution of the protestant faith; they fed the civil wars of the Low Countries, of France, and of Germany."—G. Procter, *Hist. of Italy, ch.* 9.—"The Papacy and Catholicism had long maintained themselves against these advances of their enemy [the Protestant Reformation], in an attitude of defence it is true, but passive only; upon the whole they were compelled to endure them. Affairs now assumed a different aspect. . . . It may be affirmed generally that a vital and active force was again manifested, that the church had regenerated her creed in the spirit of the age, and had established reforms in accordance with the demands of the times. The religious tendencies which had

appeared in southern Europe were not suffered to become hostile to herself, she adopted them, and gained the mastery of their movements; thus she renewed her powers, and infused fresh vigour into her system. . . . The influence of the restored Catholic system was first established in the two southern peninsulas, but this was not accomplished without extreme severities. The Spanish Inquisition received the aid of that lately revived in Rome; every movement of Protestantism was violently suppressed. But at the same time those tendencies of the inward life which renovated Catholicism claimed and enchained as her own, were peculiarly powerful in those countries. The sovereigns also attached themselves to the interests of the church. It was of the highest importance that Philip II., the most powerful of all, adhered so decidedly to the popedom; with the pride of a Spaniard, by whom unimpeachable Catholicism was regarded as a sign of a purer blood and more noble descent, he rejected every adverse opinion: the character of his policy was however not wholly governed by mere personal feeling. From remote times, and more especially since the regulations established by Isabella, the kingly dignity of Spain had assumed an ecclesiastical character; in every province the royal authority was strengthened by the addition of spiritual power; deprived of the Inquisition, it would not have sufficed to govern the kingdom. Even in his American possessions, the king appeared above all in the light of a disseminator of the Christian and Catholic faith. This was the bond by which all his territories were united in obedience to his rule; he could not have abandoned it, without incurring real danger. The extension of Huguenot opinions in the south of France caused the utmost alarm in Spain; the Inquisition believed itself bound to redoubled vigilance. . . . The power possessed by Philip in the Netherlands secured to the southern system an immediate influence over the whole of Europe; but besides this, all was far from being lost in other countries. The emperor, the kings of France and Poland, with the duke of Bavaria, still adhered to the Catholic church. On all sides there were spiritual princes whose expiring zeal might be reanimated; there were also many places where Protestant opinions had not yet made their way among the mass of the people. The majority of the peasantry throughout France, Poland, and even Hungary, still remained Catholic. Paris, which even in those days exercised a powerful influence over the other French towns, had not yet been affected by the new doctrines. In England a great part of the nobility and commons were still Catholic; and in Ireland the whole of the ancient native population remained in the old faith. Protestantism had gained no admission into the Tyrolese or Swiss Alps, nor had it made any great progress among the peasantry of Bavaria. Canisius compared the Tyrolese and Bavarians with the two tribes, of Israel, 'who alone remained faithful to the Lord.' The internal causes on which this pertinacity, this immovable attachment to tradition, among nations so dissimilar, was founded, might well repay a more minute examination. A similar constancy was exhibited in the Walloon provinces of the Netherlands. And now the papacy resumed a position in which it could once more gain the mastery of all these inclinations, and bind them indissolubly to itself. Although it had experienced great changes, it still possessed the inestimable advantage of having all the externals of the past and the habit of obedience on its side. In the council so prosperously concluded, the popes had even gained an accession of that authority which it had been the purpose of the temporal powers to restrict; and had strengthened their influence over the national churches; they had moreover abandoned that temporal policy by which they had formerly involved Italy and all Europe in confusion. They attached themselves to Spain with perfect confidence and without any reservations, fully returning the devotion evinced by that kingdom to the Roman church. The Italian principality, the enlarged dominions of the pontiff, contributed eminently to the success of his ecclesiastical enterprises; while the interests of the universal Catholic church were for some time essentially promoted by the overplus of its revenues. Thus strengthened internally, thus supported by powerful adherents, and by the idea of which they were the representatives, the popes exchanged the defensive position, with which they had hitherto been forced to content themselves, for that of assailants."—L. von Ranke, *Hist. of the Popes, bk.* 5, *sect.* 2 (*v.* 1).

A. D. 1559.—Election of Pius IV.

A. D. 1559-1595.—The institution of the Index.—"The first 'Index' of prohibited books published by Papal authority, and therefore, unlike the 'catalogi' previously issued by royal, princely, or ecclesiastical authorities, valid for the whole Church, was that authorised by a bull of Paul IV. in 1559. In 1564 followed the Index published by Pius IV., as drawn up in harmony with the decrees of the Council of Trent, which, after all, appears to be a merely superficial revision of its predecessor. Other Indices followed, for which various authorities were responsible, the most important among them being the Index Expurgatorius, sanctioned by a bull of Clement VIII. in 1595, which proved so disastrous to the great printing trade of Venice."—A. W. Ward, *The Counter-Reformation, ch.* 2.

A. D. 1566.—Election of Pius V.

A. D. 1570-1571.—Holy League with Venice and Spain against the Turks.—Great battle and victory of Lepanto. See TURKS: A. D. 1566–1571.

A. D. 1572 (May).—Election of Gregory XIII.

A. D. 1572.—Reception of the news of the Massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day. See FRANCE: A. D. 1572 (AUGUST—OCTOBER).

A. D. 1585.—Election of Sixtus V.

A. D. 1585.—The Bull against Henry of Navarre, called "Brutum Fulmen." See FRANCE: A. D. 1584–1589.

A. D. 1590 (September).—Election of Urban VII.

A. D. 1590 (December).—Election of Gregory XIV.

A. D. 1591.—Election of Innocent IX.

A. D. 1591.—Election of Clement VIII.

A. D. 1597.—Annexation of Ferrara to the States of the Church.—"The loss which the papal states sustained by the alienation of Parma and Placentia was repaired, before the end of the 16th century, by the acquisition of a duchy little inferior in extent to those territories:—that of Ferrara." With the death, in 1597, of

Alfonso II., the persecutor of Tasso, "terminated the legitimate Italian branch of the ancient and illustrious line of Este. But there remained an illegitimate representative of his house, whom he designed for his successor; don Cesare da Este, the grandson of Alfonso I. by a natural son of that duke. The inheritance of Ferrara and Modena had passed in the preceding century to bastards, without opposition from the popes, the feudal superiors of the former duchy. But the imbecile character of don Cesare now encouraged the reigning pontiff, Clement VIII., to declare that all the ecclesiastical fiefs of the house of Este reverted, of right, to the holy see on the extinction of the legitimate line. The papal troops, on the death of Alfonso II., invaded the Ferrarese state; and Cesare suffered himself to be terrified by their approach into an ignominious and formal surrender of that duchy to the holy see. By the indifference of the Emperor Rodolph II., he was permitted to retain the investiture of the remaining possessions of his ancestors: the duchies of Modena and Reggio, over which, as imperial and not papal fiefs, the pope could not decently assert any right. In passing beneath the papal yoke, the duchy of Ferrara, which, under the government of the house of Este, had been one of the most fertile provinces of Italy, soon became a desert and marshy waste. The capital itself lost its industrious population and commercial riches; its architectural magnificence crumbled into ruins, and its modern aspect retains no trace of that splendid court in which literature and art repaid the fostering protection of its sovereigns, by reflecting lustre on their heads."—G. Procter, *Hist. of Italy, ch.* 9.

A. D. 1605 (April).—Election of Leo XI.

A. D. 1605 (May).—Election of Paul V.

A. D. 1605-1700.—The conflict with Venice.—Opposition of Urban VIII. to the Emperor.—Annexation of Urbino to the States of the Church.—Half a century of unimportant history.—"Paul V. (1605–1621) was imbued with mediæval ideas as to the papal authority and the validity of the canon-law. These speedily brought him into collision with the secular power, especially in Venice, which had always maintained an attitude of independence towards the papacy. Ecclesiastical disputes [growing out of a Venetian decree forbidding alienations of secular property in favor of the churches] were aggravated by the fact that the acquisition of Ferrara had extended the papal states to the frontiers of Venice, and that frequent differences arose as to the boundary line between them. The defence of the republic and of the secular authority in church affairs was undertaken with great zeal and ability by Fra Paoli Sarpi, the famous historian of the Council of Trent. Paul V. did not hesitate to excommunicate the Venetians [1606], but the government compelled the clergy to disregard the pope's edict. The Jesuits, Theatines, and Capuchins were the only orders that adhered to the papacy, and they had to leave the city. If Spain had not been under the rule of the pacific Lerma, it would probably have seized the opportunity to punish Venice for its French alliance. But France and Spain were both averse to war, and Paul V. had to learn that the papacy was powerless without secular support. By the mediation of the two great powers, a compromise was arranged in 1607. The Jesuits, however, remained excluded from Venetian territory for another half-century. This was the first serious reverse encountered by the Catholic reaction [see VENICE: A. D. 1606–1607]. . . . The attention of the Catholic world was now absorbed in the Austrian schemes for the repression of Protestantism in Germany, which received the unhesitating support both of Paul and of his successor, Gregory XV. [1621–1623]. The latter was a great patron of the Jesuits. Under him the Propaganda was first set on foot. . . . The pontificate of Urban VIII. (1623–1644) was a period of great importance. He regarded himself rather as a temporal prince than as head of the Church. He fortified Rome and filled his states with troops. The example of Julius II. seemed to find an imitator. Urban was imbued with the old Italian jealousy of the imperial power, and allied himself closely with France. . . . At the moment when Ferdinand II. had gained his greatest success in Germany he was confronted with the hostility of the pope. Gustavus Adolphus landed in Germany, and by a strange coincidence Protestantism found support in the temporal interests of the papacy. The Catholics were astounded and dismayed by Urban's attitude. . . . Urban VIII. succeeded in making an important addition to the papal states by the annexation of Urbino, in 1631, on the death of Francesco Maria, the last duke of the Della Rovere family. But in the government of the states he met with great difficulties. . . . Urban VIII.'s relatives, the Barberini, quarreled with the Farnesi, who had held Parma and Piacenza since the pontificate of Paul III. The pope was induced to claim the district of Castro, and this claim aroused a civil war (1641–1644) in which the papacy was completely worsted. Urban was forced to conclude a humiliating treaty and directly afterwards died. His successors [Innocent X., 1644–1655; Alexander VII., 1655–1667; Clement IX., 1667–1669; Clement X., 1670–1676; Innocent XI., 1676–1689; Alexander VIII., 1689–1691; Innocent XII., 1691–1700] are of very slight importance to the history of Europe. . . . The only important questions in which the papacy was involved in the latter half of the century were the schism of the Jansenists and the relations with Louis XIV."—R. Lodge, *Hist. of Modern Europe, ch.* 12.

ALSO IN: J. E. Darras, *General Hist. of the Catholic Church, period* 7, *ch.* 7; *period* 8, *ch.* 1–3 (*v.* 4).—T. A. Trollope, *Paul the Pope and Paul the Friar.*—A. Robertson, *Fra Paolo Sarpi.*

A. D. 1621.—Election of Gregory XV.

A. D. 1622.—Founding of the College of the Propaganda.—Cardinal Alexander Ludovisio, elected pope on the 9th of February, 1621, taking the name of Gregory XV., "had always shown the greatest zeal for the conversion of infidels and heretics; this zeal inspired the design of founding the College of the Propaganda (1622). The origin of the Propaganda is properly to be traced to an edict of Gregory XIII., in virtue of which a certain number of cardinals were charged with the direction of missions to the East, and catechisms were ordered to be printed in the less-known languages. But the institution was neither firmly established nor provided with the requisite funds. Gregory XV. gave it a constitution, contributed the necessary funds from his private purse, and as it

met a want the existence of which was really felt and acknowledged, its success was daily more and more brilliant. Who does not know what the Propaganda has done for philological learning? But it chiefly labored, with admirable grandeur of conception and energy, to fulfil its great mission — the propagation of the Catholic faith — with the most splendid results. Urban VIII., the immediate successor of Gregory XV., completed the work by the addition of the 'Collegium de Propaganda Fide,' where youth are trained in the study of all the foreign languages, to bear the name of Christ to every nation on the globe."—J. E. Darras, *General Hist. of the Catholic Church, period* 7, *ch.* 7, *sect.* 10 (*v.* 4).

A. D. 1623.—Election of Urban VIII.

A. D. 1623-1626.—The Valtelline War. See FRANCE: A. D. 1624–1626.

A. D. 1644-1667.—Pontificates of Innocent X. and Alexander VII.—Growth of Nepotism. — Sixtus V. had "invented a system of nepotism which was so actively followed up by his successors, that even a short reign provided the means of accumulating a brilliant fortune. That pontiff raised one nephew to the rank of cardinal, with a share of the public business and an ecclesiastical income of a hundred thousand crowns. Another he created a marquess, with large estates in the Neapolitan territory. The house of Ferretti thus founded, long maintained a high position, and was frequently represented in the College of Cardinals. The Aldobrandini, founded in like manner by Clement VIII., the Borghesi by Paul V., the Ludovisi by Gregory XV., and the Barberini by Urban VIII., now vied in rank and opulence with the ancient Roman houses of Colonna and Orsini, who boasted that for centuries no peace had been concluded in Christendom in which they were not expressly included. On the death of Urban VIII. (29th July 1644) the Barberini commanded the votes of eight-and-forty cardinals, the most powerful faction ever seen in the conclave. Still, the other papal families were able to resist their dictation, and the struggle terminated in the election of Cardinal Pamfili, who took the name of Innocent X. During the interval of three months, the city was abandoned to complete lawlessness; assassinations in the streets were frequent; no private house was safe without a military guard, and a whole army of soldiers found occupation in protecting the property of their employers. This was then the usual state of things during an interregnum. Innocent X., though seventy-two years of age at his election, was full of energy. He restrained the disorders in the city. . . . Innocent brought the Barberini to strict account for malpractices under his predecessor, and wrested from them large portions of their ill-gotten gain. So far, however, from reforming the system out of which these abuses sprung, his nepotism exhibited itself in a form which scandalised even the Roman courtiers. The pope brought his sister-in-law, Donna Olimpia Maidalchina, from Viterbo to Rome, and established her in a palace, where she received the first visits of foreign ambassadors on their arrival, gave magnificent entertainments, and dispensed for her own benefit the public offices of the government. . . . Her daughters were married into the noblest families. Her son, having first been appointed the cardinal-nephew, soon after renounced his orders, married, and became the secular-nephew. The struggle for power between his mother and his wife divided Rome into new factions, and the feud was enlarged by the ambition of a more distant kinsman, whom Innocent appointed to the vacant post of cardinal-nephew. The pontiff sank under a deep cloud from the disorders in his family and the palace, and when he died (5th January, 1655) the corpse laid three days uncared for, till an old canon, who had been long dismissed from his household, expended half-a-crown on its interment. . . . Fabio Chigi, who came next as Alexander VIII. [VII.] brought to the tottering chair a spotless reputation, and abilities long proved in the service of the church. His first act was to banish the scandalous widow; her son was allowed to retain her palace and fortune. Beginning with the loudest protestations against nepotism, now the best established institution at Rome, in the phrase of the time, the pope soon 'became a man.' The courtiers remonstrated on his leaving his family to live a plain citizen's life at Siena: it might involve the Holy See in a misunderstanding with Tuscany. . . . The question was gravely proposed in consistory, and the flood-gates being there authoritatively unclosed, the waters of preferment flowed abundantly on all who had the merit to be allied with Fabio Chigi. After discharging this arduous duty, the pope relieved himself of further attention to business, and spent his days in literary leisure. His nephews, however, had less power than formerly, from the growth of the constitutional principle. The cardinals, in their different congregations, with the official secretaries, aspired to the functions of responsible advisers."—G. Trevor, *Rome, from the Fall of the Western Empire, pp.* 416–418.

A. D. 1646.—The Hostility of Mazarin and France. See ITALY: A. D. 1646–1654.

A. D. 1653.—The first condemnation of Jansenism. See PORT ROYAL AND THE JANSENISTS: A. D. 1602–1660.

A. D. 1667.—Election of Clement IX.

A. D. 1670.—Election of Clement X.

A. D. 1676.—Election of Innocent XI.

A. D. 1682-1693.—Successful contest with Louis XIV. and the Gallican Church. —"It has always been the maxim of the French court, that the papal power is to be restricted by means of the French clergy, and that the clergy, on the other hand, are to be kept in due limits by means of the papal power. But never did a prince hold his clergy in more absolute command than Louis XIV. . . . The prince of Condé declared it to be his opinion, that if it pleased the king to go over to the Protestant church, the clergy would be the first to follow him. And certainly the clergy of France did support their king without scruple against the pope. The declarations they published were from year to year increasingly decisive in favour of the royal authority. At length there assembled the convocation of 1682. 'It was summoned and dissolved,' remarks a Venetian ambassador, 'at the convenience of the king's ministers, and was guided by their suggestions.' The four articles drawn up by this assembly have from that time been regarded as the manifesto of the Gallican immunities. The first three repeat assertions of principles laid down in earlier times; as, for example, the independence of the secular power, as regarded the spiritual authority; the superiority

of councils over the pope; and the inviolable character of the Gallican usages. But the fourth is more particularly remarkable, since it imposes new limits even to the spiritual authority of the pontiff. 'Even in questions of faith, the decision of the pope is not incapable of amendment, so long as it is without the assent of the church.' We see that the temporal power of the kingdom received support from the spiritual authority, which was in its turn upheld by the secular arm. The king is declared free from the interference of the pope's temporal authority; the clergy are exempted from submission to the unlimited exercise of his spiritual power. It was the opinion of contemporaries, that although France might remain within the pale of the Catholic church, it yet stood on the threshold, in readiness for stepping beyond it. The king exalted the propositions above named into a kind of 'Articles of Faith,' a symbolical book. All schools were to be regulated in conformity with these precepts; and no man could attain to a degree, either in the juridical or theological faculties, who did not swear to maintain them. But the pope also was still possessed of a weapon. The authors of this declaration — the members of this assembly — were promoted and preferred by the king before all other candidates for episcopal offices; but Innocent refused to grant them spiritual institution. They might enjoy the revenues of those sees, but ordination they did not receive; nor could they venture to exercise one spiritual act of the episcopate. These complications were still further perplexed by the fact that Louis XIV. at that moment resolved on that relentless extirpation of the Huguenots, but too well known, and to which he proceeded chiefly for the purpose of proving his own perfect orthodoxy. He believed himself to be rendering a great service to the church. It has indeed been also affirmed that Innocent XI. was aware of his purpose and had approved it, but this was not the fact. The Roman court would not now hear of conversions effected by armed apostles. 'It was not of such methods that Christ availed himself: men must be led to the temple, not dragged into it.' New dissensions continually arose. In the year 1687, the French ambassador entered Rome with so imposing a retinue, certain squadrons of cavalry forming part of it, that the right of asylum, which the ambassadors claimed at that time, not only for their palace, but also for the adjacent streets, could by no means have been easily disputed with him, although the popes had solemnly abolished the usage. With an armed force the ambassador braved the pontiff in his own capital. 'They come with horses and chariots,' said Innocent, 'but we will walk in the name of the Lord.' He pronounced the censures of the church on the ambassador; and the church of St. Louis, in which the latter had attended a solemn high mass, was laid under interdict. The king also then proceeded to extreme measures. He appealed to a general council, took possession of Avignon, and caused the nuncio to be shut up in St. Olon: it was even believed that he had formed the design of creating for Harlai, archbishop of Paris, who, if he had not suggested these proceedings, had approved them, the appointment of patriarch of France. So far had matters proceeded: the French ambassador in Rome excommunicated; the papal nuncio in France detained by force; thirty-five French bishops deprived of canonical institution; a territory of the Holy See occupied by the king: it was, in fact, the actual breaking out of schism; yet did Pope Innocent refuse to yield a single step. If we ask to what he trusted for support on this occasion, we perceive that it was not to the effect of the ecclesiastical censures in France, nor to the influence of his apostolic dignity, but rather, and above all, to that universal resistance which had been aroused in Europe against those enterprises of Louis XIV. that were menacing the existence of its liberties. To this general opposition the pope now also attached himself. . . . If the pope had promoted the interests of Protestantism by his policy, the Protestants on their side, by maintaining the balance of Europe against the 'exorbitant Power,' also contributed to compel the latter into compliance with the spiritual claims of the papacy. It is true that when this result ensued, Innocent XI. was no longer in existence; but the first French ambassador who appeared in Rome after his death (10th of August, 1689) renounced the right of asylum: the deportment of the king was altered; he restored Avignon, and entered into negotiations. . . . After the early death of Alexander VIII., the French made all possible efforts to secure the choice of a pontiff disposed to measures of peace and conciliation; a purpose that was indeed effected by the elevation of Antonio Pignatelli, who assumed the tiara with the name of Innocent XII., on the 12th of July, 1691. . . . The negotiations continued for two years. Innocent more than once rejected the formulas proposed to him by the clergy of France, and they were, in fact, compelled at length to declare that all measures discussed and resolved on in the assembly of 1682 should be considered as not having been discussed or resolved on: 'casting ourselves at the feet of your holiness, we profess our unspeakable grief for what has been done.' It was not until they had made this unreserved recantation that Innocent accorded them canonical institution. Under these conditions only was peace restored. Louis XIV. wrote to the pope that he retracted his edict relating to the four articles. Thus we perceive that the Roman see once more maintained its prerogatives, even though opposed by the most powerful of monarchs."—L. Ranke, *Hist. of the Popes, bk.* 8, *sect.* 16 (*v.* 2).

A. D. 1689.—Election of Alexander VIII.

A. D. 1691.—Election of Innocent XII.

A. D. 1700.—Election of Clement XI.

A. D. 1700-1790.—Effects of the War of the Spanish Succession. — Declining Powers. — The issue of the War of the Spanish Succession "will serve to show us that when the Pope was not, as in his contest with Louis XIV., favoured by political events, he could no longer laugh to scorn the edicts of European potentates. Charles II. of Spain, that wretched specimen of humanity, weak in body, and still weaker in mind, haunted by superstitious terrors which almost unsettled his reason, was now, in the year 1700, about to descend to a premature grave. He was without male issue, and was uncertain to whom he should bequeath the splendid inheritance transmitted to him by his ancestors. The Pope, Innocent XII., who was wholly in the interests of France, urged him to bequeath Spain, with its dependencies, to Philip, Duke of Anjou, the grandson of Louis XIV., who claimed through his grandmother, the eldest sister of Charles. He would thus pre-

vent the execution of the partition treaty concluded between France, England, and Holland, according to which the Archduke Charles . . . was to have Spain, the Indies, and the Netherlands, while France took the Milanese, or the Province of Lorraine. The Archbishop of Toledo seconded the exhortation of the Pope, and so worked on the superstitious terrors of the dying monarch that he signed a will in favour of the Duke of Anjou, which was the cause of lamentation, and mourning, and woe, for twelve years, throughout Europe, from the Vistula to the Atlantic Ocean [see SPAIN: A. D. 1701–1702; and ENGLAND: A. D. 1701–1702]. . . . The Duke of Marlborough's splendid victories of Blenheim and Ramillies . . . placed the Emperor Joseph (1705–11), the brother of the Archduke Charles, in possession of Germany and the Spanish Netherlands [see GERMANY: A. D. 1704; and NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1706–1707]; and the victory of Prince Eugene before Turin made him supreme in the north of Italy and the kingdom of Naples [see ITALY: A. D. 1701–1713]. The Pope, Clement XI., was now reduced to a most humiliating position. Political events had occurred . . . which served to show very plainly that the Pope, without a protector, could not, as in former days, bid defiance to the monarchs of Europe. His undutiful son, the Emperor, compelled him to resign part of his territories as a security for his peaceful demeanour, and to acknowledge the Archduke Charles, the Austrian claimant to the Spanish throne. The peace of Utrecht, concluded in 1713 [see UTRECHT: A. D. 1712–1714], which produced the dismemberment of the monarchy, but left Philip in the peaceful occupation of the throne of Spain, did indeed release him from that obligation; but it did not restore him to the 'high and palmy state' which he occupied before he was obliged to submit to the Imperial arms. It inflicted a degradation upon him, for it transferred to other sovereigns, without his consent, his fiefs of Sicily and Sardinia. Now, also, it became manifest that the Pope could no longer assert an indirect sovereignty over the Italian States; for, notwithstanding his opposition, it conferred a large extent of territory on the Duke of Savoy, which has, in our day, been expanded into a kingdom under the sceptre of Victor Emmanuel and his successor. We have a further evidence of the decline of the Papacy in the change in the relative position of the States of Europe as Papal and anti-Papal during the eighteenth century, after the death of Louis XIV. The Papal powers of Spain in the sixteenth century, and of France, Spain, and Austria, in the latter half of the seventeenth century, determined the policy of Europe. . . . On the other hand, England, Prussia, and Russia became, in the eighteenth century, the great leading powers in the world. . . . The Pope, then, no longer stood at the head of those powers which swayed the destinies of Europe. . . . The Papacy, from the death of Louis XIV. till the time of the French Revolution, led a very quiet and obscure life. It had no part in any of the great events which during the eighteenth century were agitating Europe, and gained no spiritual or political victories."— A. R. Pennington, *Epochs of the Papacy, ch.* 10.

A. D. 1713.—The Bull Unigenitus and the Christian doctrines it condemned. See PORT ROYAL AND THE JANSENISTS: A. D. 1702–1715.

A. D. 1721.—Election of Innocent XIII.

A. D. 1724.—Election of Benedict XIII.

A. D. 1730.—Election of Clement XII.

A. D. 1740.—Election of Benedict XIV.

A. D. 1758.—Election of Clement XIII.

A. D. 1765-1769.—Defense of the Jesuits, on their expulsion from France, Spain, Parma, Venice, Modena and Bavaria. See JESUITS: A. D. 1761–1769.

A. D. 1769.—Election of Clement XIV.

A. D. 1773.—Suppression of the Jesuits. See JESUITS: A. D. 1769–1871.

A. D. 1775.—Election of Pius VI.

A. D. 1789-1810.—Founding of the Roman Episcopate in the United States of America.—In 1789, the first episcopal see of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States was founded, at Baltimore, by a bull of Pope Pius VI., which appointed Father John Carroll to be its bishop. In 1810, Bishop Carroll "was raised to the dignity of Archbishop, and four suffragan dioceses were created, with their respective sees at Philadelphia, Boston, New York, and Bardstown, in Kentucky."— J. A. Russell, *The Catholic Church in the U. S.* (*Hist. of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, pp.* 16–18).

A. D. 1790-1791.—Revolution at Avignon.—Reunion of the Province with France. See FRANCE: A. D. 1790–1791.

A. D. 1796.—First extortions of Bonaparte from the Pope. See FRANCE: A. D. 1796 (APRIL—OCTOBER).

A. D. 1797.—Treaty of Tolentino.—Papal territory taken by Bonaparte to add to the Cispadane and Cisalpine Republics. See FRANCE: A. D. 1796–1797 (OCTOBER—APRIL).

A. D. 1797-1798.—French occupation of Rome.—Formation of the Roman Republic.—Removal of the Pope. See FRANCE: A. D. 1797–1798 (DECEMBER—MAY).

A. D. 1800.—Election of Pius VII.

A. D. 1802.—The Concordat with Napoleon.—Its Ultramontane influence. See FRANCE: A. D. 1801–1804.

A. D. 1804.—Journey of the Pope to Paris for the coronation of Napoleon. See FRANCE: A. D. 1804–1805.

A. D. 1808-1814.—Conflict of Pius VII. with Napoleon.—French seizure of Rome and the Papal States.—Captivity of the Pope at Savona and Fontainebleau.—The Concordat of 1813 and its retraction.—Napoleon "had long been quarrelling with Pius VII., to make a tool of whom he had imposed the concordat on France. The Pope resisted, as the Emperor might have expected, and, not obtaining the price of his compliance, hindered the latter's plans in every way that he could. He resisted as head of the Church and as temporal sovereign of Rome, refusing to close his dominions either to the English or to Neapolitan refugees of the Bourbon party. Napoleon would not allow the Pope to act as a monarch independent of the Empire, but insisted that he was amenable to the Emperor, as temporal prince, just as his predecessors were amenable to Charlemagne. They could not agree, and Napoleon, losing patience, took military possession of Rome and the Roman State."— H. Martin, *Popular Hist. of France, since* 1789, *v.* 2, *ch.* 12.—In February, 1808, "the French troops, who had already taken possession of the whole of Tuscany, in virtue of the resignation forced upon the Queen of Etruria, invaded

the Roman territories, and made themselves masters of the ancient capital of the world. They immediately occupied the castle of St. Angelo, and the gates of the city, and entirely dispossessed the papal troops. Two months afterwards, an imperial decree of Napoleon severed the provinces of Ancona, Urbino, Macerata, and Camerino, which had formed part of the ecclesiastical estates, under the gift of Charlemagne, for nearly a thousand years, and annexed them to the kingdom of Italy. The reason assigned for this spoliation was, 'That the actual sovereign of Rome has constantly declined to declare war against the English, and to coalesce with the Kings of Italy and Naples for the defence of the Italian peninsula. The interests of these two kingdoms, as well as of the armies of Naples and Italy, require that their communications should not be interrupted by a hostile power.'"—Sir A. Alison, *Hist. of Europe*, 1789–1815, *ch.* 51 (*v.* 11).—"The pope protested in vain against such violence. Napoleon paid no attention. . . . He confiscated the wealth of the cardinals who did not return to the place of their birth. He disarmed nearly all the guards of the Holy Father — the nobles of this guard were imprisoned. Finally, Miollis [the French commander] had Cardinal Gabrielle, pro-Secretary of State, carried off, and put seals upon his papers. On May 17, 1809, a decree was issued by Napoleon, dated from Vienna, proclaiming the union (in his quality of successor to Charlemagne) of the States of the pope with the French Empire, ordaining that the city of Rome should be a free and imperial city; that the pope should continue to have his seat there, and that he should enjoy a revenue of 2,000,000 francs. On June 10, he had this decree promulgated at Rome. On this same June 10, the pope protested against all these spoliations, refused all pensions, and recapitulating all the outrages of which he had cause to complain, issued the famous and imprudent bull of excommunication against the authors, favourers, and executors of the acts of violence against him and the Holy See, but without naming any one. Napoleon was incensed at it, and on the first impulse he wrote to the bishops of France a letter in which he spoke in almost revolutionary terms 'of him who wished,' said he, 'to make dependent upon a perishable temporal power the eternal interest of consciences, and that of all spiritual affairs.' On the 6th of July, 1809, Pius VII., taken from Rome, after he had been asked if he would renounce the temporal sovereignty of Rome and of the States of the Church, was conducted by General Radet as far as Savone, where he arrived alone, August 10, the cardinals having all been previously transported to Paris. And to complete the spoliation of the pope, Napoleon issued on the 17th of February, 1810, a senatus-consultum which bestowed upon the eldest son of the emperor the title of King of Rome, and even ordained that the emperor should be consecrated a second time at Rome, in the first ten years of his reign. It was while oppressed, captive and deprived of all council, that the pope refused the bulls to all the bishops named by the emperor, and then it was that all the discussions relative to the proper measures to put an end to the viduity of the churches were commenced. . . . The year 1810, far from bringing any alleviation to the situation of the pope and giving him, according to the wishes and prayers of the ecclesiastic commission, a little more liberty, aggravated, on the contrary, this situation, and rendered his captivity harder. In effect, on February 17, 1810, appeared the senatus-consultum pronouncing the union of the Roman States with the French Empire; the independence of the imperial throne of all authority on earth, and annulling the temporal existence of the popes. This senatus-consultum assured a pension to the pope, but it ordained also that the pope should take oath to do nothing in opposition to the four articles of 1682. . . . The pope must have consoled himself, . . . even to rejoicing, that they made the insulting pension they offered him depend upon the taking of such an oath, and it is that which furnished him with a reply so nobly apostolic: that he had no need of this pension, and that he would live on the charity of the faithful. . . . The rigorous treatment to which the Holy Father was subjected at Savona was continued during the winter of 1811–1812, and in the following spring. At this time, it seems there was some fear, on the appearance of an English squadron, that it might carry off the pope; and the emperor gave the order to transfer him to Fontainebleau. This unhappy old man left Savona, June 10, and was forced to travel day and night. He fell quite ill at the hospice of Mont Cenis; but they forced him none the less to continue his journey. They had compelled him to wear such clothes . . . as not to betray who he was on the way they had to follow. They took great care also to conceal his journey from the public, and the secret was so profoundly kept, that on arriving at Fontainebleau, June 19, the concierge, who had not been advised of his arrival, and who had made no preparation, was obliged to receive him in his own lodgings. The Holy Father was a long time before recovering from the fatigue of this painful journey, and from the needlessly rigorous treatment to which they had subjected him. The cardinals not disgraced by Napoleon, who were in Paris, as well as the Archbishop of Tours, the Bishop of Nantes, the Bishop of Evreux, and the Bishop of Trèves, were ordered to go and see the pope. . . . The Russian campaign, marked by so many disasters, was getting to a close. The emperor on his return to Paris, December 18, 1812, still cherished chimerical hopes, and was meditating without doubt, more gigantic projects. Before carrying them out, he wished to take up again the affairs of the Church, either because he repented not having finished with them at Savona, or because he had the fancy to prove that he could do more in a two hours' tête-à-tête with the pope, than had been done by the council, its commissions, and its most able negotiators. He had beforehand, however, taken measures which were to facilitate his personal negotiation. The Holy Father had been surrounded for several months by cardinals and prelates, who, either from conviction or from submission to the emperor, depicted the Church as having arrived at a state of anarchy which put its existence in peril. They repeated incessantly to the pope, that if he did not get reconciled with the emperor and secure the aid of his power to arrest the evil, schism would be inevitable. Finally, the Sovereign pontiff overwhelmed by age, by infirmities, by the anxiety and cares with which his mind was worried,

found himself well prepared for the scene Napoleon had planned to play, and which was to assure him what he believed to be a success. On January 19, 1813, the emperor, accompanied by the Empress Marie Louise, entered the apartment of the Holy Father unexpectedly, rushed to him and embraced him with effusion. Pius VII., surprised and affected, allowed himself to be induced, after a few explanations, to give his approbation to the propositions that were imposed, rather than submitted to him. They were drawn up in eleven articles, which were not yet a compact, but which were to serve as the basis of a new act. On January 24, the emperor and the pope affixed their signatures to this strange paper, which was lacking in the usual diplomatic forms, since they were two sovereigns who had treated directly together. It was said in these articles, that the pope would exercise the pontificate in France, and in Italy;—that his ambassadors and those in authority near him, should enjoy all diplomatic privileges;—that such of his domains which were not disposed of should be free from taxes, and that those which were transferred should be replaced by an income of 2,000,000 francs;—that the pope should nominate, whether in France or in Italy, to episcopal sees which should be subsequently fixed; that the suburban sees should be re-established, and depend on the nomination of the pope, and that the unsold lands of these sees should be restored; that the pope should give bishoprics 'in partibus' to the Roman bishops absent from their diocese by force of circumstances, and that he should serve them a pension equal to their former revenue, until such time as they should be appointed to vacant sees; that the emperor and the pope should agree in opportune time as to the reduction to be made if it took place, in the bishoprics of Tuscany and of the country about Geneva, as well as to the institution of bishoprics in Holland, and in the Hanseatic departments; that the propaganda, the confessional, and the archives should be established in the place of sojourn of the Holy Father; finally, that His Imperial Majesty bestowed his good graces upon the cardinals, bishops, priests, and laymen, who had incurred his displeasure in connection with actual events. . . . The news of the signing of the treaty occasioned great joy among the people, but it appears that that of the pope was of short duration. The sacrifices he had been led to make were hardly consummated, than he experienced bitter grief; this could but be increased in proportion as the exiled and imprisoned cardinals, Consalvi, Pacca, di Pietro, on obtaining their liberty, received also the authorization to repair to Fontainebleau. What passed then between the Holy Father and these cardinals I do not pretend to know; but it must be that Napoleon had been warned by some symptoms of what was about to happen; for, in spite of the agreement he had made with the pope to consider the eleven articles only as preliminaries which were not to be published, he decided nevertheless to make them the object of a message that the arch-chancellor was charged to submit to the senate. This premature publicity given to an act which the pope so strongly regretted having signed must have hastened his retractation which he addressed to the emperor by a brief, on March 24, 1813. . . . This time, the emperor, although greatly irritated by the retractation, believed it was to his interest not to make any noise about it, and decided to take outwardly no notice of it. He had two decrees published: one of February 13, and the other of March 25, 1813. By the first, the new Concordat of January 25 was declared state law; by the second, he declared it obligatory upon archbishops, bishops, and chapters, and ordered, according to Article IV. of this Concordat that the archbishops should confirm the nominated bishops, and in case of refusal, ordained that they should be summoned before the tribunals. He restricted anew the liberty that had been given momentarily to the Holy Father, and Cardinal di Pietro returned to exile. Thereupon, Napoleon started, soon after, for that campaign of 1813 in Germany, the prelude to that which was to lead to his downfall. The decrees issued 'ab irato' were not executed, and during the vicissitudes of the campaign of 1813, the imperial government attempted several times to renew with the pope negotiations which failed. Matters dragged along thus, and no one could foresee any issue when, on January 23, 1814, it was suddenly learned that the pope had left Fontainebleau that very day, and returned to Rome. . . . Murat, who had abandoned the cause of the emperor, and who . . . had treated with the coalition, was then occupying the States of the Church, and it is evident that Napoleon in his indignation against Murat, preferred to allow the pope to re-enter his States, to seeing them in the hands of his brother-in-law. While Pius VII. was en route and the emperor was fighting in Champagne, a decree of March 10, 1814, announced that the pope was taking possession again of the part of his States which formed the departments of Rome and Trasmania. The lion, although vanquished, would not yet let go all the prey he hoped surely to retake. . . . The pope arrived on April 30, at Cesena, on May 12, at Ancona, and made his solemn entry into Rome on May 24, 1814."—Talleyrand, *Memoirs, pt.* 6 (*v.* 2).

Also in: D. Silvagni, *Rome: its Princes, Priests and People, ch.* 35-39 (*v.* 2).—C. Botta, *Italy during the Consulate and Empire of Napoleon, ch.* 5-8.—M. de Bourrienne, *Private Memoirs of Napoleon, v.* 4, *ch.* 6 *and* 11-12.—*Selections from the Letters and Despatches of Napoleon, by Capt. Bingham, v.* 2-3.—*Memoirs of Napoleon dictated at St. Helena, v.* 5 (*Hist. Miscellany, v.* 1).—P. Lanfrey, *Hist. of Napoleon, v.* 3, *ch.* 13 *and* 16.

A. D. 1814.—Restoration of the Jesuits. See Jesuits: A. D. 1769-1871.

A. D. 1815.—Restoration of the Papal States. See Vienna, The Congress of.

A. D. 1823.—Election of Leo XII.

A. D. 1829.—Election of Pius VIII.

A. D. 1831.—Election of Gregory XVI.

A. D. 1831-1832.—Revolt of the Papal States, suppressed by Austrian troops. See Italy: A. D. 1830-1832.

A. D. 1846-1849.—Election of Pius IX.—His liberal reforms.—Revolution at Rome.—The Pope's flight.—His restoration by the French. See Italy: A. D. 1848-1849.

A. D. 1850.—Restoration of the Roman Episcopate in England.—"The Reformation had deprived the Church of Rome of an official home on English soil. . . . But a few people had remained faithful to the Church of their forefathers, and a handful of priests had braved the risks

attendant on the discharge of their duties to it. Rome, moreover, succeeded in maintaining some sort of organisation in England. In the first instance her Church was placed under an archpriest. From 1623 to 1688 it was placed under a Vicar Apostolic, that is a Bishop, nominally appointed to some foreign see, with a brief enabling him to discharge episcopal duties in Great Britain. This policy was not very successful. Smith, the second Vicar Apostolic, was banished in 1629, and, though he lived till 1655, never returned to England. The Pope did not venture on appointing a successor to him for thirty years. . . . On the eve of the Revolution [in 1688] he divided England into four Vicariates. This arrangement endured till 1840. In that year Gregory XVI. doubled the vicariates, and appointed eight Vicars Apostolic. The Roman Church is a cautious but persistent suitor. She had made a fresh advance; she was awaiting a fresh opportunity. The eight Vicars Apostolic asked the Pope to promote the efficiency of their Church by restoring the hierarchy. The time seemed ripe for the change. . . . The Pope prepared Apostolic letters, distributing the eight vicariates into eight bishoprics. . . . The Revolution, occurring immediately afterwards, gave the Pope other things to think about than the re-establishment of the English hierarchy. For two years nothing more was heard of the conversion of vicariates into bishoprics. But the scheme had not been abandoned; and, in the autumn of 1850, the Pope, restored to the Vatican by French bayonets, issued a brief for 're-establishing and extending the Catholic faith in England.' England and Wales were divided into twelve sees. One of them, Westminster, was made into an archbishopric; and Wiseman, an Irishman by extraction, who had been Vicar Apostolic of the London District, and Bishop of Melipotamus, was promoted to it. Shortly afterwards a new distinction was conferred upon him, and the new archbishop was made a cardinal. The publication of the brief created a ferment in England. The effect of the Pope's language was increased by a pastoral from the new archbishop, in which he talked of governing, and continuing to govern, his see with episcopal jurisdiction; and by the declaration of an eminent convert that the people of England, who for so many years have been separated from the see of Rome, are about of their own free will to be added to the Holy Church. For the moment, High Churchmen and Low Churchmen forgot their differences in their eagerness to punish a usurpation of what was called the Queen's prerogative. The Prime Minister, instead of attempting to moderate the tempest, added violence to the storm by denouncing, in a letter to the Bishop of Durham, the late aggression of the Pope as 'insolent and insidious, . . . inconsistent with the Queen's supremacy, with the rights of our bishops and clergy, and with the spiritual independence of the nation.' . . . Amidst the excitement which was thus occasioned, Parliament met. The Speech from the Throne alluded to the strong feelings excited by 'the recent assumption of ecclesiastical titles conferred by a foreign Power.' . . . It declared that a measure would be introduced into Parliament to maintain 'under God's blessing, the religious liberty which is so justly prized by the people.' It hardly required such words as these to fan the spreading flame. In the debate on the Address, hardly any notice was taken of any subject except the 'triple tyrant's insolent pretension.' On the first Friday in the session, Russell introduced a measure forbidding the assumption of territorial titles by the priests and prelates of the Roman Catholic Church; declaring all gifts made to them, and all acts done by them, under those titles null and void; and forfeiting to the Crown all property bequeathed to them." Action on the Bill was interrupted in the House by a Ministerial crisis, which ended, however, in the return of Lord John Russell and his colleagues to the administration; but the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill, when it was again brought forward, was greatly changed. In its amended shape the bill merely made it illegal for Roman Catholic prelates to assume territorial titles. According to the criticism of one of the Conservatives, "the original bill . . . was milk and water; by some chemical process the Government had extracted all the milk." After much debate the emasculated bill became a law, but it was never put into execution.—S. Walpole, *Hist. of Eng. from* 1815, *ch.* 23 (*v.* 5).

Also in: J. McCarthy, *Hist. of Our Own Times*, *ch.* 20 (*v.* 2).—J. Stoughton, *Religion in England*, 1800–1850, *v.* 2, *ch.* 13.

A. D. 1854.—Promulgation of the Dogma of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary.—"The thought of defining dogmatically the belief of all ages and all Catholic nations in the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin dated back to the beginning of his [Pius IX.'s] pontificate. By an encyclical letter dated from his exile at Gaeta, he had asked the opinion of all the patriarchs, primates, archbishops and bishops of the universe as to the seasonableness of this definition. The holding of a general council is attended with many embarrassments, and cannot be freed from the intrigues and intervention of the so-called Catholic powers. Pius IX. has initiated a new course. All, even the most Gallican in ideas, acknowledge that a definition in matters of faith by the pope, sustained by the episcopate, is infallible. The rapid means of communication and correspondence in modern times, the more direct intercourse of the bishops with Rome, makes it easy now for the pope to hear the well-considered, deliberate opinion of a great majority of the bishops throughout the world. In this case the replies of the bishops coming from all parts of the world show that the universal Church, which has one God, one baptism, has also one faith. As to the dogma there was no dissension, a few doubted the expediency of making it an article of faith. These replies determined the Holy Father to proceed to the great act, so long demanded by [the] Catholic heart. . . . A number of bishops were convoked to Rome for the 8th of December, 1854; a still greater number hastened to the Eternal City. . . . That day the bishops assembled in the Vatican to the number of 170, and robed in white cape and mitre proceeded to the Sixtine Chapel, where the Holy Father soon appeared in their midst." There, after befitting ceremonies, the pontiff made formal proclamation of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception of Mary, in the following words: "'By the authority of Jesus Christ our Lord, of the blessed apostles, Peter and Paul, and our own, we declare, pronounce, and define that the doctrine which holds that the Blessed Virgin Mary, at the first instant of her

conception, by a singular privilege and grace of the Omnipotent God, in virtue of the merits of Jesus Christ, the Saviour of mankind, was preserved immaculate from all stain of original sin, has been revealed by God, and therefore should firmly and constantly be believed by all the faithful. Wherefore, if any shall dare — which God avert — to think otherwise than as it has been defined by us, let them know and understand that they are condemned by their own judgment, that they have suffered shipwreck of the faith, and have revolted from the unity of the Church; and besides, by their own act, they subject themselves to the penalties justly established, if what they think they should dare to signify by word, writing, or any other outward means.' . . . . The next day the sovereign pontiff assembled the sacred college and the bishops in the great consistorial hall of the Vatican, and pronounced the allocution which, subsequently published by all the bishops, announced to the Catholic world the act of December 8th."—A. de Montor, *The Lives and Times of the Roman Pontiffs, v. 2, pp.* 924–926.

A. D. 1860-1861.—First consequences of the Austro-Italian war.—Absorption of Papal States in the new Kingdom of Italy. See ITALY: A. D. 1859–1861.

A. D. 1864.—The Encyclical and the Syllabus.—"On the 8th of December 1864, Pius IX. issued his Encyclical [a circular letter addressed by the Pope to all the Patriarchs, Primates, Archbishops and Bishops of the Church throughout the world] 'Quanta cura,' accompanied by the Syllabus, or systematically arranged collection of errors, condemned from time to time, by himself and his predecessors. The Syllabus comprises 80 erroneous propositions. These are set forth under 10 distinct heads: viz. 1. Pantheism, Naturalism, and Absolute Rationalism; 2. Moderated Rationalism; 3. Indifferentism, Latitudinarianism; 4. Socialism, Communism, Secret Societies, Biblical Societies, Clerico-Liberal Societies; 5. Errors concerning the Church and her rights; 6. Errors concerning Civil Society, as well in itself as in its relations with the Church; 7. Errors concerning Natural and Christian Ethics; 8. Errors concerning Christian marriage; 9. Errors concerning the Civil Princedom of the Roman Pontiff; 10. Errors in relation with Modern Liberalism. Immediately under each error are given the two initial words, and the date, of the particular Papal Allocution, Encyclical, Letter Apostolic, or Epistle, in which it is condemned. Whilst, on the one hand, the publication of the Encyclical and Syllabus was hailed by many as the greatest act of the pontificate of Pius IX., on the other hand, their appearance excited the angry feelings, and intensified the hostility, of the enemies of the Church."—J. N. Murphy, *The Chair of Peter, ch.* 33.

The following is a translation of the text of the Encyclical, followed by that of the Syllabus or Catalogue of Errors:

To our venerable brethren all the Patriarchs, Primates, Archbishops, and Bishops in communion with the Apostolic See, we, Pius IX., Pope, send greeting, and our apostolic blessing: You know, venerable brethren, with what care and what pastoral vigilance the Roman Pontiffs, our predecessors — fulfilling the charge intrusted to them by our Lord Jesus Christ himself in the person of the blessed Peter, chief of the apostles — have unfailingly observed their duty in providing food for the sheep and the lambs, in assiduously nourishing the flock of the Lord with the words of faith, in imbuing them with salutary doctrine, and in turning them away from poisoned pastures; all this is known to you, and you have appreciated it. And certainly our predecessors, in affirming and in vindicating the august Catholic faith, truth, and justice, were never animated in their care for the salvation of souls by a more earnest desire than that of extinguishing and condemning by their letters and their constitutions all the heresies and errors which, as enemies of our divine faith, of the doctrines of the Catholic Church, of the purity of morals, and of the eternal salvation of man, have frequently excited serious storms, and precipitated civil and Christian society into the most deplorable misfortunes. For this reason our predecessors have opposed themselves with vigorous energy to the criminal enterprise of those wicked men, who, spreading their disturbing opinions like the waves of a raging sea, and promising liberty when they are slaves to corruption, endeavor by their pernicious writings to overturn the foundations of the Christian Catholic religion and of civil society; to destroy all virtue and justice; to deprave all minds and hearts; to turn away simple minds, and especially those of inexperienced youth, from the healthy discipline of morals; to corrupt it miserably, to draw it into the meshes of error, and finally to draw it from the bosom of the Catholic Church. But as you are aware, venerable brethren, we had scarcely been raised to the chair of St. Peter above our merits, by the mysterious designs of Divine Providence, than seeing with the most profound grief of our soul the horrible storm excited by evil doctrines, and the very grave and deplorable injury caused specially by so many errors to Christian people, in accordance with the duty of our apostolic ministry, and following in the glorious footsteps of our predecessors, we raised our voice, and by the publication of several encyclicals, consistorial letters, allocutions, and other apostolic letters, we have condemned the principal errors of our sad age, re-animated your utmost episcopal vigilance, warned and exhorted upon various occasions all our dear children in the Catholic Church to repel and absolutely avoid the contagion of so horrible a plague. More especially in our first encyclical of the 9th November, 1846, addressed to you, and in our two allocutions of the 9th December, 1854, and the 9th June, 1862, to the consistories, we condemned the monstrous opinions which particularly predominated in the present day, to the great prejudice of souls and to the detriment of civil society — doctrines which not only attack the Catholic Church, her salutary instruction, and her venerable rights, but also the natural, unalterable law inscribed by God upon the heart of man — that of sound reason. But although we have not hitherto omitted to proscribe and reprove the principal errors of this kind, yet the cause of the Catholic Church, the safety of the souls which have been confided to us, and the well-being of human society itself, absolutely demand that we should again exercise our pastoral solicitude to destroy new opinions which spring out of these same errors as from so many sources. These false and perverse opinions are

the more detestable as they especially tend to shackle and turn aside the salutary force that the Catholic Church, by the example of her Divine author and his order, ought freely to exercise until the end of time, not only with regard to each individual man, but with regard to nations, peoples, and their rulers, and to destroy that agreement and concord between the priesthood and the government which have always existed for the happiness and security of religious and civil society. For as you are well aware, venerable brethren, there are a great number of men in the present day who, applying to civil society the impious and absurd principle of naturalism, as it is called, dare to teach that the perfect right of public society and civil progress absolutely require a condition of human society constituted and governed without regard to all considerations of religion, as if it had no existence, or, at least, without making any distinction between true religion and heresy. And, contrary to the teaching of the Holy Scriptures, of the church, and of the fathers, they do not hesitate to affirm that the best condition of society is that in which the power of the laity is not compelled to inflict the penalties of law upon violators of the Catholic religion unless required by considerations of public safety. Actuated by an idea of social government so absolutely false, they do not hesitate further to propagate the erroneous opinion, very hurtful to the safety of the Catholic Church and of souls, and termed "delirium" by our predecessor, Gregory XVI., of excellent memory, namely: "Liberty of conscience and of worship is the right of every man — a right which ought to be proclaimed and established by law in every well-constituted State, and that citizens are entitled to make known and declare, with a liberty which neither the ecclesiastical nor the civil authority can limit, their convictions of whatever kind, either by word of mouth, or through the press, or by other means." But in making these rash assertions they do not reflect, they do not consider, that they preach the liberty of perdition (St. Augustine, Epistle 105, Al. 166), and that "if it is always free to human conviction to discuss, men will never be wanting who dare to struggle against the truth and to rely upon the loquacity of human wisdom, when we know by the example of our Lord Jesus Christ how faith and Christian sagacity ought to avoid this culpable vanity." (St. Leon, Epistle 164, Al. 133, sec. 2, Boll. Ed.) Since also religion has been banished from civil government, since the doctrine and authority of divine revelation have been repudiated, the idea intimately connected therewith of justice and human right is obscured by darkness and lost sight of, and in place of true justice and legitimate right brute force is substituted, which has permitted some, entirely oblivious of the plainest principles of sound reason, to dare to proclaim "that the will of the people, manifested by what is called public opinion or by other means, constitutes a supreme law superior to all divine and human right, and that accomplished facts in political affairs, by the mere fact of their having been accomplished, have the force of law." But who does not perfectly see and understand that human society, released from the ties of religion and true justice, can have no further object than to amass riches, and can follow no other law in its actions than the indomitable wickedness of a heart given up to pleasure and interest? For this reason, also, these same men persecute with so relentless a hatred the religious orders, who have deserved so well of religion, civil society, and letters. They loudly declare that the orders have no right to exist, and in so doing make common cause with the falsehoods of the heretics. For, as taught by our predecessor of illustrious memory, Pius VI., "the abolition of religious houses injures the state of public profession, and is contrary to the counsels of the Gospel, injures a mode of life recommended by the church and in conformity with the Apostolic doctrine, does wrong to the celebrated founders whom we venerate upon the altar, and who constituted these societies under the inspiration of God." (Epistle to Cardinal de la Rochefoucauld, March 10, 1791.) In their impiety these same persons pretend that citizens and the church should be deprived of the opportunity of openly "receiving alms from Christian charity," and that the law forbidding "servile labor on account of divine worship" upon certain fixed days should be abrogated, upon the fallacious pretext that this opportunity and this law are contrary to the principles of political economy. Not content with eradicating religion from public society, they desire further to banish it from families and private life. Teaching and professing these most fatal errors of Socialism and Communism, they declare that "domestic society, or the entire family, derives its right of existence solely from civil law, whence it is to be concluded that from civil law descend all the rights of parents over their children, and, above all, the right of instructing and educating them." By such impious opinions and machinations do these false spirits endeavor to eliminate the salutary teaching and influences of the Catholic Church from the instruction and education of youth, and to infect and miserably deprave by their pernicious errors and their vices the pliant minds of youth. All those who endeavor to trouble sacred and public things, to destroy the good order of society, and to annihilate all divine and human rights, have always concentrated their criminal schemes, attention, and efforts upon the manner in which they might above all deprave and delude unthinking youth, as we have already shown. It is upon the corruption of youth that they place all their hopes. Thus they never cease to attack the clergy, from whom have descended to us in so authentic manner the most certain records of history, and by whom such desirable benefit has been bestowed in abundance upon Christian and civil society and upon letters. They assail them in every shape, going so far as to say of the clergy in general — "that being the enemies of the useful sciences, of progress, and of civilization, they ought to be deprived of the charge of instructing and educating youth." Others, taking up wicked errors many times condemned, presume with notorious impudence to submit the authority of the church and of this Apostolic See, conferred upon it by God himself, to the judgment of civil authority, and to deny all the rights of this same church and this see with regard to exterior order. They do not blush to affirm that the laws of the church do not bind the conscience if they are not promulgated by the civil power; that the acts and decrees of the Roman Pontiffs concerning religion and the church require the sanction and approbation, or, at least,

the assent, of the civil power; and that the Apostolic constitutions condemning secret societies, whether these exact, or do not exact, an oath of secrecy, and branding with anathema their secretaries and promoters, have no force in those regions of the world where these associations are tolerated by the civil government. It is likewise affirmed that the excommunications launched by the Council of Trent and the Roman Pontiffs against those who invade the possessions of the church and usurp its rights, seek, in confounding the spiritual and temporal powers, to attain solely a terrestrial object; that the church can decide nothing which may bind the consciences of the faithful in a temporal order of things; that the law of the church does not demand that violations of sacred laws should be punished by temporal penalties; and that it is in accordance with sacred theology and the principles of public law to claim for the civil government the property possessed by the churches, the religious orders, and other pious establishments. And they have no shame in avowing openly and publicly the thesis, the principle of heretics from whom emanate so many errors and perverse opinions. They say: "That the ecclesiastical power is not of right divine, distinct and independent from the civil power; and that no distinction, no independence of this kind can be maintained without the church invading and usurping the essential rights of the civil power." Neither can we pass over in silence the audacity of those who, insulting sound doctrines, assert that "the judgments and decrees of the Holy See, whose object is declared to concern the general welfare of the church, its rights, and its discipline, do not claim the acquaintance and obedience under pain of sin and loss of the Catholic profession, if they do not treat of the dogmas of faith and manners." How contrary is this doctrine to the Catholic dogma of the full power divinely given to the sovereign Pontiff by our Lord Jesus Christ, to guide, to supervise, and govern the universal church, no one can fail to see and understand clearly and evidently. Amid so great a diversity of depraved opinions, we, remembering our apostolic duty, and solicitous before all things for our most holy religion, for sound doctrine, for the salvation of the souls confided to us, and for the welfare of human society itself, have considered the moment opportune to raise anew our apostolic voice. And therefore do we condemn and proscribe generally and particularly all the evil opinions and doctrines specially mentioned in this letter, and we wish that they may be held as rebuked, proscribed, and condemned by all the children of the Catholic Church. But you know further, venerable brothers, that in our time insulters of every truth and of all justice, and violent enemies of our religion, have spread abroad other impious doctrines by means of pestilent books, pamphlets, and journals which, distributed over the surface of the earth, deceive the people and wickedly lie. You are not ignorant that in our day men are found who, animated and excited by the spirit of Satan, have arrived at that excess of impiety as not to fear to deny our Lord and Master Jesus Christ, and to attack his divinity with scandalous persistence. We cannot abstain from awarding you well-merited eulogies, venerable brothers, for all the care and zeal with which you have raised your episcopal voice against so great an impiety.

Catalogue of the Principal Errors of Our Time Pointed Out in the Consistorial Allocutions, Encyclical and other Apostolical Letters of Pope Pius IX.

I.—PANTHEISM, NATURALISM, AND ABSOLUTE RATIONALISM.

1. There is no divine power, supreme being, wisdom, and providence distinct from the universality of things, and God is none other than the nature of things, and therefore immutable. In effect, God is in man, and in the world, and all things are God, and have the very substance of God. God is, therefore, one and the same thing with the world, and thence mind is confounded with matter, necessity with liberty of action, true with false, good with evil, just with unjust.—(See Allocution, "Maxima quidem," June 9, 1862.)

2. All action of God upon man and the world should be denied.—(See Alloc., "Maxima quidem," June 9, 1862.)

3. Human reason, without any regard to God, is the sole arbiter of true and false, good and evil; it is its own law in itself, and suffices by its natural force for the care of the welfare of men and nations.—(See Alloc., "Maxima quidem," June 9, 1862.)

4. All the truths of religion are derived from the native strength of human reason, whence reason is the principal rule by which man can and must arrive at the knowledge of all truths of every kind.—(See Encyclicals, "Qui pluribus," Nov. 9, 1846, and "Singulari quidem," March 17, 1856, and Alloc., "Maxima quidem," June 9, 1862.)

5. Divine revelation is imperfect, and therefore subject to the continual and indefinite progress corresponding to the progress of human reason.—(See Encyc., "Qui pluribus," Nov. 9, 1846, and Alloc., "Maxima quidem," June 9, 1862.)

6. Christian faith is in opposition to human reason, and divine revelation is not only useless but even injurious to the perfection of man.—(See Encyc., "Qui pluribus," Nov. 9, 1846, and Alloc., "Maxima quidem," June 9, 1862.)

7. The prophecies and miracles told and narrated in the sacred books are the fables of poets, and the mysteries of the Christian faith the sum of philosophical investigations. The books of the two Testaments contain fabulous fictions, and Jesus Christ is himself a myth.—(Encyc., "Qui pluribus," Nov. 9, 1846; Alloc., "Maxima quidem," June 9, 1862.)

II.—MODERATE RATIONALISM.

8. As human reason is rendered equal to religion itself, theological matters must be treated as philosophical matters.—(Alloc., "Singulari quidem perfusi.")

9. All the dogmas of the Christian religion are indistinctly the object of natural science or philosophy, and human reason, instructed solely by history, is able by its natural strength and principles to arrive at a comprehension of even the most abstract dogmas from the moment when they have been proposed as objective.—(Letter to Archbishop Frising, "Gravissimus," Dec. 4, 1862. Letter to the same, "Tuas libenter," Dec. 21, 1863.)

10. As the philosopher is one thing and philosophy is another, it is the right and duty of the

former to submit himself to the authority of which he shall have recognized the truth; but philosophy neither can nor ought to submit to authority.—(Letter to Archbishop Frising, "Gravissimus," Dec. 11, 1862; to the same, "Tuas libenter," Dec. 21, 1863.)

11. The church not only ought in no way to concern herself with philosophy, but ought further herself to tolerate the errors of philosophy, leaving to it the care of their correction.—(Letter to Archbishop Frising, Dec. 11, 1862.)

12. The decrees of the Apostolic See and of the Roman congregation fetter the free progress of science.—(Id., ibid.)

13. The methods and principles by which the old scholastic doctors cultivated theology are no longer suitable to the demands of the age and the progress of science.—(Id., "Tuas libenter," Dec. 21, 1863.)

14. Philosophy must be studied without taking any account of supernatural revelation.—(Id., ibid.)

N. B.—To the rationalistic system are due in great part the errors of Antony Gunther, condemned in the letter to the Cardinal Archbishop of Cologne "Eximiam tuam," June 15, 1847, and in that to the Bishop of Breslau, "Dolore haud mediocri," April 30, 1860.

III.—INDIFFERENTISM, TOLERATION.

15. Every man is free to embrace and profess the religion he shall believe true, guided by the light of reason.—(Apost. Let., "Multiplices inter," June 10, 1851; Alloc., "Maxima quidem," June 9, 1862.)

16. Men who have embraced any religion may find and obtain eternal salvation.—(Encyc., "Qui pluribus," Nov. 9, 1846; Alloc., "Ubi primum," Dec. 17, 1847; Encyc., "Singulari quidem," March 17, 1856.)

17. At least the eternal salvation may be hoped for of all who have never been in the true church of Christ.—(Alloc., "Singulari quidem," Dec. 9, 1865; Encyc., "Quanto conficiamur mœrore," Aug. 17, 1863.)

18. Protestantism is nothing more than another form of the same true religion in which it is possible to be equally pleasing to God, as in the Catholic church.—(Encyc., "Nescitis et vobiscum," Dec. 8, 1849.)

IV.—SOCIALISM, COMMUNISM, CLANDESTINE SOCIETIES, BIBLICAL SOCIETIES, CLERICO-LIBERAL SOCIETIES.

Pests of this description have been frequently rebuked in the severest terms in the Encyc., "Qui pluribus," Nov. 9, 1846; Alloc., "Quibus, quantisque," Aug. 20, 1849; Encyc., "Nescitis et vobiscum," Dec. 8, 1849; Alloc., "Singulari quidem," Dec. 9, 1854; Encyc., "Quanto conficiamur mœrore," Aug. 10, 1863.

V.—ERRORS RESPECTING THE CHURCH AND HER RIGHTS.

19. The church is not a true and perfect entirely free association; she does not rest upon the peculiar and perpetual rights conferred upon her by her divine founder; but it appertains to the civil power to define what are the rights and limits within which the church may exercise authority.—(Alloc., "Singulari quidem," Dec. 9, 1854; "Multis gravibus," Dec. 17, 1860; "Maxima quidem," June, 1862.)

20. The ecclesiastical power must not exercise its authority without the toleration and assent of the civil government.—(Alloc., "Meminit unusquisque," Sept. 30, 1851.)

21. The church has not the power of disputing dogmatically that the religion of the Catholic church is the only true religion.—(Lit. Apost., "Multiplices inter," June 10, 1851.)

22. The obligation which binds Catholic masters and writers does not apply to matters proposed for universal belief as articles of faith by the infallible judgment of the church.—(Let. to Archbishop Frising, "Tuas libenter," Dec. 21, 1863.)

23. The church has not the power of availing herself of force, or any direct or indirect temporal power.—(Lit. Apost., "Ad apostolicas," August 22, 1851.)

24. The Roman pontiffs and œcumenical councils have exceeded the limits of their power, have usurped the rights of princes, and have even committed errors in defining matter relating to dogma and morals.—(Lit. Apost., "Multiplices inter," June 10, 1851.)

25. In addition to the authority inherent in the episcopate, further temporal power is granted to it by the civil power, either expressly or tacitly, but on that account also revocable by the civil power whenever it pleases.—(Lit. Apost., "Ad Apostolicas," August 22, 1851.)

26. The church has not the natural and legitimate right of acquisition and possession.—("Nunquam," December 18, 1856; Encyc., "Incredibili," September 17, 1862.)

27. The ministers of the church and the Roman pontiff ought to be absolutely excluded from all charge and dominion over temporal affairs.—(Alloc., "Maximum quidem," June 9, 1862.)

28. Bishops have not the right of promulgating their apostolical letters without the sanction of the government.—(Alloc., "Nunquam fore," December 15, 1856.)

29. Spiritual graces granted by the Roman pontiff must be considered null unless they have been requested by the civil government.—(Id., ibid.)

30. The immunity of the church and of ecclesiastical persons derives its origin from civil law.—(Lit. Apost., "Multiplices inter," June 10, 1851.)

31. Ecclesiastical jurisdiction for temporal lawsuits, whether civil or criminal, of the clergy, should be abolished, even without the consent and against the desire of the Holy See.—(Alloc., "Acerbissimum," September 27, 1852; Id., "Nunquam fore," December 15, 1856.)

32. The personal immunity exonerating the clergy from military law may be abrogated without violation either of natural right or of equity. This abrogation is called for by civil progress, especially in a society modelled upon principles of liberal government.—(Let. to Bishop Montisregal, "Singularis nobilisque," September 29, 1864.)

33. It does not appertain to ecclesiastical jurisdiction, by any right, and inherent to its essence, to direct doctrine in matters of theology.—(Let. to Archbishop Frising, "Tuas libenter," Dec. 21, 1863.)

34. The doctrine of those who compare the sovereign pontiff to a free sovereign acting in the universal church is a doctrine which pre-

vailed in the middle ages.—(Lit. Apost., Aug. 22, 1851.)

35. There is no obstacle to the sentence of a general council, or the act of all the nation transferring the pontifical sovereign from the bishopric and city of Rome to some other bishopric in another city.—(Id., ibid.)

36. The definition of a national council does not admit of subsequent discussion, and the civil power can require that matters shall remain as they are.—(Id., ibid.)

37. National churches can be established without, and separated from, the Roman pontiff.—(Alloc., "Multis gravibusque," Dec. 17, 1860; "Jamdudum cernimus," March 18, 1861.)

38. Many Roman pontiffs have lent themselves to the division of the church in Eastern and Western churches.—(Lit. Apost., "Ad Apostolicas," August 22, 1851.)

VI.—ERRORS OF CIVIL SOCIETY, AS MUCH IN THEMSELVES AS CONSIDERED IN THEIR RELATIONS TO THE CHURCH.

39. The state of a republic, as being the origin and source of all rights, imposes itself by its rights, which is not circumscribed by any limit.—(Alloc., "Maxima quidem," June 9, 1862.)

40. The doctrine of the Catholic church is opposed to the laws and interests of society.—(Encyc., "Qui pluribus," Nov. 9, 1846; Alloc., "Quibus quantisque," April 20, 1849.)

41. The civil government, even when exercised by a heretic sovereign, possesses an indirect and negative power over religious affairs.—(Lit. Apost., August 22, 1851.)

42. In a legal conflict between the two powers, civil law ought to prevail.—(Id., ibid.)

43. The lay power has the authority to destroy, declare, and render null solemn conventions or concordats relating to the use of rights appertaining to ecclesiastical immunity, without the consent of the priesthood, and even against its will.—(Alloc., "In consistoriali," Nov. 1, 1850; "Multis gravibusque," Dec. 17, 1860.)

44. The civil authority may interfere in matters regarding religion, morality, and spiritual government, whence it has control over the instructions for the guidance of consciences issued, conformably with their mission, by the pastors of the church. Further, it possesses full power in the matter of administering the divine sacraments and the necessary arrangements for their reception.—("In consistoriali," Nov. 1, 1858; Alloc., "Maxima quidem," June 9, 1862.)

45. The entire direction of public schools in which the youth of Christian States are educated, save an exception in the case of Episcopal seminaries, may and must appertain to the civil power, and belong to it so far that no other authority shall be recognized as having any right to interfere in the discipline of the schools, the arrangement of the studies, the taking of degrees, or the choice and approval of teachers.—(Alloc., "In consistoriali," Nov. 1, 1850; "Quibus luctuosissimis," Sept. 5, 1861.)

46. Further, even in clerical seminaries the mode of study must be submitted to the civil authority.—(Alloc., "Nunquam fore," Dec. 15, 1856.)

47. The most advantageous conditions of civil society require that popular schools open without distinction to all children of the people, and public establishments destined to teach young people letters and good discipline, and to impart to them education, should be freed from all ecclesiastical authority and interference, and should be fully subjected to the civil and political power for the teaching of masters and opinions common to the times.—(Letter to Archbishop of Friburg, "Quum none sine," July 14, 1864.)

48. This manner of instructing youth, which consists in separating it from the Catholic faith and from the power of the church, and in teaching it above all a knowledge of natural things and the objects of social life, may be perfectly approved by Catholics.—(Id., ibid.)

49. The civil power is entitled to prevent ministers of religion and the faithful from communicating freely and mutually with the Roman Pontiff.—(Alloc., "Maxima quidem," June 9, 1862.)

50. The lay authority possesses of itself the right of presenting bishops, and may require of them that they take possession of their diocese before having received canonical institution and the Apostolical letter of the Holy See.—(Alloc., "Nunquam fore," Dec. 15, 1856.)

51. Further, the lay authority has the right of deposing bishops from their pastoral functions, and is not forced to obey the Roman Pontiff in matters affecting the filling of sees and the institution of bishops.—(Lit. Apost., "Multiplices inter," June 10, 1851; Alloc., "Acerbissimum.")

52. The government has a right to alter a period fixed by the church for the accomplishment of the religious duties of both sexes, and may enjoin upon all religious establishments to admit nobody to take solemn vows without permission.—(Alloc., "Nunquam fore," Dec. 15, 1856.)

53. Laws respecting the protection, rights, and functions of religious establishments must be abrogated; further, the civil government may lend its assistance to all who desire to quit a religious life, and break their vows. The government may also deprive religious establishments of the right of patronage to collegiate churches and simple benefices, and submit their goods to civil competence and administration.—(Alloc., "Acerbissimum," Sept. 27, 1862; "Probe memineritis," Jan. 22, 1885; and "Quum sæpe," July 26, 1858.)

54. Kings and princes are not only free from the jurisdiction of the church, but are superior to the church even in litigious questions of jurisdiction.—(Lit. Apost., "Multiplices inter," June 10, 1851.)

55. The church must be separated from the State and the State from the church.—(Alloc., "Acerbissimum," Sept. 27, 1862.)

VII.—ERRORS IN NATURAL AND CHRISTIAN MORALS.

56. Moral laws do not stand in need of the Divine sanction, and there is no necessity that human laws should be conformable to the laws of nature and receive their sanction from God.—(Alloc., "Maxima quidem," June 9, 1862.)

57. Knowledge of philosophical and moral things and civil laws may and must be free from Divine and ecclesiastical authority.—(Id., ibid.)

58. No other forces are recognized than those which reside in matter, and which, contrary to all discipline and all decency of morals, are summed up in the accumulation and increase of riches by every possible means and in the satisfaction of every pleasure.—(Id., ibid; Alloc.,

"Maxima quidem;" Encyc., "Quanto conficiamur," August 10, 1863.)

59. Right consists in material fact. All human duties are vain words, and all human facts have the force of right.—(Alloc., "Maxima quidem," June 9, 1862.)

60. Authority is nothing but the sum of numbers and material force.—(Id., ibid.)

61. The happy injustice of a fact inflicts no injury upon the sanctity of right.—(Alloc., "Jamdudum cernimus," March 18, 1861.)

62. The principle of non-intervention must be proclaimed and observed.—(Alloc., "Novos et ante," Sept. 27, 1860.)

63. It is allowable to withdraw from obedience to legitimate princes and to rise in insurrection against them.—(Encyc., "Qui pluribus," Nov. 9, 1846; Alloc., "Quisque vestrum," Oct. 4, 1847; Encyc., "Noscitis et nobiscum," Dec. 8, 1849; Lit. Apost., "Cum Catholica," March 25, 1860.)

64. The violation of a solemn oath, even every guilty and shameful action repugnant to the eternal law, is not only undeserving rebuke, but is even allowable and worthy of the highest praise when done for the love of country.—(Alloc., "Quibus quantisque," April 20, 1849.)

VIII.—ERRORS AS TO CHRISTIAN MARRIAGE.

65. It is not admissable, rationally, that Christ has raised marriage to the dignity of a sacrament.—(Lit. Apost., August 22, 1852.)

66. The sacrament of marriage is only an adjunct of the contract, from which it is separable, and the sacrament itself only consists in the nuptial benediction.—(Id., ibid.)

67. By the law of nature the marriage tie is not indissoluble, and in many cases divorce, properly so called, may be pronounced by the civil authority.—(Id., ibid.; Alloc., "Acerbissimum," Sept. 27, 1852.)

68. The church has not the power of pronouncing upon the impediments to marriage. This belongs to civil society, which can remove the existing hindrances.—(Lit. Apost., "Multiplices inter," June 10, 1851.)

69. It is only more recently that the church has begun to pronounce upon invalidating obstacles, availing herself, not of her own right, but of a right borrowed from the civil power.—(Lit. Apost., August 22, 1851.)

70. The canons of the Council of Trent, which invoke anathema against those who deny the church the right of pronouncing upon invalidating obstacles, are not dogmatic, and must be considered as emanating from borrowed power.—(Lit. Apost., ibid.)

71. The form of the said council, under the penalty of nullity, does not bind in cases where the civil law has appointed another form, and desires that this new form is to be used in marriage.—(Id., ibid.)

72. Boniface VIII. is the first who declared that the vow of chastity pronounced at ordination annuls nuptials.—(Id., ibid.)

73. A civil contract may very well, among Christians, take the place of true marriage, and it is false, either that the marriage contract between Christians must always be a sacrament, or that the contract is null if the sacrament does not exist.—(Id., ibid.; Let. to King of Sardinia, Sept. 9, 1852; Allocs., "Acerbissimum," Sept. 27, 1852; "Multis gravibusque," Dec. 17, 1860.)

74. Matrimonial or nuptial causes belong by their nature to civil jurisdiction.—(Lit. Apost., August 22, 1851; Alloc., "Acerbissimum," Sept. 27, 1852.)

N. B.—Two other errors are still current upon the abolition of the celibacy of priests and the preference due to the state of marriage over that of virginity. These have been refuted—the first in Encyc., "Qui pluribus," Nov. 9, 1846; the second in Lit. Apost., "Multiplices inter," June 10, 1851.

IX.—ERRORS REGARDING THE CIVIL POWER OF THE SOVEREIGN PONTIFF.

75. The children of the Christian and Catholic Church are not agreed upon the compatibility of the temporal with the spiritual power.—(Lit. Apost., August 22, 1852.)

76. The cessation of the temporal power, upon which the Apostolic See is based, would contribute to the happiness and liberty of the church.—(Alloc., "Quibus quantisque," April 20, 1849.)

N. B.—Besides these errors explicitly pointed out, still more, and those numerous, are rebuked by the certain doctrine which all Catholics are bound to respect touching the civil government of the Sovereign Pontiff. These doctrines are abundantly explained in Allocs., "Quantis quantumque," April 20, 1859, and "Si semper antea," May 20, 1850; Lit. Apost., "Quum Catholica Ecclesia," March 26, 1860; Allocs., "Novos," Sept. 28, 1860; "Jamdudum," March 18, 1861; and "Maxima quidem," June 9, 1862.

X.—ERRORS REFERRING TO MODERN LIBERALISM.

77. In the present day it is no longer necessary that the Catholic religion shall be held as the only religion of the State, to the exclusion of all other modes of worship.—(Alloc., "Nemo vestrum," July 26, 1855.)

78. Whence it has been wisely provided by law, in some countries called Catholic, that emigrants shall enjoy the free exercise of their own worship.—(Alloc., "Acerbissimum," Sept. 27, 1852.)

79. But it is false that the civil liberty of every mode of worship and the full power given to all of overtly and publicly displaying their opinions and their thoughts conduce more easily to corrupt the morals and minds of the people and to the propagation of the evil of indifference.—(Alloc., "Nunquam fore," Dec. 15, 1856.)

80. The Roman pontiff can and ought to reconcile himself to and agree with progress, liberalism, and modern civilization.—(Alloc., "Jamdudum cernimus," March 18, 1861.)

A. D. 1869-1870.—The Œcumenical Council of the Vatican.—Adoption and Promulgation of the Dogma of Papal Infallibility.—"More than 300 years after the close of the Council of Trent, Pope Pius IX., . . . resolved to convoke a new œcumenical Council. . . . He first intimated his intention, June 26, 1867, in an Allocution to 500 Bishops who were assembled at the 18th centenary of the martyrdom of St. Peter in Rome. . . . The call was issued by an Encyclical, commencing 'Æterni Patris Unigenitus Filius,' in the 23rd year of his Pontificate, on the feast of St. Peter and Paul, June 29, 1868. It created at once a universal commotion in the Christian world, and called forth a multitude of books and pamphlets even before the Council

convened. . . . It was even hoped that the Council might become a general feast of reconciliation of divided Christendom; and hence the Greek schismatics, and the Protestant heretics and other non-Catholics, were invited by two special letters of the Pope (Sept. 8, and Sept. 13, 1868) to return on this auspicious occasion to 'the only sheepfold of Christ.'. . . But the Eastern Patriarchs spurned the invitation. . . . The Protestant communions either ignored or respectfully declined it. Thus the Vatican Council, like that of Trent, turned out to be simply a general Roman Council, and apparently put the prospect of a reunion of Christendom farther off than ever before. While these sanguine expectations of Pius IX., were doomed to disappointment, the chief object of the Council was attained in spite of the strong opposition of the minority of liberal Catholics. This object . . . was nothing less than the proclamation of the personal Infallibility of the Pope, as a binding article of the Roman Catholic faith for all time to come. Herein lies the whole importance of the Council; all the rest dwindles into insignificance, and could never have justified its convocation. After extensive and careful preparations, the first (and perhaps the last) Vatican Council was solemnly opened amid the sound of innumerable bells and the cannon of St. Angelo, but under frowning skies and a pouring rain, on the festival of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary, Dec. 8, 1869, in the Basilica of the Vatican. It reached its height at the fourth public session, July 18, 1870, when the decree of Papal Infallibility was proclaimed. After this it dragged on a sickly existence till October 20, 1870, when it was adjourned till Nov. 11, 1870, but indefinitely postponed on account of the extraordinary change in the political situation of Europe. For on the second of September the French Empire, which had been the main support of the temporal power of the Pope, collapsed with the surrender of Napoleon III., at the old Huguenot stronghold of Sedan, to the Protestant King William of Prussia, and on the 20th of September the Italian troops, in the name of King Victor Emmanuel, took possession of Rome, as the future capital of United Italy. Whether the Council will ever be convened again to complete its vast labors, like the twice interrupted Council of Trent, remains to be seen. But, in proclaiming the personal Infallibility of the Pope, it made all future œcumenical Councils unnecessary for the definition of dogmas and the regulation of discipline. . . . The acts of the Vatican Council, as far as they go, are irrevocable. The attendance was larger than at any of its eighteen predecessors. . . . The whole number of prelates of the Roman Catholic Church, who are entitled to a seat in an œcumenical Council, is 1,037. Of these there were present at the opening of the Council 719, viz., 49 Cardinals, 9 Patriarchs, 4 Primates, 121 Archbishops, 479 Bishops, 57 Abbots and Generals of monastic orders. This number afterwards increased to 764, viz., 49 Cardinals, 10 Patriarchs, 4 Primates, 105 diocesan Archbishops, 22 Archbishops in partibus infidelium, 424 diocesan Bishops, 98 Bishops in partibus, and 52 Abbots, and Generals of monastic orders. Distributed according to continents, 541 of these belonged to Europe, 83 to Asia, 14 to Africa, 113 to America, 13 to Oceanica. At the proclamation of the decree of Papal Infallibility, July 18, 1870, the number was reduced to 535, and afterwards it dwindled down to 200 or 180. Among the many nations represented, the Italians had a vast majority of 276, of whom 143 belonged to the former Papal States alone. France with a much larger Catholic population, had only 84, Austria and Hungary 48, Spain 41, Great Britain 35, Germany 19, the United States 48, Mexico 10, Switzerland 8, Belgium 6, Holland 4, Portugal 2, Russia 1. The disproportion between the representatives of the different nations and the number of their constituents was overwhelmingly in favor of the Papal influence."—P. Schaff, *Hist. of the Vatican Council (app. to Gladstone's 'Vatican Decrees' Am. ed.).*—The vote taken in the Council on the affirmation of the dogma "showed 400 'placet,' 88 'non placet,' and 60 'placet juxta modum.' Fifty bishops absented themselves from the congregation, preferring that mode of intimating their dissent. . . . After the votes the Archbishop of Paris proposed that the dissentients should leave Rome in a body, so as not to be present at the public services of the 18th, when the dogma was formally to be promulgated. Cardinal Rauscher, on the other hand, advised that they should all attend, and have the courage to vote 'non placet' in the presence of the Pope. This bold counsel, however, was rejected. . . . The recalcitrant bishops stayed away to the number of 110. The Pope's partisans mustered 533. When the dogmatic constitution 'De Ecclesia Christi' was put in its entirety to the vote, two prelates alone exclaimed 'non placet.' These were Riccio, Bishop of Casazzo, and Fitzgerald, Bishop of Peticola, or Little Rock, in the United States. A violent thunderstorm burst over St. Peter's at the commencement of the proceedings, and lasted till the close. The Pope proclaimed himself infallible amidst its tumult. . . . The Bishops in opposition, after renewing their negative vote in writing, quitted Rome almost to a man. . . . Several of the German bishops who had taken part in the opposition thought that at this juncture it behoved them, for the peace of the Church, and the respect due to the Dogma once declared, to give way at the end of August. They assembled again at Fulda, and pronounced the acceptance of the decree. . . . Seventeen names were appended to the declaration. Among them was not that of Hefele [Bishop of Rottenburg] who, it was soon made known, was determined under no circumstances to submit to the decision of the Council. His chapter and the theological faculty of Tübingen, declared that they would unanimously support him. A meeting of the Catholic professors of theology, held at Nuremberg, also agreed upon a decided protest against the absolute power and personal infallibility of the Pope. The German opposition, evidently, was far from being quelled. And the Austrian opposition, led by Schwarzenberg, Rauscher and Strossmayer, remained unbroken. By the end of August the members of the Council remaining at Rome were reduced to 80. They continued, however, to sit on through that month and the month of September, discussing various 'Schemes' relative to the internal affairs of the Church."—*Annual Register*, 1870, *pt.* 1, *foreign hist., ch.* 5.—But on the 20th of October, after the Italian troops had taken possession of Rome, the Pope, by a Bull, suspended the sittings of the Œcumenical Coun-

cil. Most of the German bishops who had opposed the dogma of infallibility surrendered to it in the end; but Dr. Döllinger, the Bavarian theologian, held his ground. "He had now become the acknowledged leader of all those who, within the pale of the Romish Church, were disaffected towards the Holy See; but he was to pay for this position of eminence. The Old Catholic movement soon drew upon itself the hostility of the ecclesiastical authorities. On the 19th of April 1871 Dr. Döllinger was formally excommunicated by the Archbishop of Munich, on account of his refusal to retract his opposition to the dogma of infallibility. . . . A paper war of great magnitude followed the excommunication. Most of the doctor's colleagues in his own divinity school, together with not a few canons of his cathedral, a vast number of the Bavarian lower clergy, and nearly all the laity, testified their agreement with him. The young King of Bavaria, moreover, lent the support of his personal sympathies to Dr. Döllinger's movement. . . . A Congress of Old Catholics was held at Munich in September, when an Anti-Infallibility League was formed; and the cause soon afterwards experienced a triumph in the election of Dr. Döllinger to the Rectorship of the University of Munich by a majority of fifty-four votes against six. At Cologne in the following year an Old Catholic Congress assembled, and delegates attended from various foreign States. . . . Dr. Döllinger . . . was always glad to give the Old Catholic body the benefit of his advice, and he presided over the Congress, mainly of Old Catholics, which was held at Bonn in 1874 to promote the reunion of Christendom; but we believe he never formally joined the Communion, and, at the outset, at any rate, he strongly opposed its constitution as a distinct Church. From the day of his excommunication by the Archbishop of Munich he abstained from performing any ecclesiastical function. He always continued a strict observer of the disciplinary rules and commandments of the Roman Catholic Church. . . . The Old Catholic movement did not generally make that headway upon the Continent which its sanguine promoters had hoped speedily to witness, though it was helped in Germany by the passing of a Bill for transferring ecclesiastical property to a committee of the ratepayers and communicants in each parish of the empire. When the third synod of the Old Catholics was held at Bonn in June 1876 it was stated by Dr. von Schulte that there were then 35 communities in Prussia, 44 in Baden, 5 in Hesse, 2 in Birkenfeld, 31 in Bavaria, and 1 in Würtemberg. The whole number of persons belonging to the body of Old Catholics was—in Prussia, 17,203; Bavaria, 10,110; Hesse, 1,042; Oldenburg, 249; and Würtemberg, 223. The number of Old Catholic priests in Germany was sixty. Subsequently some advance was recorded over these numbers."—*Eminent Persons: Biographies reprinted from the Times, v. 4, pp.* 213–216.

ALSO IN: Quirinus (Dr. J. I. von Döllinger), *Letters from Rome on the Council.*—Janus (the same), *The Pope and the Council.*—J. I. von Döllinger, *Declarations and Letters on the Vatican Decrees.*—H. E. Manning, *The Vatican Council.*—Pomponio Leto (Marchese F. Vitelleschi), *The Vatican Council.*—E. de Pressense, *Rome and Italy at the opening of the Œcumenical Council.*—W. E. Gladstone, *The Vatican Decrees.*

The following is a translation of the text of the Constitution "Pastor æternus" in which the Dogma of Infallibility was subsequently promulgated by the Pope:

"*Pius Bishop, Servant of the Servants of God, with the approval of the Sacred Council, for an everlasting remembrance.* The eternal Pastor and Bishop of our souls, in order to continue for all time the life-giving work of His Redemption, determined to build up the Holy Church, wherein, as in the House of the living God, all faithful men might be united in the bond of one faith and one charity. Wherefore, before he entered into His glory, He prayed unto the Father, not for the Apostles only, but for those also who through their preaching should come to believe in Him, that all might be one even as He the Son and the Father are one. As then the Apostles whom He had chosen to Himself from the world were sent by Him, not otherwise than He Himself had been sent by the Father; so did He will that there should ever be pastors and teachers in His Church to the end of the world. And in order that the Episcopate also might be one and undivided, and that by means of a closely united priesthood the body of the faithful might be kept secure in the oneness of faith and communion, He set Blessed Peter over the rest of the Apostles, and fixed in him the abiding principle of this twofold unity, and its visible foundation, in the strength of which the everlasting temple should arise, and the Church in the firmness of that faith should lift her majestic front to Heaven. And seeing that the gates of hell with daily increase of hatred are gathering their strength on every side to upheave the foundation laid by God's own hand, and so, if that might be, to overthrow the Church; We, therefore, for the preservation, safe-keeping, and increase of the Catholic flock, with the approval of the Sacred Council, do judge it to be necessary to propose to the belief and acceptance of all the faithful, in accordance with the ancient and constant faith of the universal Church, the doctrine touching the institution, perpetuity, and nature of the sacred Apostolic Primacy, in which is found the strength and sureness of the entire Church, and at the same time to inhibit and condemn the contrary errors, so hurtful to the flock of Christ.

CHAPTER I. *Of the institution of the apostolic primacy in Blessed Peter.* We, therefore, teach and declare that, according to the testimony of the Gospel, the primacy of jurisdiction was immediately and directly promised to Blessed Peter the Apostle, and on him conferred by Christ the Lord. For it had been said before to Simon: Thou shalt be called Cephas, and afterwards on occasion of the confession made by him: Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God, it was to Simon alone that the Lord addressed the words: Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jona, because flesh and blood hath not revealed it to thee, but my Father who is in Heaven. And I say to thee that thou art Peter; and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of Heaven. And whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in heaven, and whatsover thou shalt loose on earth it shall be loosed also in heaven. And it was upon Simon alone that Jesus after His resurrection bestowed the jurisdiction of Chief Pastor and Ruler over all His fold in the

words: Feed my lambs: feed my sheep. At open variance with this clear doctrine of Holy Scripture as it has been ever understood by the Catholic Church are the perverse opinions of those who, while they distort the form of government established by Christ the Lord in His Church, deny that Peter in his single person, preferably to all the other Apostles, whether taken separately or together, was endowed by Christ with a true and proper primacy of jurisdiction; or of those who assert that the same primacy was not bestowed immediately and directly upon Blessed Peter himself, but upon the Church, and through the Church on Peter as her Minister. If anyone, therefore, shall say that Blessed Peter the Apostle was not appointed the Prince of all the Apostles and the visible Head of the whole Church Militant; or that the same directly and immediately received from the same Our Lord Jesus Christ a Primacy of honour only, and not of true and proper jurisdiction; let him be anathema.

CHAPTER II. *On the perpetuation of the primacy of Peter in the Roman Pontiffs.* That which the Prince of Shepherds and great Shepherd of the sheep, Jesus Christ our Lord, established in the person of the Blessed Apostle Peter to secure the perpetual welfare and lasting good of the Church, must, by the same institution, necessarily remain unceasingly in the Church; which, being founded upon the Rock, will stand firm to the end of the world. For none can doubt, and it is known to all ages, that the holy and Blessed Peter, the Prince and Chief of the Apostles, the pillar of the faith and foundation of the Catholic Church, who received the keys of the kingdom from Our Lord Jesus Christ, the Saviour and Redeemer of the race of man, continues up to the present time, and ever continues, in his successors the Bishops of the Holy See of Rome, which was founded by Him, and consecrated by His blood, to live and preside and judge. Whence, whosoever succeeds to Peter in this See, does by the institution of Christ Himself obtain the Primacy of Peter over the whole Church. The disposition made by Incarnate Truth therefore remains, and Blessed Peter, abiding through the strength of the Rock in the power that he received, has not abandoned the direction of the Church. Wherefore it has at all times been necessary that every particular Church — that is to say, the faithful throughout the world — should agree with the Roman Church, on account of the greater authority of the princedom which this has received; that all being associated in the unity of that See whence the rights of communion spread to all, as members in the unity of the Head, might combine to form one connected body. If, then, any should deny that it is by the institution of Christ the Lord, or by divine right, that Blessed Peter should have a perpetual line of successors in the Primacy over the Universal Church, or that the Roman Pontiff is the successor of Blessed Peter in this Primacy; let him be anathema.

CHAPTER III. *On the force and character of the Primacy of the Roman Pontiff.* Wherefore, resting on plain testimonies of the Sacred Writings, and in agreement with both the plain and express decrees of our predecessors, the Roman Pontiffs, and of the General Councils, We renew the definition of the Œcumenical Council of Florence, in virtue of which all the faithful of Christ must believe that the Holy Apostolic See and the Roman Pontiff possesses the Primacy over the whole world, and that the Roman Pontiff is the successor of Blessed Peter, Prince of the Apostles, and is true Vicar of Christ, and Head of the whole Church, and Father and teacher of all Christians; and that full power was given to him in Blessed Peter to rule, feed, and govern the Universal Church by Jesus Christ our Lord: as is also contained in the acts of the General Councils and in the Sacred Canons. Further we teach and declare that by the appointment of our Lord the Roman Church possesses the chief ordinary jurisdiction over all other Churches, and that this power of jurisdiction possessed by the Roman Pontiff being truly episcopal is immediate; which all, both pastors and faithful, both individually and collectively, are bound, by their duty of hierarchical submission and true obedience, to obey, not merely in matters which belong to faith and morals, but also in those that appertain to the discipline and government of the Church throughout the world, so that the Church of Christ may be one flock under one supreme pastor through the preservation of unity both of communion and of profession of the same faith with the Roman Pontiff. This is the teaching of Catholic truth, from which no one can deviate without loss of faith and of salvation. But so far is this power of the Supreme Pontiff from being any prejudice to the ordinary power of episcopal jurisdiction, by which the Bishops who have been set by the Holy Spirit to succeed and hold the place of the Apostles feed and govern, each his own flock, as true Pastors, that this episcopal authority is really asserted, strengthened, and protected by the supreme and universal Pastor; in accordance with the words of S. Gregory the Great: My honour is the honour of the whole Church. My honour is the firm strength of my Brethren. I am then truly honoured, when due honour is not denied to each of their number. Further, from this supreme power possessed by the Roman Pontiff of governing the Universal Church, it follows that he has the right of free communication with the Pastors of the whole Church, and with their flocks, that these may be taught and directed by him in the way of salvation. Wherefore we condemn and reject the opinions of those who hold that the communication between this supreme Head and the Pastors and their flocks can lawfully be impeded; or who represent this communication as subject to the will of the secular power, so as to maintain that whatever is done by the Apostolic See, or by its authority, cannot have force or value, unless it be confirmed by the assent of the secular power. And since by the divine right of Apostolic primacy, the Roman Pontiff is placed over the Universal Church, we further teach and declare that he is the supreme judge of the faithful, and that in all causes, the decision of which belongs to the Church, recourse may be had to his tribunal: and that none may meddle with the judgment of the Apostolic See, the authority of which is greater than all other, nor can any lawfully depart from its judgment. Wherefore they depart from the right course who assert that it is lawful to appeal from the judgments of the Roman Pontiffs and an Œcumenical Council, as to an authority higher than that of the Roman Pontiff. If then any shall say that the Roman Pontiff has

the office merely of inspection or direction, and not full and supreme power of jurisdiction over the Universal Church, not alone in things which belong to faith and morals, but in those which relate to the discipline and government of the Church spread throughout the world; or who assert that he possesses merely the principal part, and not all the fulness of this supreme power; or that this power which he enjoys is not ordinary and immediate, both over each and all the Churches and over each and all the Pastors and the faithful; let him be anathema.

CHAPTER IV. *Concerning the infallible teaching of the Roman Pontiff.* Moreover that the supreme power of teaching is also included in the Apostolic Primacy, which the Roman Pontiff, as successor of Peter, Prince of the Apostles, enjoys over the whole Church, this Holy See has always held, the perpetual practice of the Church attests, and Œcumenical Councils themselves have declared, especially those in which the East with the West met in the union of faith and charity. For the Fathers of the Fourth Council of Constantinople, following in the footsteps of their predecessors, gave forth this solemn profession: The first condition of salvation is to keep the rule of the true faith. And because the sentence of our Lord Jesus Christ cannot be passed by, who said: Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build my Church, these things which have been said are approved by events, because in the Apostolic See the Catholic Religion and her holy solemn doctrine has always been kept immaculate. Desiring, therefore, not to be in the least degree separated from the faith and doctrine of that See, we hope that we may deserve to be in the one communion, which the Apostolic See preaches, in which is the entire and true solidity of the Christian religion. And, with the approval of the Second Council of Lyons, the Greeks professed that the Holy Roman Church enjoy supreme and full Primacy and preeminence over the whole Catholic Church, which it truly and humbly acknowledges that it has received with the plenitude of power from our Lord Himself in the person of blessed Peter, Prince or Head of the Apostles, whose successor the Roman Pontiff is; and as the Apostolic See is bound before all others to defend the truth of faith, so also if any questions regarding faith shall arise, they must be defined by its judgment. Finally, the Council of Florence defined: That the Roman Pontiff is the true Vicar of Christ, and the Head of the whole Church, and the Father and Teacher of all Christians; and that to him in blessed Peter was delivered by our Lord Jesus Christ the full power of feeding, ruling, and governing the whole Church. To satisfy this pastoral duty our predecessors ever made unwearied efforts that the salutary doctrine of Christ might be propagated among all the nations of the earth, and with equal care watched that it might be preserved sincere and pure where it had been received. Therefore the Bishops of the whole world, now singly, now assembled in synod, following the long-established custom of Churches, and the form of the ancient rule, sent word to this Apostolic See of those dangers which sprang up in matters of faith, that there especially the losses of faith might be repaired where faith cannot feel any defect. And the Roman Pontiffs, according to the exigencies of times and circumstances, sometimes assembling Œcumenical Councils, or asking for the mind of the Church scattered throughout the world, sometimes by particular Synods, sometimes using other helps which Divine Providence supplied, defined as to be held those things which with the help of God they had recognised as conformable with the Sacred Scriptures and Apostolic Traditions. For the Holy Spirit was not promised to the successors of Peter that under His revelation they might make known new doctrine, but that under His assistance they might scrupulously keep and faithfully expound the revelation or deposit of faith delivered through the Apostles. And, indeed, all the venerable Fathers have embraced, and the holy orthodox Doctors have venerated and followed, their Apostolic doctrine; knowing most fully that this See of holy Peter remains ever free from all blemish of error, according to the divine promise of the Lord our Saviour made to the Prince of His disciples: I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not, and thou, at length converted, confirm thy brethren. This gift, then, of truth and never-failing faith was conferred by Heaven upon Peter and his successors in this Chair, that they might perform their high office for the salvation of all; that the whole flock of Christ, kept away by them from the poisonous food of error, might be nourished with the pasture of heavenly doctrine; that the occasion of schism being removed the whole Church might be kept one, and, resting on its foundation, might stand firm against the gates of hell. But since in this very age, in which the salutary efficacy of the Apostolic office is even most of all required, not a few are found who take away from its authority, We judge it altogether necessary solemnly to assert the prerogative which the only-begotten Son of God vouchsafed to join with the supreme pastoral office. Therefore We, faithfully adhering to the tradition received from the beginning of the Christian faith, for the glory of God our Saviour, the exaltation of the Roman Catholic Religion, and the salvation of Christian people, with the approbation of the Sacred Council, teach and define that it is a dogma divinely revealed: that the Roman Pontiff, when he speaks ex cathedrâ, that is, when in discharge of the office of Pastor and Doctor of all Christians, by virtue of his supreme Apostolic authority he defines a doctrine regarding faith or morals to be held by the Universal Church, by the divine assistance promised to him in blessed Peter, enjoys that infallibility with which the divine Redeemer wished that His Church be provided for defining doctrine regarding faith or morals; and that therefore such definitions of the Roman Pontiff are irreformable of themselves, and not from the consent of the Church. But if anyone—which may God avert—presume to contradict this Our definition; let him be anathema."

A. D. 1870.—End of the Temporal Sovereignty.—Rome made the capital of the Kingdom of Italy.—The Law of the Papal Guarantees. — The events which extinguished the temporal sovereignty of the Pope and made Rome the capital of the Kingdom of Italy will be found narrated under ITALY: A. D. 1870. "The entry of the Italian troops into Rome, and its union to Italy . . . was acquiesced in by all the powers of Europe, both Protestant and Roman Catholic. The French Government of National Defence, which had succeeded to power after the

fall of the Second Empire, expressed through M. Jules Favre, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, its desire that the Italians should do what they liked, and avowed its sympathy with them. . . . The Austro-Hungarian Cabinet was asked by the Papal Court to protest against the occupation of Rome. To this the Imperial and Royal Government gave a direct refusal, alleging among other reasons that 'its excellent relations' with Italy, upon which it had 'cause to congratulate itself ever since reconciliation had been effected' prevented its acceding to the desire of the Vatican. . . . The Spanish Government of the Regency, which succeeded to that of Queen Isabella, adopted much the same line of conduct; it praised Signor Visconti-Venosta's circular, and spoke of the 'wise and prudent' measures it proposed to adopt with regard to the Pope. . . . Baron d'Anethan, at that time Prime Minister of Belgium, who was the leader of the conservative or clerical party in the country, admitted to the Italian Minister at Brussels: 'that speaking strictly, the temporal power was not, in truth, an indispensable necessity to the Holy See for the fulfilment of its mission in the world.' As to the course Belgium would take the Baron said —'If Italy has a territorial difficulty to discuss with the Holy See, that is a matter with which Belgium has nothing to do, and it would be to disown the principles on which our existence reposes if we expressed an opinion one way or the other on the subject.' . . . The Italian Chamber elected in March, 1867, was dissolved, and on the 5th December, 1870, the newly elected Parliament met in Florence for the last time. Among its members now sat those who represented Rome and the province, in which it is situated. The session of 1871 was occupied with the necessary arrangements for the transfer of the capital to Rome, and by the discussion of an act defining the position of the Pope in relation to the kingdom of Italy. The labours of Parliament resulted in the Law of the Papal Guarantees, which, after long and full debate in both Houses, received the royal assent on the 13th of May, 1871. Its provisions ran as follows:

Article I.—The person of the Sovereign Pontiff is sacred and inviolable.

Art. II.—An attack (attentato) directed against the person of the Sovereign Pontiff, and any instigation to commit such attack, is punishable by the same penalties as those established in the case of an attack directed against the person of the king, or any instigation to commit such an attack. Offences and public insults committed directly against the person of the Pontiff by discourses, acts, or by the means indicated in the 1st article of the law on the press, are punishable by the penalties established by the 19th article of the same law. These crimes are liable to public action, and are within the jurisdiction of the court of assizes. The discussion of religious subjects is completely free.

Art. III.—The Italian Government renders throughout the territory of the kingdom royal honours to the Sovereign Pontiff, and maintains that pre-eminence of honour recognised as belonging to him by Catholic princes. The Sovereign Pontiff has power to keep up the usual number of guards attached to his person, and to the custody of the palaces, without prejudice to the obligations and duties resulting to such guards from the actual laws of the kingdom.

Art. IV.—The endowment of 3,225,000 francs (lire italiane) of yearly rental is retained in favour of the Holy See. With this sum, which is equal to that inscribed in the Roman balance-sheet under the title, 'Sacred Apostolic Palaces, Sacred College, Ecclesiastical Congregations, Secretary of State, and Foreign Diplomatic Office,' it is intended to provide for the maintenance of the Sovereign Pontiff, and for the various ecclesiastical wants of the Holy See for ordinary and extraordinary maintenance, and for the keeping of the apostolic palaces and their dependencies; for the pay, gratifications, and pensions of the guards of whom mention is made in the preceding article, and for those attached to the Pontifical Court, and for eventual expenses; also for the ordinary maintenance and care of the annexed museums and library, and for the pay, stipends, and pensions of those employed for that purpose. The endowment mentioned above shall be inscribed in the Great Book of the public debt, in form of perpetual and inalienable revenue, in the name of the Holy See; and during the time that the See is vacant, it shall continue to be paid, in order to meet all the needs of the Roman Church during that interval of time. The endowment shall remain exempt from any species of government, communal, or provincial tax; and it cannot be diminished in future, even in the case of the Italian Government resolving ultimately itself to assume the expenses of the museums and library.

Art. V.—The Sovereign Pontiff, besides the endowment established in the preceding article, will continue to have the use of the apostolic palaces of the Vatican and Lateran with all the edifices, gardens, and grounds annexed to and dependent on them, as well as the Villa of Castel Gondolfo with all its belongings and dependencies. The said palaces, villa, and annexes, like the museums, the library, and the art and archæological collections there existing, are inalienable, are exempt from every tax or impost, and from all expropriation on the ground of public utility.

Art. VI.—During the time in which the Holy See is vacant, no judiciary or political authority shall be able for any reason whatever to place any impediment or limit to the personal liberty of the cardinals. The Government provides that the meetings of the Conclave and of the Œcumenical Councils shall not be disturbed by any external violence.

Art. VII.—No official of the public authority, nor agent of the public forces, can in the exercise of his peculiar office enter into the palaces or localities of habitual residence or temporary stay of the Sovereign Pontiff, or in those in which are assembled a Conclave or Œcumenical Council, unless authorised by the Sovereign Pontiff, by the Conclave, or by the Council.

Art. VIII.—It is forbidden to proceed with visits, perquisitions, or seizures of papers, documents, books, or registers in the offices and pontifical congregations invested with purely spiritual functions.

Art. IX.—The Sovereign Pontiff is completely free to fulfil all the functions of his spiritual ministry, and to have affixed to the doors of the basilicas and churches of Rome all the acts of the said ministry.

Art. X.—The ecclesiastics who, by reason of their office, participate in Rome in the sending

forth of the acts of the spiritual ministry of the Holy See, are not subject on account of those acts to any molestation, investigation, or act of magistracy, on the part of the public authorities. Every stranger invested with ecclesiastical office in Rome enjoys the personal guarantees belonging to Italian citizens in virtue of the laws of the kingdom.

Art. XI.—The envoys of foreign governments to the Holy See enjoy in the kingdom all the prerogatives and immunities which belong to diplomatic agents, according to international right. To offences against them are extended the penalties inflicted for offences against the envoys of foreign powers accredited to the Italian Government. To the envoys of the Holy See to foreign Governments are assured throughout the territory of the kingdom the accustomed prerogatives and immunities, according to the same (international) right, in going to and from the place of their mission.

Art. XII.—The Supreme Pontiff corresponds freely with the Episcopate and with all the Catholic world without any interference whatever on the part of the Italian Government. To such end he has the faculty of establishing in the Vatican, or any other of his residences, postal and telegraphic offices worked by clerks of his own appointment. The Pontifical post-office will be able to correspond directly, by means of sealed packets, with the post-offices of foreign administrations, or remit its own correspondence to the Italian post-offices. In both cases the transport of despatches or correspondence furnished with the official Pontifical stamp will be exempt from every tax or expense as regards Italian territory. The couriers sent out in the name of the Supreme Pontiff are placed on the same footing in the kingdom, as the cabinet couriers or those of foreign government. The Pontifical telegraphic office will be placed in communication with the network of telegraphic lines of the kingdom, at the expense of the State. Telegrams transmitted by the said office with the authorised designation of 'Pontifical' will be received and transmitted with the privileges established for telegrams of State, and with the exemption in the kingdom from every tax. The same advantages will be enjoyed by the telegrams of the Sovereign Pontiff or those which, signed by his order and furnished with the stamp of the Holy See, shall be presented to any telegraphic office in the kingdom. Telegrams directed to the Sovereign Pontiff shall be exempt from charges upon those who send them.

Art. XIII.—In the city of Rome and in the six suburban sees the seminaries, academies, colleges, and other Catholic institutions founded for the education and culture of ecclesiastics, shall continue to depend only on the Holy See, without any interference of the scholastic authorities of the kingdom.

Art. XIV.—Every special restriction of the exercise of the right of meeting on the part of the members of the Catholic clergy is abolished.

Art. XV.—The Government renounces its right of apostolic legateship (legazia apostolica) in Sicily, and also its right, throughout the kingdom, of nomination or presentation in the collation of the greater benefices. The bishops shall not be required to make oath of allegiance to the king. The greater and lesser benefices cannot be conferred except on citizens of the kingdom, save in the case of the city of Rome, and of the suburban sees. No innovation is made touching the presentation to benefices under royal patronage.

Art. XVI.—The royal 'exequatur' and 'placet,' and every other form of Government assent for the publication and execution of acts of ecclesiastical authority, are abolished. However, until such time as may be otherwise provided in the special law of which Art. XVIII. speaks, the acts of these (ecclesiastical) authorities which concern the destination of ecclesiastical property and the provisions of the major and minor benefices, excepting those of the city of Rome and the suburban sees, remain subject to the royal 'exequatur' and 'placet.' The enactments of the civil law with regard to the creation and to the modes of existence of ecclesiastical institutions and of their property remain unaltered.

Art. XVII.—In matters spiritual and of spiritual discipline, no appeal is admitted against acts of the ecclesiastical authorities, nor is any aid on the part of the civil authority recognised as due to such acts, nor is it accorded to them. The recognising of the judicial effects, in these as in every other act of these (ecclesiastical) authorities, rests with the civil jurisdiction. However, such acts are without effect if contrary to the laws of the State, or to public order, or if damaging to private rights, and are subjected to the penal laws if they constitute a crime.

Art. XVIII.—An ulterior law will provide for the reorganisation, the preservation, and the administration of the ecclesiastical property of the kingdom.

Art. XIX.—As regards all matters which form part of the present law, everything now existing, in so far as it may be contrary to this law, ceases to have effect.

The object of this law was to carry out still further than had yet been done the principle of a 'free Church in a free State,' by giving the Church unfettered power in all spiritual matters, while placing all temporal power in the hands of the State. . . . The Pope and his advisers simply protested against all that was done. Pius IX. shut himself up in the Vatican and declared himself a prisoner. In the meanwhile the practical transfer of the capital from Florence was effected."—J. W. Probyn, *Italy*, 1815 *to* 1878, *ch.* 11.—The attitude towards the Italian Government assumed by the Papal Court in 1870, and since maintained, is indicated by the following, quoted from a work written in sympathy with it: "Pius IX. had refused to treat with or in any way recognize the new masters of Rome. The Law of Guarantees adopted by the Italian Parliament granted him a revenue in compensation for the broad territories of which he had been despoiled. He refused to touch a single lira of it, and preferred to rely upon the generosity of his children in every land, rather than to become the pensioner of those who had stripped him of his civil sovereignty. His last years were spent within the boundaries of the Vatican palace. He could not have ventured to appear publicly in the city without exposing himself to the insults of the mob on the one hand, or on the other calling forth demonstrations of loyalty, which would have been made the pretext for stern military repression. Nor could he have accepted in the streets of Rome the protection of

the agents of that very power against whose presence in the city he had never ceased to protest. Thus it was that Pius IX. became, practically, a prisoner in his own palace of the Vatican. He had not long to wait for evidence of the utter hollowness of the so-called Law of Guarantees. The extension to Rome of the law suppressing the religious orders, the seizure of the Roman College, the project for the expropriation of the property of the Propaganda itself, were so many proofs of the spirit in which the new rulers of Rome interpreted their pledges, that the change of government should not in any way prejudice the Church or the Holy See in its administration of the Church. . . . The very misfortunes and difficulties of the Holy See drew closer the bonds that united the Catholic world to its centre. The Vatican became a centre of pilgrimage to an extent that it had never been before in all its long history, and this movement begun under Pius IX. has continued and gathered strength under Leo XIII., until at length it has provoked the actively hostile opposition of the intruded government. Twice during his last years Pius IX. found himself the centre of a world-wide demonstration of loyalty and affection, first on June 16th, 1871, when he celebrated the twenty-fifth anniversary of his coronation, the first of all the Popes who had ever reigned beyond the 'years of Peter;' and again on June 3rd, 1877, when, surrounded by the bishops and pilgrims of all nations, he kept the jubilee of his episcopal consecration. . . . Pius IX. was destined to outlive Victor Emmanuel, as he had outlived Napoleon III. . . . Victor Emmanuel died on January 9th, Pius IX. on February 6th [1879]. . . . It had been the hope of the Revolution that, however stubbornly Pius IX. might refuse truce or compromise with the new order of things, his successor would prove to be a man of more yielding disposition. The death of the Pope had occurred somewhat unexpectedly. Though he had been ill in the autumn of 1877, at the New Year he seemed to have recovered, and there was every expectation that his life would be prolonged for at least some months. The news of his death came at a moment when the Italian Government was fully occupied with the changes that followed the accession of a new king, and when the diplomatists of Europe were more interested in the settlement of the conditions of peace between France and Germany than in schemes for influencing the conclave. Before the enemies of the Church had time to concert any hostile plans of action, the cardinals had assembled at the Vatican and had chosen as Supreme Pontiff, Cardinal Pecci, the Archbishop of Perugia. He assumed the name of Leo XIII., a name now honoured not only within the Catholic Church, but throughout the whole civilized world. . . . The first public utterances of the new Pope shattered the hopes of the usurpers. He had taken up the standard of the Church's rights from the hands of his predecessor, and he showed himself as uncompromising as ever Pius IX. had been on the question of the independence of the Holy See, and its effective guarantee in the Civil Sovereignty of the Supreme Pontiff. The hope that the Roman Question would be solved by a surrender on the part of Leo XIII. of all that Pius IX. had contended for, has been long since abandoned by even the most optimist of the Italian party."—Chevalier O'Clery, *The Making of Italy, ch.* 26.

A. D. 1873-1887.—The Culturkampf in Germany.—The "May Laws" and their repeal. See GERMANY: A. D. 1873–1887.

A. D. 1878.—Election of Leo XIII.

A. D. 1891.—Disestablishment of the Church in Brazil. See BRAZIL: A. D. 1889–1891.

A. D. 1892.—Mission of an Apostolic Delegate to the United States of America.—In October, 1892, Monsignor Francisco Satolli arrived in the United States, commissioned by the Pope as "Apostolic Delegate," with powers described in the following terms: "'We command all whom it concerns,' says the Head of the Church, 'to recognize in you, as Apostolic Delegate, the supreme power of the delegating Pontiff; we command that they give you aid, concurrence and obedience in all things; that they receive with reverence your salutary admonitions and orders.'"—*Forum, May*, 1893 (*v.* 15, *p.* 278).

PAPAGOS, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: PIMAN FAMILY, and PUEBLOS.

PAPAL GUARANTEES, Law of the. See PAPACY: A. D. 1870.

PAPAL STATES. See STATES OF THE CHURCH; also PAPACY.

PAPER BLOCKADE. See BLOCKADE, PAPER.

PAPER MONEY. See MONEY AND BANKING.

PAPHLAGONIANS, The.—A people who anciently inhabited the southern coast of the Euxine, from the mouth of the Kizil-Irmak to Cape Baba.—G. Rawlinson, *Five Great Monarchies: Persia, ch.* 1.—Paphlagonia formed part, in succession, of the dominions of Lydia, Persia, Pontus, Bithynia, and Rome, but was often governed by local princes.

PAPIN, Inventions of. See STEAM ENGINE: THE BEGINNINGS.

PAPINEAU REBELLION, The. See CANADA: A. D. 1837–1838.

PAPUANS, The.—"In contrast to the Polynesians, both in color of skin and shape of skull, are the crispy-haired black dolichocephalic Papuans, whose centre is in the large and little-known island of New Guinea, from whence they spread over the neighboring islands to the southeast, the Louisades, New Caledonia, New Britain, Solomon Islands, Queen Charlotte Islands, New Hebrides, Loyalty, and Fiji Islands. Turning now to the northward, a similar black race is found in the Eta or Ita of the Philippenes (Negritos of the Spanish), whom Meyer, Semper, Peschel, and Hellwald believe to be closely allied to the true Papuan type; and in the interiors of Sumatra, Borneo, Celebes, and Gilolo, and in the mountains of Malacca, and at last in the Andaman Islands, we find peoples closely related; and following Peschel, we may divide the whole of the eastern blacks (excepting of course the Australians) into Asiatic and Australasian Papuans; the latter inhabiting New Guinea and the islands mentioned to the south and east. In other of the islands of the South Seas traces of a black race are to be found, but so mingled with Polynesian and Malay as to render them fit subjects for treatment under the chapters on those races. The name Papua comes from the Malay word papuwah, crispy-haired, and is the name

which the Malays apply to their black neighbors. In New Guinea, the centre of the Papuans, the name is not known, nor have the different tribes any common name for themselves. In body, conformation of skull, and in general appearance the Papuans present a very close resemblance to the African negroes, and afford a strong contrast to the neighboring Polynesians."—J. S. Kingsley, ed., *The Standard [now called The Riverside], Natural History, v.* 6, *p.* 42.

Also in: A. R. Wallace, *The Malay Archipelago, ch.* 40.

PARABOLANI OF ALEXANDRIA, The. —"The 'parabolani' of Alexandria were a charitable corporation, instituted during the plague of Gallienus, to visit the sick and to bury the dead. They gradually enlarged, abused, and sold the privileges of their order. Their outrageous conduct under the reign of Cyril [as patriarch of Alexandria] provoked the emperor to deprive the patriarch of their nomination and to restrain their number to five or six hundred. But these restraints were transient and ineffectual."—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, ch.* 47, *foot-note.*

Also in: J. Bingham, *Antiq. of the Christ. Ch., bk.* 3, *ch.* 9.

PARACELSUS. See Medical Science: 16th Century.

PARAGUAY: The name.—"De Azara tells us that the river Paraguay derives its name from the Payaguas tribe of Indians, who were the earliest navigators on its waters. Some writers deduce the origin of its title from an Indian cacique, called Paraguaio, but Azara says, this latter word has no signification in any known idiom of the Indians, and moreover there is no record of a cacique ever having borne that name."—T. J. Hutchinson, *The Parana, p.* 44.

The aboriginal inhabitants. See American Aborigines: Pampas Tribes, and Tupi.

A. D. 1515-1557.—Discovery and exploration of La Plata.—Settlement and early years of the peculiar colony.—The Rio de la Plata, or River of Silver, was discovered in 1515 by the Spanish explorer, Juan de Solis, who landed incautiously and was killed by the natives. In 1519 this "Sweet Sea," as Solis called it, was visited again by Magellan, in the course of the voyage which made known the great strait which bears his name. The first, however, to ascend the important river for any distance, and to attempt the establishing of Spanish settlements upon it, was Sebastian Cabot, in 1526, after he had become chief pilot to the king of Spain. He sailed up the majestic stream to the junction of the Paraguay and the Parana, and then explored both channels, in turn, for long distances beyond. "Cabot passed the following two years in friendly relations with the Guaranis, in whose silver ornaments originated the name of La Plata, and thence of the Argentine Republic, the name having been applied by Cabot to the stream now called the Paraguay. That able and sagacious man now sent to Spain two of his most trusted followers with an account of Paraguay and its resources, and to seek the authority and reinforcements requisite for their acquisition. Their request was favourably received, but so tardily acted on that in despair the distinguished navigator quitted the region of his discoveries after a delay of five years." In 1534, the enterprise abandoned by Cabot was taken up by a wealthy Spanish courtier, Don Pedro de Mendoza, who received large powers, and who fitted out an expedition of 2,000 men, with 100 horses, taking with him eight priests. Proceeding but a hundred miles up the Plata, Mendoza founded a town on its southwestern shore, which, in compliment to the fine climate of the region, he named Buenos Ayres. As long as they kept at peace with the natives, these adventurers fared well; but when war broke out, as it did ere long, they were reduced to great straits for food. Mendoza, broken down with disappointments and hardships, resigned his powers to his lieutenant, Ayolas, and sailed for home, but died on the way. Ayolas, with part of his followers, ascended to a point on the Paraguay some distance above its junction with the Parana, where he founded a new city, calling it Asuncion. This was in 1537; and Ayolas perished that same year in an attempt to make his way overland to Peru. The survivors of the colony were left in command of an officer named Irala, who proved to be a most capable man. The settlement at Buenos Ayres was abandoned and all concentrated at Asuncion, where they numbered 600 souls. In 1542 they were joined by a new party of 400 adventurers from Spain, who came out with Cabeza de Vaca—a hero of strange adventures in Florida—now appointed Adelantado of La Plata. Cabeza de Vaca had landed with part of his forces on the Brazilian coast, at a point eastward from Asuncion, and boldly marched across country, making an important exploration and establishing friendly relations with the Guaranis. But he was not successful in his government, and the discontented colonists summarily deposed him, shipping him off to Spain, with charges against him, and restoring Irala to the command of their affairs. This irregularity seems to have been winked at by the home authorities, and Irala was scarcely interfered with for a number of years. "The favourable reports which had reached Spain of the climate and capabilities of Paraguay were such as to divert thither many emigrants who would otherwise have turned their faces toward Mexico or Peru. It was the constant endeavour of Irala to level the distinctions which separated the Spaniards from the natives and to encourage intermarriages between them. This policy, in the course of time, led to a marked result,—namely, to that singular combination of outward civilization and of primitive simplicity which was to be found in the modern Paraguayan race until it was annihilated under the younger Lopez. . . . Irala, in fact, created a nation. The colony under his administration became numerous and wealthy. . . . He was the life and soul of the colony, and his death, which occurred in 1557 at the village of Ita, near Asuncion, when he had attained the age of 70 years, was lamented alike by Spaniards and Guaranis. . . . The Spaniards brought with them few if any women, and if a certain proportion of Spanish ladies arrived later they were not in sufficient numbers to affect the general rule, which was that the Spanish settlers were allied to Guarani wives. Thus was formed the modern mixed Paraguayan race. In a very short time, therefore, by means of the ties of relationship, a strong sympathy grew up between the Spaniards and the Guaranis, or those of Guarani blood, and a recognition of this fact formed the

basis of the plan of government founded by the great Irala. The lot of the natives of Paraguay, as compared with the natives of the other Spanish dominions in the New World, was far from being a hard one. There were no mines to work. The Spaniards came there to settle, rather than to amass fortunes with which to return to Europe. The country was abundantly fertile, and such wealth as the Spaniards might amass consisted in the produce of their fields or the increase of their herds, which were amply sufficient to support them. Consequently, all they required of the natives, for the most part, was a moderate amount of service as labourers or as herdsmen."—R. G. Watson, *Spanish and Portuguese South Am., v.* 1, *ch.* 5 *and* 16.

Also in: R. Southey, *Hist. of Brazil, v.* 1, *ch.* 2–3, 5–7, *and* 11.—R. Biddle, *Memoir of S. Cabot, ch.* 16–23.—Father Charlevoix, *Hist. of Paraguay, bk.* 1–3.

A. D. 1608-1873.—The rule of the Jesuits. —The Dictatorship of Dr. Francia and of Lopez I. and Lopez II.—Disastrous War with Brazil.—"Under Spanish rule, from the early part of the 16th century as a remote dependency of Peru, and subsequently of Buenos Ayres, Paraguay had been almost entirely abandoned to the Jesuits [see Jesuits: A. D. 1542–1649] as a virgin ground on which to try the experiment of their idea of a theocratic government. The Loyola Brethren, first brought in in 1608, baptized the Indian tribes, built towns, founded missions [and communities of converts called Reductions, meaning that they had been reduced into the Christian faith], gave the tamed savages pacific, industrious, and passively obedient habits, married them by wholesale, bidding the youth of the two sexes stand up in opposite rows, and saving them the trouble of a choice by pointing out to every Jack his Jenny; drilled and marshalled them to their daily tasks in processions and at the sound of the church bells, headed by holy images; and in their leisure hours amused them with Church ceremonies and any amount of music and dancing and merry-making. They allowed each family a patch of ground and a grove of banana and other fruit trees for their sustenance, while they claimed the whole bulk of the land for themselves as 'God's patrimony,' bidding those well-disciplined devotees save their souls by slaving with their bodies in behalf of their ghostly masters and instructors. With the whole labouring population under control, these holy men soon waxed so strong as to awe into subjection the few white settlers whose estates dated from the conquest; and by degrees, extending their sway from the country into the towns, and even into the capital, Asuncion, they set themselves above all civil and ecclesiastical authority, snubbing the intendente of the province and worrying the bishop of the diocese. Driven away by a fresh outburst of popular passions in 1731, and brought back four years later by the strong hand of the Spanish Government, they made common cause with it, truckled to the lay powers whom they had set at naught, and shared with them the good things which they had at first enjoyed undivided. All this till the time of the general crusade of the European powers against their order, when they had to depart from Paraguay as well as from all other Spanish dominions in 1767. In the early part of the present century, when the domestic calamities of Spain determined a general collapse of her power in the American colonies, Paraguay raised its cry for independence, and constituted itself into a separate Republic in 1811. But, although the party of emancipation was the strongest and seized the reins of government, there were still many among the citizens who clung to their connection with the mother country, and these were known as Peninsulares; and there were many more who favoured the scheme of a federal union of Paraguay with the Republics of the Plate, and these went by the name of Porteños, owing to the importance they attached to the dependence of their country on Buenos Ayres (the puerto or harbour), the only outlet as well as the natural head of the projected confederation [see Argentine Republic: A. D. 1580–1777]. All these dissenters were soon disposed of by the ruthless energy of one man, Juan Gaspar Rodriguez, known under the name of Dr. Francia. This man, the son of a Mamaluco, or Brazilian half-caste, with Indian blood in his veins, a man of stern, gloomy and truculent character, with a mixture of scepticism and stoicism, was one of those grim, yet grotesque, heroes according to Mr. Carlyle's heart whom it is now the fashion to call 'Saviours of society.' A Doctor of Divinity, issuing from the Jesuit seminary at Cordova, but practising law at Asuncion, he made his way from the Municipal Council to the Consular dignity of the New Republic, and assumed a Dictatorship, which laid the country at his discretion . . . (1814–1840), wielding the most unbounded power till his death, at the advanced age of 83. With a view, or under pretext of stifling discontent and baffling conspiracy within and warding off intrigue or aggression from without, he rid himself of his colleagues, rivals, and opponents, by wholesale executions, imprisonments, proscriptions, and confiscations, and raised a kind of Chinese wall all round the Paraguayan territory, depriving it of all trade or intercourse, and allowing no man to enter or quit his dominions without an express permission from himself. Francia's absolutism was a monomania, though there was something like method in his madness. There were faction and civil strife and military rule in Paraguay for about a twelvemonth after his death. In the end, a new Constitution, new Consuls—one of whom, Carlos Antonio Lopez, a lawyer, took upon himself to modify the Charter in a strictly despotic sense, had himself elected President, first for ten years, then for three, and again for ten more, managing thus to reign alone and supreme for 21 years (1841–1862). On his demise he bequeathed the Vice-Presidency to his son, Francisco Solano Lopez, whom he had already trusted with the command of all the forces, and who had no difficulty in having himself appointed President for life in an Assembly where there was only one negative vote. The rule of Francia in his later years, and that of the first Lopez throughout his reign, though tyrannical and economically improvident, had not been altogether unfavourable to the development of public prosperity. The population, which was only 97,480 in 1796 and 400,000 in 1825, had risen to 1,337,431 at the census of 1857. Paraguay had then a revenue of 12,441,323f., no debt, no paper money, and the treasury was so full as to enable Lopez II. to muster an army of

62,000 men, with 200 pieces of artillery, in the field and in his fortresses. Armed with this two-edged weapon, the new despot, whose perverse and violent temper bordered on insanity, corrupted by several years' dissipation in Paris, and swayed by the influence of a strong and evil-minded woman, flattered also by the skill he fancied he had shown when he played at soldiers as his father's general in early youth, had come to look upon himself as a second Napoleon, and allowed himself no rest till he had picked a quarrel with all his neighbours and engaged in a war with Brazil and with the Republics of the Plate, which lasted five years (1865–1870) [see BRAZIL: A. D. 1825–1865]. At the end of it nearly the whole of the male population had been led like sheep to the slaughter; and the tyrant himself died 'in the last ditch,' not indeed fighting like a man, but killed like a dog when his flight was cut off, and not before he had sacrificed 100,000 of his combatants, doomed to starvation, sickness, and unutterable hardship a great many of the scattered and houseless population (400,000, as it is calculated), and so ruined the country that the census of 1873 only gave 221,079 souls, of whom the females far more than doubled the males."—A. Gallenga, *South America, ch.* 16.

ALSO IN: Father Charlevoix, *Hist. of Paraguay.*—J. R. Rengger and Longchamps, *The Reign of Dr. Francia.*—T. Carlyle, *Dr. Francia* (*Essays, v.* 6).—C. A. Washburn, *Hist. of Paraguay.*—R. F. Burton, *Letters from the Battlefields of Paraguay.*—T. J. Page, *La Plata, the Argentine Confederation and Paraguay, ch.* 27–30.—T. Griesinger, *The Jesuits, bk.* 2, *ch.* 1 (*v.* 1).—J. E. Darras, *General Hist. of the Catholic Church, period* 7, *ch.* 7 (*v.* 4).

A. D. 1870-1894.—The Republic under a new Constitution.—Since the death of Lopez, the republic of Paraguay has enjoyed a peaceful, uneventful history and has made fair progress in recovery from its prostration. The Brazilian army of occupation was withdrawn in 1876. Under a new constitution, the executive authority is entrusted to a president, elected for four years, and the legislative to a congress of two houses, senate and deputies. Don Juan G. Gonzales entered, in 1890, upon a presidential term which expires in 1894.

PARALI, The. See ATHENS: B. C. 594.

PARALUS, The.—The official vessel of the ancient Athenian government, for the conveyance of despatches and other official service.

PARASANG, The.—The parasang was an ancient Persian measure of distance, about which there is no certain knowledge. Xenophon and Herodotus represented it as equivalent to 30 Greek stadia; but Strabo regarded it as being of variable length. Modern opinion seems to incline toward agreement with Strabo, and to conclude that the parasang was a merely rough estimate of distance, averaging, according to computations by Colonèl Chesney and others, something less than three geographical miles. The modern farsang or farsakh of Persia is likewise an estimated distance, which generally, however, overruns three geographical miles.—E. H. Bunbury, *Hist. of Ancient Geog., ch.* 10, *note B* (*v.* 1).

PARAWIANAS, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: CARIBS AND THEIR KINDRED.

PARICANIANS, The.—The name given by Herodotus to a people who anciently occupied the territory of modern Baluchistan.—G. Rawlinson, *Five Great Monarchies, Persia, ch.* 1.

PARILIA, OR PULILIA, The.—The anniversary of the foundation of Rome, originally a shepherds' festival. It was celebrated on the 21st of April.—C. Merivale, *Hist. of the Romans, ch.* 21, *with foot-note.*

PARIS: The beginning.—A small island in the Seine, which now forms an almost insignificant part of the great French capital, was the site of a rude town called Lutetia, or Luketia, or Lucotecia, when Cæsar extended the dominion of Rome over that part of Gaul. It was the chief town or stronghold of the Parisii, one of the minor tribes of the Gallic people, who were under the protection of the more powerful Senones and who occupied but a small territory. They were engaged in river traffic on the Seine and seem to have been prosperous, then and afterwards. "Strabo calls this place Lucototia; Ptolemy, Lucotecia; Julian, Luketia; Ammianus calls it at first Lutetia, and afterward Parisii, from the name of the people. It is not known when nor why the designation was changed, but it is supposed to have been changed during the reign of Julian. Three laws in the Theodosian Code, referred to Valentinian and Valens, for the year 365, bear date at Parisii, and since then this name has been preserved in all the histories and public records."—P. Godwin, *Hist. of France: Ancient Gaul, bk.* 2, *ch.* 7, *note.*—See GAUL: B. C. 58–51.

Julian's residence.—Before Julian ("the Apostate") became emperor, while, as Cæsar (355–361), he governed Gaul, his favorite residence, when not in camp or in the field, was at the city of the Parisii, which he called his "dear Luketia." The change of name to Parisii (whence resulted the modern name of Paris) is supposed to have taken place during his subsequent reign. "Commanding the fruitful valleys of the Seine, the Marne, and the Oise, the earliest occupants were merchants and boatmen, who conducted the trade of the rivers, and as early as the reign of Tiberius had formed a powerful corporation. During the revolts of the Bagauds in the third century, it acquired an unhappy celebrity as the stronghold from which they harassed the peace of the surrounding region. Subsequently, when the advances of the Germans drove the government from Trèves, the emperors selected the town of the Parisii as a more secure position. They built a palace there, and an entrenched camp for the soldiers; and very soon afterward several of those aqueducts and amphitheatres which were inseparable accompaniments of Roman life. It was in that palace, which the traveller still regards with curiosity in those mouldering remains of it known as the 'Palais des Thermes,' that Julian found his favorite residence."—P. Godwin, *Hist. of France: Ancient Gaul, bk.* 2, *ch.* 7.

The capital of Clovis.—Clovis, the Frank conqueror—founder of the kingdom of the united Frank tribes in Gaul—fixed his residence first at Soissons [486], after he had overthrown Syagrius. "He afterwards chose Paris for his abode, where he built a church dedicated to the apostles St. Peter and St. Paul. But the epoch at which that town passed into his power is

uncertain."—J. C. L. de Sismondi, *The French under the Merovingians, ch.* 5.

A. D. 511-752.—Under the Merovingians. See FRANCE: A. D. 511–752.

A. D. 845.—Sacked by the Normans.—"France was heavily afflicted: a fearfully cold year was followed by another still colder and more inclement. The North wind blew incessantly all through the Winter, all through the pale and leafless Spring. The roots of the vines were perished by the frost—the wolves starved out of their forests, even in Aquitaine. . . . Meanwhile the Danish hosts were in bright activity. Regner Lodbrok and his fellows fitted out their fleet, ten times twelve dragons of the sea. Early in the bleak Spring they sailed, and the stout-built vessels ploughed cheerily through the crashing ice on the heaving Seine. . . . Rouen dared not offer any opposition. The Northmen quietly occupied the City: we apprehend that some knots or bands of the Northmen began even now to domicile themselves there, it being scarcely possible to account for the condition of Normandy under Rollo otherwise than by the supposition, that the country had long previously received a considerable Danish population. Paris, the point to which the Northmen were advancing by land and water, was the key of France, properly so called. Paris taken, the Seine would become a Danish river: Paris defended, the Danes might be restrained, perhaps expelled. The Capetian 'Duchy of France,' not yet created by any act of State, was beginning to be formed through the encreasing influence of the future Capital. . . . Fierce as the Northmen generally were, they exceeded their usual ferocity. . . . With such panic were the Franks stricken, that they gave themselves up for lost. Paris island, Paris river, Paris bridges, Paris towers, were singularly defensible: the Palais-des-Thermes, the monasteries, were as so many castles. Had the inhabitants, for their own sakes, co-operated with Charles-le-Chauve [who had stationed himself with a small army at Saint-Denis], the retreat of the Danes would have been entirely cut off; but they were palsied in mind and body; neither thought of resistance nor attempted resistance, and abandoned themselves to despair. On Easter Eve [March 28, 845] the Danes entered Paris. . . . The priests and clerks deserted their churches: the monks fled, bearing with them their shrines: soldiers, citizens and sailors abandoned their fortresses, dwellings and vessels: the great gate was left open, Paris emptied of her inhabitants, the city a solitude. The Danes hied at once to the untenanted monasteries: all valuable objects had been removed or concealed, but the Northmen employed themselves after their fashion. In the church of Saint-Germain-des-près, they swarmed up the pillars and galleries, and pulled the roof to pieces: the larchen beams being sought as excellent ship-timber. In the city, generally, they did not commit much devastation. They lodged themselves in the empty houses, and plundered all the moveables. . . . The Franks did not make any attempt to attack or dislodge the enemy, but a more efficient power compelled the Danes to retire from the city; disease raged among them, dysentery—a complaint frequently noticed, probably occasioned by their inordinate potations of the country-wine." Under these circumstances, Regner Lodbrok consented to quit Paris on receiving 7,000 pounds of silver,—a sum reckoned to be equivalent to 520,000 livres. "This was the first Danegeld paid by France, an unhappy precedent, and yet unavoidable: the pusillanimity of his subjects compelled Charles to adopt this disgraceful compromise."—Sir F. Palgrave, *Hist. of Normandy and England, bk.* 1, *ch.* 3 (*v.* 1).

ALSO IN: C. F. Keary, *The Vikings in Western Christendom, ch.* 9.

A. D. 857-861.—Twice ravaged by the Northmen.—"The Seine as well as the future Duchy of France being laid open to the Northmen [A. D. 857], Paris, partially recovered from Regner Lodbrok's invasion, was assailed with more fell intent. The surrounding districts were ravaged, and the great monasteries, heretofore sacked, were now destroyed. Only three churches were found standing—Saint-Denis, Saint-Germain-des-près, and Saint-Etienne or Notre-Dame—these having redeemed themselves by contributions to the enemy; but Saint-Denis made a bad bargain. The Northmen did not hold to their contract, or another company of pirates did not consider it as binding: the monastery was burnt to a shell, and a most heavy ransom paid for the liberation of Abbot Louis, Charlemagne's grandson by his daughter Rothaida. Sainte-Génévière suffered most severely amongst all; and the pristine beauty of the structure rendered the calamity more conspicuous and the distress more poignant. During three centuries the desolated grandeur of the shattered ruins continued to excite sorrow and dread. . . . Amongst the calamities of the times, the destruction of the Parisian monasteries seems to have worked peculiarly on the imagination." After this destructive visitation, the city had rest for only three years. In 861 a fresh horde of Danish pirates, first harrying the English coast and burning Winchester, swept then across the channel and swarmed over the country from Scheldt to Seine. Amiens, Nimeguen, Bayeux and Terouenne were all taken, on the way, and once more on Easter Day (April 6, 861) the ruthless savages of the North entered Paris. Saint-Germain-des-près, spared formerly, was now set on fire, and the city was stripped of its movable goods. King Charles the Bald met the enemy on this occasion, as before, with bribes, gave a fief to Jarl Welland, the Danish leader, and presently got him settled in the country as a baptized Christian and a vassal.—Sir F. Palgrave, *Hist. of Normandy and England, bk.* 1, *ch.* 3 (*v.* 1).

A. D. 885-886.—The great siege by the Northmen.—"In November, 885, under the reign of Charles the Fat, after having, for more than forty years, irregularly ravaged France, they [the Northmen] resolved to unite their forces in order at length to obtain possession of Paris, whose outskirts they had so often pillaged without having been able to enter the heart of the place, in the Ile de la Cité, which had originally been and still was the real Paris. Two bodies of troops were set in motion; one, under the command of Rollo, who was already famous amongst his comrades, marched on Rouen; the other went right up the course of the Seine, under the orders of Siegfried, whom the Northmen called their king. Rollo took Rouen, and pushed on at once for Paris. . . . On the 25th of November, 885, all the forces of the North-

men formed a junction before Paris; 700 huge barks covered two leagues of the Seine, bringing, it is said, more than 30,000 men. The chieftains were astonished at sight of the new fortifications of the city, a double wall of circumvallation, the bridges crowned with towers, and in the environs the ramparts of the abbeys of St. Denis and St. Germain solidly rebuilt. . . . Paris had for defenders two heroes, one of the Church and the other of the Empire [Bishop Gozlin, and Eudes, lately made Count of Paris]. . . . The siege lasted thirteen months, whiles pushed vigorously forward, with eight several assaults; whiles maintained by close investment. . . . The bishop, Gozlin, died during the siege. Count Eudes quitted Paris for a time to go and beg aid of the emperor; but the Parisians soon saw him reappear on the heights of Montmartre with three battalions of troops, and he re-entered the town, spurring on his horse and striking right and left with his battle-axe through the ranks of the dumfounded besiegers. The struggle was prolonged throughout the summer, and when, in November, 886, Charles the Fat at last appeared before Paris, 'with a large army of all nations,' it was to purchase the retreat of the Northmen at the cost of a heavy ransom, and by allowing them to go and winter in Burgundy, 'whereof the inhabitants obeyed not the emperor.'"—F. P. Guizot, *Popular Hist. of France, ch.* 12 (*v.* 1).

Also in: Sir F. Palgrave, *Hist. of Normandy and Eng., bk.* 1, *ch.* 5.—C. F. Keary, *The Vikings in Western Christendom, ch.* 15.

A. D. 987.—First becomes the capital of France.—"Nothing is more certain than that Paris never became the capital of France until after the accession of the third dynasty. Paris made the Capets, the Capets made Paris."—Sir F. Palgrave, *Hist. of Normandy and Eng., v.* 1, *p.* 280.

A. D. 1180-1199.—Improvement of the city by Philip Augustus.—"During the few short intervals of peace which had occurred in the hitherto troubled reign of Philip [A. D. 1180–1199], he had not been unmindful of the civil improvement of his people; and the inhabitants of his capital are indebted to his activity for the first attempts to rescue its foul, narrow, and mud-embedded streets from the reproach which its Latin name 'Lutetia' very justly implied. Philip expended much of the treasure, hitherto devoted solely to the revels of the court, in works of public utility, in the construction of paved causeways and aqueducts, in founding colleges and hospitals, in commencing a new city wall, and in the erection of the Cathedral of Nôtre-Dâme."—E. Smedley, *Hist. of France, pt.* 1, *ch.* 4.

A. D. 1328.—The splendor and gaiety of the Court. See France: A. D. 1328.

A. D. 1356-1383.—The building of the Bastille. See Bastille.

A. D. 1357-1358.—The popular movement under Stephen Marcel. See States General of France in the 14th Century.

A. D. 1381.—The Insurrection of the Maillotins.—At the beginning of the reign of Charles VI. a tumult broke out in Paris, caused by the imposition of a general tax on merchandise of all kinds. "The Parisians ran to the arsenal, where they found mallets of lead intended for the defence of the town, and under the blows from which the greater part of the collectors of the new tax perished. From the weapons used the insurgents took the name of Maillotins. Reims, Châlons, Orleans, Blois, and Rouen rose at the example of the capital. The States-General of the Langue d' Oil were then convoked at Compiègne, and separated without having granted anything. The Parisians were always in arms, and the dukes [regents during the minority of the young king], powerless to make them submit, treated with them, and contented themselves with the offer of 100,000 livres. The chastisement was put off for a time." The chastisement of Paris and of the other rebellious towns was inflicted in 1382 (see Flanders: A. D. 1382) after the king and his uncles had subdued the Flemings at Rosebecque.—E. de Bonnechose, *Hist. of France, epoch* 2, *bk.* 2, *ch.* 5.

A. D. 1410-1415.—The reign of the Cabochiens.—The civil war of Armagnacs and Burgundians. See France: A. D. 1380–1415.

A. D. 1418.—The massacre of Armagnacs. See France: A. D. 1415–1419.

A. D. 1420-1422.—King Henry V. of England and his court in the city. See France: A. D. 1417–1422.

A. D. 1429.—The repulse of the Maid of Orleans. See France: A. D. 1429–1431.

A. D. 1436.—Recovery from the English. See France: A. D. 1431–1453.

A. D. 1465.—Siege by the League of the Public Weal. See France: A. D. 1461–1468.

A. D. 1496.—Founding of the press of Henry Estienne. See Printing: A. D. 1496–1598.

A. D. 1567.—The Battle of St. Denis. See France: A. D. 1563–1570.

A. D. 1572.—The massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day. See France: A. D. 1572 (August).

A. D. 1588-1589.—Insurrection of the Catholic League.—The Day of Barricades.—Siege of the city by the king and Henry of Navarre. See France: A. D. 1584–1589.

A. D. 1590.—The siege by Henry IV.—Horrors of famine and disease.—Relief by the Duke of Parma. See France: A. D. 1590.

A. D. 1594.—Henry IV.'s entry.—Expulsion of Jesuits. See France: A. D. 1593–1598.

A. D. 1636.—Threatening invasion of Spaniards from the Netherlands.—The capital in peril. See Netherlands: A. D. 1635–1638.

A. D. 1648-1652.—In the wars of the Fronde. See France: A. D. 1647–1648; 1649; 1650–1651; and 1651–1653.

A. D. 1652.—The Battle of Porte St. Antoine and the massacre of the Hotel de Ville. See France: A. D. 1651–1653.

A. D. 1789-1799.—Scenes of the Revolution. See France: A. D. 1789 (June), and after.

A. D. 1814.—Surrender to the Allied armies. See France: A. D. 1814 (January—March), and (March—April).

A. D. 1815.—The English and Prussian armies in the city.—Restoration of the art-spoils of Napoleon. See France: A. D. 1815 (July—November).

A. D. 1848 (February).—Revolution.—Abdication and flight of Louis Philippe. See France: A. D. 1841–1848.

A. D. 1848 (March—June).—Creation of the Ateliers Nationaux.—Insurrection consequent on closing them. See France: A. D. 1848 (February—May), and (April—December).

A. D. 1851.—The Coup d'État. See France: A. D. 1851; and 1851–1852.

A. D. 1870-1871.—Siege by the Germans.—Capitulation. See FRANCE: A. D. 1870 (SEPTEMBER—OCTOBER), to 1871 (JANUARY—MAY).

A. D. 1871 (March—May).—The insurgent Commune.—Its Reign of Terror.—Second Siege of the city. See FRANCE: A. D. 1871 (MARCH—MAY).

PARIS, Congress of (1856). See RUSSIA: A. D. 1854–1856; and DECLARATION OF PARIS.

PARIS, Declaration of. See DECLARATION OF PARIS.

PARIS, The Parliament of. See PARLIAMENT OF PARIS.

PARIS, Treaty of (1763). See SEVEN YEARS WAR: THE TREATIES.....**Treaty of (1783).** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1783 (SEPTEMBER).....**Treaty of (1814).** See FRANCE: A. D. 1814 (APRIL—JUNE).....**Treaty of (1815).** See FRANCE: A. D. 1815 (JULY—NOVEMBER).

PARIS, University of. See EDUCATION: MEDIÆVAL.

PARISII, The. See PARIS: THE BEGINNING; and BRITAIN: CELTIC TRIBES.

PARLIAMENT, The English: Early stages of its evolution.—"There is no doubt that in the earliest Teutonic assemblies every freeman had his place. . . . But how as to the great assembly of all, the Assembly of the Wise, the Witenagemót of the whole realm [of early England]? No ancient record gives us any clear or formal account of the constitution of that body. It is commonly spoken of in a vague way as a gathering of the wise, the noble, the great men. But alongside of passages like these, we find other passages which speak of it in a way which implies a far more popular constitution. . . . It was in fact a body, democratic in ancient theory, aristocratic in ordinary practice, but to which any strong popular impulse could at any time restore its ancient democratic character. . . . Out of this body, whose constitution, by the time of the Norman Conquest, had become not a little anomalous, and not a little fluctuating, our Parliament directly grew. Of one House of that Parliament we may say more; we may say, not that it grew out of the ancient Assembly, but that it is absolutely the same by personal identity. The House of Lords not only springs out of, it actually is, the ancient Witenagemót. I can see no break between the two. . . . An assembly in which at first every freeman had a right to appear has, by the force of circumstances, step by step, without any one moment of sudden change, shrunk up into an Assembly wholly hereditary and official, an Assembly to which the Crown may summon any man, but to which, it is now strangely held, the Crown cannot refuse to summon the representatives of any man whom it has once summoned. As in most other things, the tendency to shrink up into a body of this kind began to show itself before the Norman Conquest, and was finally confirmed and established through the results of the Norman Conquest. But the special function of the body into which the old national Assembly has changed, the function of 'another House,' an Upper House, a House of Lords as opposed to a House of Commons, could not show itself till a second House of a more popular constitution had arisen by its side. Like everything else in our English polity, both Houses in some sort came of themselves. Neither of them was the creation of any ingenious theorist. . . . Our Constitution has no founder; but there is one man to whom we may give all but honours of a founder, one man to whose wisdom and self-devotion we owe that English history has taken the course which it has taken for the last 600 years. . . . That man, the man who finally gave to English freedom its second and more lasting shape, the hero and martyr of England in the greatest of her constitutional struggles, was Simon of Montfort, Earl of Leicester. If we may not call him the founder of the English Constitution, we may at least call him the founder of the House of Commons. . . . When we reach the 13th century, we may look on the old Teutonic constitution as having utterly passed away. Some faint traces of it indeed we may find here and there in the course of the 12th century; . . . but the regular Great Council, the lineal representatives of the ancient Mycel Gemót or Witenagemót, was shrinking up into a body not very unlike our House of Lords. . . . The Great Charter secures the rights of the nation and of the national Assembly as against arbitrary legislation and arbitrary taxation on the part of the Crown. But it makes no change in the constitution of the Assembly itself. . . . The Great Charter in short is a Bill of Rights; it is not what, in modern phrase, we understand by a Reform Bill. But, during the reigns of John and Henry III., a popular element was fast making its way into the national Councils in a more practical form. The right of the ordinary freeman to attend in person had long been a shadow; that of the ordinary tenant-in-chief was becoming hardly more practical; it now begins to be exchanged for what had by this time become the more practical right of choosing representatives to act in his name. Like all other things in England, this right has grown up by degrees and as the result of what we might almost call a series of happy accidents. Both in the reign of John and in the former part of the reign of Henry, we find several instances of knights from each county being summoned. Here we have the beginning of our county members and of the title which they still bear, of knights of the Shire. Here is the beginning of popular representation, as distinct from the gathering of the people in their own persons; but we need not think that those who first summoned them had any conscious theories of popular representation. The earliest object for which they were called together was probably a fiscal one; it was a safe and convenient way of getting money. The notion of summoning a small number of men to act on behalf of the whole was doubtless borrowed from the practice in judicial proceedings and in inquests and commissions of various kinds, in which it was usual for certain select men to swear on behalf of the whole shire or hundred. We must not forget . . . that our judicial and our parliamentary institutions are closely connected. . . . But now we come to that great change, that great measure of Parliamentary Reform, which has left to all later reformers nothing to do but to improve in detail. We come to that great act of the patriot Earl which made our popular Chamber really a popular Chamber. . . . When, after the fight of Lewes, Earl Simon, then master of the kingdom with the King in his safe keep-

ing, summoned his famous Parliament [A. D. 1264–5], he summoned, not only two knights from every county, but also two citizens from every city and two burgesses from every borough. . . . Thus was formed that newly developed Estate of the Realm which was, step by step, to grow into the most powerful of all, the Commons' House of Parliament."—E. A. Freeman, *Growth of the Eng. Constitution, ch.* 2.

Also in: W. Stubbs, *Const. Hist. of Eng., ch.* 6, 13–14.—R. Gneist, *The Eng. Parliament.*—T. P. Taswell-Langmead, *Eng. Const. Hist., ch.* 7.—A. Bissett, *Short Hist. of Eng. Parliament, ch.* 2–3.—See, also, Witenagemot; England: A. D. 1216–1274; and Knights of the Shire.

A. D. 1244.—Earliest use of the name.—In 1244, "as had happened just one hundred years previously in France, the name 'parliamentum' occurs for the first time [in England] (Chron. Dunst., 1244; Matth. Paris, 1246), and curiously enough, Henry III. himself, in a writ addressed to the Sheriff of Northampton, designates with this term the assembly which originated the Magna Charta: 'Parliamentum Runemede, quod fuit inter Dom. Joh., Regem patrem nostrum et barones suos Angliæ' (Rot. Claus., 28 Hen. III.). The name 'parliament' now occurs more frequently, but does not supplant the more indefinite terms 'concilium,' 'colloquium,' etc."—R. Gneist, *Hist. of the English Const., ch.* 19, *and foot-note,* 2*a* (*v.* 1).—"The name given to these sessions of Council [the national councils of the 12th century] was often expressed by the Latin 'colloquium': and it is by no means unlikely that the name of Parliament, which is used as early as 1175 by Jordan Fantosme, may have been in common use. But of this we have no distinct instance in the Latin Chroniclers for some years further, although when the term comes into use it is applied retrospectively."—W. Stubbs, *Const. Hist. of Eng., ch.* 13, *sect.* 159.

A. D. 1258.—The Mad Parliament.—An English Parliament, or Great Council, assembled at Oxford A. D. 1258, so-called by the party of King Henry III. from whom it extorted an important reorganization of the government, with much curtailment of the royal power.—W. Stubbs, *Const. Hist. of Eng., ch.* 14, *sect.* 176 (*v.* 2).—See England: A. D. 1216–1274.

A. D. 1264.—Simon de Montfort's Parliament. See England: A. D. 1216–1274; and Parliament, The English: Early stages in its Evolution.

A. D. 1275-1295.—Development under Edward I. See England: A. D. 1275–1295.

A. D. 1376.—The Good Parliament.—The English parliament of 1376 was called the Good Parliament; although most of the good work it undertook to do was undone by its successor.—W. Stubbs, *Const. Hist. of Eng., ch.* 16 (*v.* 2).

A. D. 1388.—The Wonderful Parliament.—In 1387, King Richard II. was compelled by a great armed demonstration, headed by five powerful nobles, to discard his obnoxious favorites and advisers, and to summon a Parliament for dealing with the offenses alleged against them. "The doings of this Parliament [which came together in February, 1388] are without a parallel in English history,—so much so that the name 'Wonderful Parliament' came afterwards to be applied to it. With equal truth it was also called 'the Merciless Parliament.'" It was occupied for four months in the impeachment and trial of ministers, judges, officers of the courts, and other persons, bringing a large number to the block.—J. Gairdner, *Houses of Lancaster and York, ch.* 2, *sect.* 5.

Also in: C. H. Pearson, *Eng. Hist. in the 14th Century, ch.* 11.

A. D. 1404.—The Unlearned Parliament.—"This assembly [A. D. 1404, reign of Edward IV.] acquired its ominous name from the fact that in the writ of summons the king, acting upon the ordinance issued by Edward III in 1372, directed that no lawyers should be returned as members. He had complained more than once that the members of the House of Commons spent more time on private suits than on public business."—W. Stubbs, *Const. Hist. of Eng., ch.* 18, *sect.* 634 (*v.* 3).

A. D. 1413-1422.—First acquisition of Privilege. See England: A. D. 1413–1422.

A. D. 1425.—The Parliament of Bats.—The English Parliament of 1425–1426 was so-called because of the quarrels in it between the parties of Duke Humfrey, of Gloucester, and of his uncle, Bishop Beaufort.

A. D. 1471-1485.—Depression under the Yorkist kings. See England: A. D. 1471–1485.

A. D. 1558-1603.—Under Queen Elizabeth. See England: A. D. 1558–1603.

A. D. 1614.—The Addled Parliament.—In 1614, James I. called a Parliament which certain obsequious members promised to manage for him and make docile to his royal will and pleasure. This fact leaked out, and the angry Parliament was dissolved in haste before it had done any business. "The humour of the time christened this futile Parliament 'The Addled Parliament.'"—J. F. Bright, *Hist. of Eng., Period* 2, *p.* 599.

A. D. 1640.—The Short Parliament. See England: A. D. 1640.

A. D. 1640.—The Long Parliament. See England: A. D. 1640–1641.

A. D. 1641-1664.—Triennial Acts. In 1641 an act was passed which provided for the election of a Parliament in three years after any dissolution, if none should have been regularly summoned. In 1664 this act was repealed, but with a proviso that no Parliament should exist longer than three years.—G. B. Smith, *Hist. of Eng. Parl., ch.* 2 (*v.* 1).

A. D. 1648.—The Rump. See England: A. D. 1648 (November—December).

A. D. 1649.—Temporary abolition of the House of Peers. See England: A. D. 1649 (February).

A. D. 1653.—The Barebones or Little Parliament. See England: A. D. 1653 (June—December).

A. D. 1659.—The Rump restored. See England: A. D. 1658–1660.

A. D. 1660-1740.—Rise and development of the Cabinet as an organ of Parliamentary government. See Cabinet, The English.

A. D. 1693.—The Triennial Bill.—In 1693, a bill which passed both Houses, despite the opposition of King William, provided that the Parliament then sitting should cease to exist on the next Lady Day, and that no future Parliament should last longer than three years. The king refused his assent to the enactment; but when a similar bill was passed the next year he suffered it to become a law.—H. Hallam, *Const. Hist. of Eng., ch.* 15 (*v.* 3).

A. D. 1703.—The Aylesbury election case. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1703.

A. D. 1707.—Becomes the Parliament of Great Britain.—Representation of Scotland. See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1707.

A. D. 1716.—The Septennial Act. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1716.

A. D. 1771.—Last struggle against the Press.—Freedom of reporting secured. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1771.

A. D. 1797.—Defeat of the first Reform measure. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1797.

A. D. 1830.—State of the unreformed representation. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1830.

A. D. 1832.—The first Reform of the Representation. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1830–1832.

A. D. 1867.—The second Reform Bill. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1865–1868.

A. D. 1883.—Act to prevent Corrupt and Illegal Practices at Elections. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1883.

A. D. 1884-1885.—The third Reform Bill (text and comment). See ENGLAND: A. D. 1884–1885.

PARLIAMENT, New Houses of. See WESTMINSTER PALACE.

PARLIAMENT, The Scottish. See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1326–1603.

The Drunken. See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1660–1666.

PARLIAMENT OF FLORENCE. See FLORENCE: A. D. 1250–1293.

PARLIAMENT OF ITALIAN FREE CITIES. See ITALY: A. D. 1056–1152.

PARLIAMENT OF PARIS.—"When the Carlovingian Monarchy had given place, first to Anarchy and then to Feudalism, the mallums, and the Champs de Mai, and (except in some southern cities) the municipal curiæ also disappeared. But in their stead there came into existence the feudal courts. Each tenant in capite of the crown held within his fief a Parliament of his own free vassals. . . . There was administered the seigneur's 'justice,' whether haute, moyenne, or basse. There were discussed all questions immediately affecting the seigneurie or the tenants of it. There especially were adopted all general regulations which the exigencies of the lordship were supposed to dictate, and especially all such as related to the raising tailles or other imposts. What was thus done on a small scale in a minor fief, was also done, though on a larger scale, in each of the feudal provinces, and on a scale yet more extensive in the court or Parliament holden by the king as a seigneur of the royal domain. . . . This royal court or Parliament was, however, not a Legislature in our modern sense of that word. It was rather a convention, in which, by a voluntary compact between the king as supreme suzerain and the greater seigneurs as his feudatories, an ordonnance or an impost was established, either throughout the entire kingdom, or in some seigneuries apart from the rest. From any such compact any seigneur might dissent on behalf of himself and his immediate vassals or, by simply absenting himself, might render the extension of it to his own fief impossible. . . . Subject to the many corrections which would be requisite to reduce to perfect accuracy this slight sketch of the origin of the great council or Parliament of the kings of France, such was, in substance, the constitution of it at the time of the accession of Louis IX. [A. D. 1226]. Before the close of his eventful reign, that monarch had acquired the character and was in full exercise of the powers of a law-giver, and was habitually making laws, not with the advice and consent of his council or Parliament, but in the exercise of the inherent prerogative which even now they began to ascribe to the French crown. . . . With our English prepossessions, it is impossible to repress the wonder, and even the incredulity, with which we at first listen to the statement that the supreme judicial tribunal of the kingdom could be otherwise than the zealous and effectual antagonist of so momentous an encroachment." The explanation is found in a change which had taken place in the character of the Parliament, through which its function and authority became distinctly judicial and quite apart from those of a council or a legislature. When Philip Augustus went to the Holy Land, he provided for the decision of complaints against officers of the crown by directing the queen-mother and the archbishop of Rheims, who acted as regents, to hold an annual assembly of the greater barons. "This practice had become habitual by the time of Louis IX. For the confirmation and improvement of it, that monarch ordered that, before the day of any such assemblage, citations should be issued, commanding the attendance, not, as before, of the greater barons exclusively, but of twenty-four members of the royal council or Parliament. Of those twenty-four, three only were to be great barons, three were to be bishops, and the remaining eighteen were to be knights. But as these members of the royal council did not appear to St. Louis to possess all the qualifications requisite for the right discharge of the judicial office, he directed that thirty-seven other persons should be associated to them. Of those associates, seventeen were to be clerks in holy orders, and twenty légistes, that is, men bred to the study of the law. The function assigned to the légistes was that of drawing up in proper form the decrees and other written acts of the collective body. To this body, when thus constituted, was given the distinctive title of the Parliament of Paris." By virtue of their superior education and training, the légistes soon gathered the business of the Parliament into their own hands; the knights and barons found attendance a bore and an absurdity. "Ennui and ridicule . . . proved in the Parliament of Paris a purge quite as effectual as that which Colonel Pride administered to the English House of Commons. The conseiller clercs were soon left to themselves, in due time to found, and to enjoy, what began to be called 'La Noblesse de la Robe.' Having thus assumed the government of the court, the légistes next proceeded to enlarge its jurisdiction. . . . By . . . astute constructions of the law, the Parliament had, in the beginning of the 14th century, become the supreme legal tribunal within the whole of that part of France which was at that time attached to the crown." In the reign of Philip the Long (1316–1322) the Parliament and the royal council became practically distinct bodies; the former became sedentary at Paris, meeting nowhere else, and its members were required to be constantly resident in Paris. By 1345 the parliamentary

counselors, as they were now called, had acquired life appointments, and in the reign of Charles VI. (1380–1422) the seats in the Parliament of Paris became hereditary. "At the period when the Parliament of Paris was acquiring its peculiar character as a court of justice, the meetings of the great vassals of the crown, to co-operate with the king in legislation, were falling into disuse. The king . . . had begun to originate laws without their sanction; and the Parliament, not without some show of reason, assumed that the right of remonstrance, formerly enjoyed by the great vassals, had now passed to themselves. . . . If their remonstrance was disregarded, their next step was to request that the projected law might be withdrawn. If that request was unheeded, they at length formally declined to register it among their records. Such refusals were sometimes but were not usually successful. In most instances they provoked from the king a peremptory order for the immediate registration of his ordinance. To such orders the Parliament generally submitted."—Sir J. Stephen, *Lect's on the Hist. of France, lect.* 8.—"It appears that the opinion is unfounded which ascribes to the States [the 'States-General'] and the Parliaments a different origin. Both arose out of the National Assemblies held at stated periods in the earliest times of the monarchy [the 'Champs de Mars' and 'Champs de Mai']. . . . Certainly in the earliest part of [the 13th] century there existed no longer two bodies, but only one, which had then acquired the name of Parliament. The stated meetings under the First race were called by the name of Mallum or Mallus, sometimes Placitum [also Plaid], sometimes Synod. Under the Second race they were called Colloquium also. The translation of this term (and it is said also of Mallum) into Parliament occurs not before the time of Louis VI. (le Gros); but in that of Louis VIII., at the beginning of the 13th century, it became the usual appellation. There were then eleven Parliaments, besides that of Paris, and all those bodies had become merely judicial, that of Paris exercising a superintending power over the other tribunals. . . . After [1334] . . . the Parliament was only called upon to register the Ordinances. This gave a considerable influence to the Parliament of Paris, which had a right of remonstrance before registry; the Provincial Parliaments only could remonstrate after registry. . . . The Parliament of Paris, besides remonstrating, might refuse to register; and though compellable by the King holding a Bed of Justice, which was a more solemn meeting of the Parliament attended by the King's Court in great state [see BED OF JUSTICE], yet it cannot be doubted that many Ordinances were prevented and many modified in consequence of this power of refusal."—Lord Brougham, *Hist. of England and France under the House of Lancaster, note* 66.—For an account of the conflict between the Parliament of Paris and the crown which immediately preceded the French Revolution, see FRANCE: A. D. 1787–1789.

ALSO IN: M. de la Rocheterie, *Marie Antoinette, ch.* 6–11.

PARMA, Alexander Farnese, Duke of, in the Netherlands. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1577–1581, to 1588–1593.

PARMA: Founding of. See MUTINA.

A. D. 1077-1115.—In the Dominions of the Countess Matilda. See PAPACY: A. D. 1077–1102.

A. D. 1339-1349.—Bought by the Visconti, of Milan. See MILAN: A. D. 1277–1447.

A. D. 1513.—Conquest by Pope Julius II. See ITALY: A. D. 1510–1513.

A. D. 1515.—Reannexed to Milanese and acquired by France. See FRANCE: A. D. 1515–1518.

A. D. 1521.—Retaken by the Pope. See FRANCE: A. D. 1520–1523.

A. D. 1545-1592.—Alienation from the Holy See and erection, with Placentia, into a duchy, for the House of Farnese.—"Paul III. was the last of those ambitious popes who rendered the interests of the holy see subordinate to the aggrandizement of their families. The designs of Paul, himself the representative of the noble Roman house of Farnése, were ultimately successful; since, although partially defeated during his life, they led to the establishment of his descendants on the throne of Parma and Placentia for nearly 200 years. . . . He gained the consent of the sacred college to alienate those states from the holy see in 1545, that he might erect them into a duchy for his natural son, Pietro Luigi Farnése; and the Emperor Charles V. had already, some years before, to secure the support of the papacy against France, bestowed the hand of his natural daughter, Margaret, widow of Alessandro de' Medici, upon Ottavio, son of Pietro Luigi, and grandson of Paul III. Notwithstanding this measure, Charles V. was not subsequently, however, the more disposed to confirm to the house of Farnése the investiture of their new possessions, which he claimed as part of the Milanese duchy; and he soon evinced no friendly disposition towards his own son-in-law, Ottavio. Pietro Luigi, the first duke of Parma, proved himself, by his extortions, his cruelties, and his debaucheries, scarcely less detestable than any of the ancient tyrants of Lombardy. He thus provoked a conspiracy and insurrection of the nobles of Placentia, where he resided; and he was assassinated by them at that place in 1547, after a reign of only two years. The city was immediately seized in the imperial name by Gonzaga, governor of Milan. . . . To deter the emperor from appropriating Parma also to himself, [Paul III.] could devise no other expedient than altogether to retract his grant from his family, and to reoccupy that city for the holy see, whose rights he conceived that the emperor would not venture to invade." But after the death of Paul III., the Farnése party, commanding a majority in the conclave, "by raising Julius III. to the tiara [1550], obtained the restitution of Parma to Ottavio from the gratitude of the new pope. The prosperity of the ducal house of Farnése was not yet securely established. The emperor still retained Placentia, and Julius III. soon forgot the services of that family. In 1551, the pope leagued with Charles V. to deprive the duke Ottavio of the fief which he had restored to him. Farnése was thus reduced . . . to place himself under the protection of the French; and this measure, and the indecisive war which followed, became his salvation. He still preserved his throne when Charles V. terminated his reign; and one of the first acts of Philip II., when Italy was menaced by the invasion of the duke de Guise [1556], was to win him

over from the French alliance, and to secure his gratitude, by yielding Placentia again to him. But a Spanish garrison was still left in the citadel of that place; and it was only the brilliant military career of Alessandro Farnése, the celebrated prince of Parma, son of duke Ottavio, which finally consummated the greatness of his family. Entering the service of Philip II., Alessandro gradually won the respect and favour of that gloomy monarch; and at length, in 1585, as a reward for his achievements, the Spanish troops were withdrawn from his father's territories. The duke Ottavio closed his life in the following year; but Alessandro never took possession of his throne. He died at the head of the Spanish armies in the Low Countries in 1592; and his son Ranuccio quietly commenced his reign over the duchy of Parma and Placentia under the double protection of the holy see and the monarchy of Spain."—G. Procter, *Hist. of Italy, ch.* 9.

A. D. 1635.—Alliance with France against Spain. See GERMANY: A. D. 1634–1639.

A. D. 1635-1637.—Desolation of the duchy by the Spaniards.—The French alliance renounced. See ITALY: A. D. 1635–1659.

A. D. 1725.—Reversion of the duchy pledged to the Infant of Spain. See SPAIN: A. D. 1713–1725.

A. D. 1731.—Possession given to Don Carlos, the Infant of Spain. See SPAIN: A. D. 1726–1731; and ITALY: A. D. 1715–1735.

A. D. 1735.—Restored to Austria. See FRANCE: A. D. 1733–1735; and ITALY: A. D. 1715–1735.

A. D. 1745-1748.—Changes of masters.— In the War of the Austrian Succession, Parma was taken by Spain in 1745; recovered by Austria in the following year (see ITALY: A. D. 1746–1747); but surrendered by Maria Theresa to the infant of Spain in 1748.

A. D. 1767.—Expulsion of the Jesuits.—Papal excommunication of the Duke. See JESUITS: A. D. 1761–1769.

A. D. 1801.—The Duke's son made King of Etruria. See GERMANY: A. D. 1801–1803.

A. D. 1802.—The duchy declared a dependency of France. See FRANCE: A. D. 1802 (AUGUST—SEPTEMBER).

A. D. 1814.—Duchy conferred on Marie Louise, the ex-empress of Napoleon. See FRANCE: A. D. 1814 (MARCH—APRIL).

A. D. 1831.—Revolt and expulsion of Marie Louise.—Her restoration by Austria. See ITALY: A. D. 1830–1832.

A. D. 1848-1849.—Abortive revolution. See ITALY: A. D. 1848–1849.

A. D. 1859-1861.—End of the duchy.—Absorption in the new kingdom of Italy. See ITALY: A. D. 1856–1859; and 1859–1861.

PARMA, Battle of (1734). See FRANCE: A. D. 1733–1735.

PARNASSUS. See THESSALY; and DORIANS AND IONIANS.

PARNELL MOVEMENT, The. See IRELAND: A. D. 1873–1879, to 1889–1891.

PARRIS, Samuel, and Salem Witchcraft. See MASSACHUSETTS: A. D. 1692.

PARSEES, The.—"On the western coast of India, from the Gulf of Cambay to Bombay, we find from one hundred to one hundred and fifty thousand families whose ancestors migrated thither from Iran. The tradition among them is, that at the time when the Arabs, after conquering Iran and becoming sovereigns there, persecuted and eradicated the old religion [of the Avesta], faithful adherents of the creed fled to the mountains of Kerman. Driven from these by the Arabs (in Kerman and Yezd a few hundred families are still found who maintain the ancient faith), they retired to the island of Hormuz (a small island close by the southern coast, at the entrance to the Persian Gulf). From hence they migrated to Din (on the coast of Guzerat), and then passed over to the opposite shore. In the neighbourhood of Bombay and in the south of India inscriptions have been found which prove that these settlers reached the coast in the tenth century of our era. At the present time their descendants form a considerable part of the population of Surat, Bombay, and Ahmadabad; they call themselves, after their ancient home, Parsees, and speak the later Middle Persian."—M. Duncker, *Hist. of Antiquity, bk.* 7, *ch.* 2 (*v.* 5).—See, also, ZOROASTRIANS.

PARSONS' CAUSE, The. See VIRGINIA: A. D. 1763.

PARTHENII, The.—This name was given among the Spartans to a class of young men, sons of Spartan women who had married outside the exclusive circle of the Spartiatæ. The latter refused, even when Sparta was most pressingly in need of soldiers, to admit these "sons of maidens," as they stigmatized them, to the military body. The Parthenii, becoming numerous, were finally driven to emigrate, and found a home at Tarentum, Italy.—E. Curtius, *Hist. of Greece, bk.* 2, *ch.* 1.—See TARENTUM.

PARTHENON AT ATHENS, The.—"Pericles had occasion to erect on the highest point of the Acropolis, in place of the ancient Hecatompedon, a new festive edifice and treasure-house, which, by blending intimately together the fulfilment of political and religious ends, was to serve to represent the piety and artistic culture, the wealth and the festive splendour—in fine, all the glories which Athens had achieved by her valour and her wisdom [see ATHENS: B. C. 445–431]. . . . The architect from whose design, sanctioned by Pericles and Phidias, the new Hecatompedon was erected, was Ictinus, who was seconded by Callicrates, the experienced architect of the double line of walls. It was not intended to build an edifice which should attract attention by the colossal nature of its proportions or the novelty of its style. The traditions of the earlier building were followed, and its dimensions were not exceeded by more than 50 feet. In a breadth of 100 feet the edifice extended in the form of a temple, 226 feet from east to west; and the height, from the lowest stair to the apex of the pediment, amounted only to 65 feet. . . . The Hecatompedon, or Parthenon (for it went by this name also as the house of Athene Parthenos), was very closely connected with the festival of the Panathenæa, whose splendour and dignity had gradually risen by degrees together with those of the state. . . . The festival commenced with the performances in the Odeum, where the masters of song and recitation, and the cither and flute-players, exhibited their skill, the choral songs being produced in the theatre. Hereupon followed the gymnastic games, which, besides the usual contests in the stadium, foot-race, wrestling-matches, &c., also included the

torch-race, which was held in the Ceramicus outside the Dipylum, when no moon shone in the heavens; and which formed one of the chief attractions of the whole festival."—E. Curtius, *Hist. of Greece, bk.* 3, *ch.* 3.—See, also, Acropolis of Athens.

A. D. 1687.—Destructive explosion during the siege of Athens by the Venetians. See Turks: A. D. 1684–1696.

PARTHENOPÉ. See Neapolis and Palæpolis.

PARTHENOPEIAN REPUBLIC, The. See France: A. D. 1798–1799 (August—April).

PARTHIA, AND THE PARTHIAN EMPIRE.—"The mountain chain, which running southward of the Caspian, skirts the great plateau of Iran, or Persia, on the north, broadens out after it passes the south-eastern corner of the sea, into a valuable and productive mountain-region. Four or five distinct ranges here run parallel to one another, having between them latitudinal valleys, with glens transverse to their courses. The sides of the valleys are often well wooded; the flat ground at the foot of the hills is fertile; water abounds; and the streams gradually collect into rivers of a considerable size. The fertile territory in this quarter is further increased by the extension of cultivation to a considerable distance from the base of the most southern of the ranges, in the direction of the Great Iranic desert. . . . It was undoubtedly in the region which has been thus briefly described that the ancient home of the Parthians lay. . . . Parthia Proper, however, was at no time coextensive with the region described. A portion of that region formed the district called Hyrcania; and it is not altogether easy to determine what were the limits between the two. The evidence goes, on the whole, to show that while Hyrcania lay towards the west and north, the Parthian country was that towards the south and east, the valleys of the Ettrek and Gurghan constituting the main portions of the former, while the tracts east and south of those valleys, as far as the sixty-first degree of E. longitude, constituted the latter. If the limits of Parthia Proper be thus defined, it will have nearly corresponded to the modern Persian province of Khorasan. . . . The Turanian character of the Parthians, though not absolutely proved, appears to be in the highest degree probable. If it be accepted, we must regard them as in race closely allied to the vast hordes which from a remote antiquity have roamed over the steppe region of Upper Asia, from time to time bursting upon the south and harassing or subjugating the comparatively unwarlike inhabitants of the warmer countries. We must view them as the congeners of the Huns, Bulgarians and Comans of the ancient world; of the Kalmucks, Ouigurs, Usbegs, Eleuts, &c., of the present day. . . .The Parthians probably maintained their independence from the time of their settlement in the district called after their name until the sudden arrival in their country of the great Persian conqueror, Cyrus, [about 554 B. C.]. . . . When the Persian empire was organised by Darius Hystaspis into satrapies, Parthia was at first united in the same government with Chorasmia, Sogdiana and Aria. Subsequently, however, when satrapies were made more numerous, it was detached from these extensive countries, and made to form a distinct government, with the mere addition of the comparatively small district of Hyrcania." The conquests of Alexander included Parthia within their range, and, under the new political arrangements which followed Alexander's death, that country became for a time part of the wide empire of the Seleucidæ, founded by Seleucus Nicator, — the kingdom of Syria as it was called. But about 250 B. C. a successful revolt occurred in Parthia, led by one Arsaces, who founded an independent kingdom and a dynasty called the Arsacid (see Seleucidæ: B. C. 281–224, and 224–187). Under succeeding kings, especially under the sixth of the line, Mithridates I. (not to be confused with the Mithridatic dynasty in Pontus), the kingdom of Parthia was swollen by conquest to a great empire, covering almost the whole territory of the earlier Persian empire, excepting in Asia Minor and Syria. On the rise of the Roman power, the Parthians successfully disputed with it the domination of the east, in several wars (see Rome: B. C. 57–52), none of which were advantageous to the Romans, until the time of Trajan.—G. Rawlinson, *Sixth Great Oriental Monarchy: Parthia.* — Trajan (A. D. 115–117 — see Rome: A. D. 96–138) "undertook an expedition against the nations of the East. . . . The success of Trajan, however transient, was rapid and specious. The degenerate Parthians, broken by intestine discord, fled before his arms. He descended the river Tigris in triumph, from the mountains of Armenia to the Persian gulf. He enjoyed the honour of being the first, as he was the last, of the Roman generals who ever navigated that remote sea. His fleets ravaged the coasts of Arabia. . . . Every day the astonished senate received the intelligence of new names and new nations that acknowledged his sway. . . . But the death of Trajan soon clouded the splendid prospect. . . . The resignation of all the eastern conquests of Trajan was the first measure of his [successor Hadrian's] reign. He [Hadrian] restored to the Parthians the election of an independent sovereign, withdrew the Roman garrisons from the provinces of Armenia, Mesopotamia and Assyria; and, in compliance with the precept of Augustus, once more established the Euphrates as the frontier of the empire."—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, ch.* 1.—In the reign of Marcus Aurelius Antoninus at Rome, the Parthian king Vologeses III. (or Arsaces XXVII.) provoked the Roman power anew by invading Armenia and Syria. In the war which followed, the Parthians were driven from Syria and Armenia; Mesopotamia was occupied; Seleucia, Ctesiphon and Babylon taken; and the royal palace at Ctesiphon burned (A. D. 165). Parthia then sued for peace, and obtained it by ceding Mesopotamia, and allowing Armenia to return to the position of a Roman dependency. Half a century later the final conflict of Rome and Parthia occurred. "The battle of Nisibis [A. D. 217], which terminated the long contest between Rome and Parthia, was the fiercest and best contested which was ever fought between the rival powers. It lasted for the space of three days. . . . Macrinus [the Roman emperor, who commanded] took to flight among the first; and his hasty retreat discouraged his troops, who soon afterwards acknowledged themselves beaten and retired within the lines of their camp. Both armies had suffered severely. Herodian describes the heaps of dead as piled to

such a height that the manœuvres of the troops were impeded by them, and at last the two contending hosts could scarcely see one another. Both armies, therefore, desired peace." But the peace was purchased by Rome at a heavy price. After this, the Parthian monarchy was rapidly undermined by internal dissensions and corruptions, and in A. D. 226 it was overthrown by a revolt of the Persians, who claimed and secured again, after five centuries and a half of subjugation, their ancient leadership among the races of the East. The new Persian Empire, or Sassanian monarchy, was founded by Artaxerxes I. on the ruins of the Parthian throne.—G. Rawlinson, *The Sixth Great Oriental Monarchy, ch.* 3–21.

Also in: The same, *Story of Parthia.*

PARTHIAN HORSE.—PARTHIAN ARROWS.—"Fleet and active coursers, with scarcely any caparison but a headstall and a single rein, were mounted by riders clad only in a tunic and trousers, and armed with nothing but a strong bow and a quiver full of arrows. A training begun in early boyhood made the rider almost one with his steed; and he could use his weapons with equal ease and effect whether his horse was stationary or at full gallop, and whether he was advancing towards or hurriedly retreating from his enemy. . . . It was his ordinary plan to keep constantly in motion when in the presence of an enemy, to gallop backwards and forwards, or round and round his square or column, never charging it, but at a moderate interval plying it with his keen and barbed shafts."—G. Rawlinson, *Sixth Great Oriental Monarchy, ch.* 11.

PARTIES AND FACTIONS, POLITICAL AND POLITICO-RELIGIOUS.—Abolitionists. See Slavery, Negro: A. D. 1828–1832; and 1840–1847.....**Adullamites.** See England: A. D. 1865–1868.....**Aggraviados.** See Spain: A. D. 1814–1827.....**American.** See United States of Am.: A. D. 1852.....**Ammoniti.** See Florence: A. D. 1358.....**Anarchists.** See Anarchists.....**Anilleros.** See Spain: A. D. 1814–1827.....**Anti-Corn-Law League.** See Tariff Legislation (England): A. D. 1836–1839; and 1845–1846.....**Anti-Federalists.** See United States of Am.: A. D. 1789–1792.....**Anti-Masonic.** See New York: A. D. 1826–1832; and Mexico: A. D. 1822–1828.....**Anti-Renters.** See Livingston Manor.....**Anti-Slavery.** See Slavery, Negro: A. D. 1688–1780; 1776–1808; 1828–1832; 1840–1847.....**Armagnacs.** See France: A. D. 1380–1415; and 1415–1419.....**Arrabiati.** See Florence: A. D. 1490–1498.....**Assideans.** See Chasidim.....**Barnburners.** See United States of Am.: A. D. 1845–1846.....**Beggars.** See below: Gueux.....**Bianchi.** See Florence: A. D. 1295–1300; and 1301–1313.....**Bigi, or Greys.** See Bigi.....**Blacks, or Black Guelfs.** See Florence: A. D. 1295–1300; and 1301–1313.....**Blue-Light Federalists.** See Blue-Light Federalists.....**Blues.** See Circus, Factions of the Roman; and Venezuela: 1829–1886.....**Border Ruffians.** See Kansas: A. D. 1854–1859.....**Boys in Blue.** See Boys in Blue.....**Bucktails.** See New York: A. D. 1817–1819.....**Bundschuh.** See Germany: A. D. 1492–1514.....**Burgundians.** See France: A. D. 1385–1415; and 1415–1419.....**Burschenschaft.** See Germany: A. D. 1817–1820.....**Butternuts.** See Boys in Blue.....**Cabochiens.** See France: A. D. 1380–1415.....**Calixtines, or Utraquists.** See Bohemia: A. D. 1419–1434; and 1434–1457.....**Camisards.** See France: A. D. 1702–1710.....**Caps and Hats.** See below: Hats and Caps.....**Carbonari.** See Italy: A. D. 1808–1809.....**Carlists.** See Spain: A. D. 1833–1846; and 1873–1885.....**Carpet-baggers.** See United States of Am.: A. D. 1866–1871.....**Cavaliers and Roundheads.** See England: A. D. 1641 (October); also, Roundheads.....**Center.** See Right, Left, and Center.....**Charcoals.** See Claybanks and Charcoals.....**Chartists.** See England: A.D. 1838–1842; and 1848.....**Chasidim.** See Chasidim.....**Chouans.** See France: A. D. 1794–1796.....**Christinos.** See Spain: A. D. 1833–1846; and 1873–1885.....**Claybanks and Charcoals.** See Claybanks and Charcoals.....**Clear Grits.** See Canada: A. D. 1840–1867.....**Clichyans.** See France: A.D. 1797 (September).....**Clintonians.** See New York: A. D. 1817–1819.....**Cods.** See below: Hooks and Cods.....**Communeros.** See Spain: A. D. 1814–1827.....**Communists.** See France: A. D. 1871 (March — May).....**Conservative (English).** See Conservative Party.....**Constitutional Union.** See United States of Am.: A. D. 1860 (April—November).....**Copperheads.** See Copperheads.....**Cordeliers.** See France: A. D. 1790.....**Country Party.** See England: A. D. 1672–1673.....**Covenanters.** See Covenanters; also Scotland: A. D. 1557, 1581, 1638, 1644–1645, and 1660–1661, to 1681–1689.....**Crêtois.** See France: A. D. 1795 (April).....**Decamisados.** See Spain: A. D. 1814–1827.....**Democrats.** See United States of Am.: A. D. 1789–1792; 1825–1828; 1845–1846.....**Doughfaces.** See Doughfaces.....**Douglas Democrats.** See United States of Am.: A. D. 1860 (April—November).....**Equal Rights Party.** See New York: A. D. 1835–1837.....**Escocés.** See Mexico: A. D. 1822–1828.....**Essex Junto.** See Essex Junto.....**Farmers' Alliance.** See United States of Am.: A. D. 1877–1891.....**Federalists.** See United States of Am.: A. D. 1789–1792; 1812; and 1814 (December) The Hartford Convention.....**Feds.** See Boys in Blue.....**Fenians.** See Ireland: A. D. 1858–1867; and Canada: A. D. 1866–1871.....**Feuillants.** See France: A. D. 1790.....**Free Soilers.** See United States of Am.: A. D. 1848.....**Free Traders.** See Tariff Legislation.....**The Fronde.** See France: A. D. 1649, to 1651–1653.....**Gachupines.** See Gachupines.....**Girondists.** See France: A. D. 1791 (October), to 1793–1794 (October—April).....**Gomerists.** See Netherlands: A. D. 1603–1619.....**Grangers.** See United States of Am.: A. D. 1877–1891.....**Graybacks.** See Boys in Blue.....**Greenbackers.** See United States of Am.: A. D. 1880.....**Greens.** See Circus, Factions of the Roman.....**Greys.** See Bigi.....**Guadalupes.** See Gachupines.....**Guelfs and Ghibellines.** See Guelfs.....**Gueux, or Beggars.** See Netherlands: A. D. 1562–1566.....**Half-breeds.** See Stalwarts.**Hard-Shell Democrats.** See United States of Am.: A. D. 1845–1846.....**Hats and Caps.** See Scandinavian States (Sweden): A. D. 1720–1792.....**Home Rulers or Nationalists.** See Ireland: A. D. 1873–1879; also England: A. D. 1885–1886, and 1892–1893.....**Hooks and Cods, or Kabeljauws.** See Netherlands

(Holland): A. D. 1345–1354; and 1482–1493. ....**Huguenots.** See France: A. D. 1559–1561, to 1598–1599; 1620–1622, to 1627–1628; 1661–1680; 1681–1698; 1702–1710.....**Hunkers.** See United States of Am.: A. D. 1845–1846..... **Iconoclasts of the 8th century.** See Iconoclastic Controversy.....**Iconoclasts of the 16th century.** See Netherlands: A. D. 1566–1568.....**Importants.** See France: A. D. 1642–1643.....**Independent Republicans.** See United States of Am.: A. D. 1884.....**Independents, or Separatists.** See Independents..... **Intransigentists.** See Intransigentists..... **Irredentists.** See Irredentists.....**Jacobins.** See France: A. D. 1790, to 1794–1795 (July—April).....**Jacobites.** See Jacobites.....**Jacquerie.** See France: A. D. 1358.....**Jingoes.** See Turks: A. D. 1878.....**Kabeljauws.** See above: Hooks and Cods.....**Kharejites.** See Kharejites.....**Know Nothing.** See United States of Am.: A. D. 1852.....**Ku Klux Klan.** See United States of Am.: A. D. 1866–1871. ....**Land Leaguers.** See Ireland: A. D. 1873–1879.....**Left.—Left Center.** See Right, Left, and Center.....**Legitimists.** See Legitimists.....**Leliaerds.** See Leliaerds..... **Levellers.** See Levellers.....**Liberal Republicans.** See United States of Am.: A. D. 1872.....**Liberal Unionists.** See England: A. D. 1885–1886.....**Libertines.** See Libertines of Geneva.....**Liberty Boys.** See below: Sons of Liberty.....**Liberty Party.** See Slavery, Negro: A. D. 1840–1847.....**Locofocos.** See Locofocos; and New York: A.D. 1835–1837.....**Lollards.** See England: A. D. 1360–1414.....**Malignants.** See Malignants. ....**The Marais, or Plain.** See France: A. D. 1792 (September — November).....**Marians.** See Rome: B. C. 88–78.....**Martling Men.** See Martling Men.....**Melchites.** See Melchites.....**The Mountain.** See France: A. D. 1791 (October); 1792 (September — November); and after, to 1794–1795 (July—April). ....**Mugwumps.** See United States of Am.: A. D. 1884.....**Muscadins.** See France: A. D. 1794–1795 (July — April)..... **Nationalists, Irish.** See England: A.D. 1885–1886.....**Neri.** See Florence: A. D. 1295–1300; and 1301–1313. **Nihilists.** See Nihilism.....**Oak Boys.** See Ireland: A. D. 1760–1798.....**Opportunists.** See France: A. D. 1893.....**Orangemen.** See Ireland: A. D. 1795–1796.....**Orleanists.** See Legitimists.....**The Ormée.** See Bordeaux: A. D. 1652–1653.....**Orphans.** See Bohemia: A. D. 1419–1434.....**Ottimati.** See Florence: A. D. 1498–1500.....**Palleschi.** See Florence: A. D. 1498–1500.....**Patrons of Husbandry.** See United States of Am.: A. D. 1877–1891. ....**Peep-o'-Day Boys.** See Ireland: A. D. 1760–1798, and 1784.....**Pelucones.** See Pelucones.....**Petits Maîtres.** See France: A. D. 1650–1651.....**Piagnoni.** See Florence: A. D. 1490–1498.....**The Plain.** See France: A. D. 1792 (September—November).....**Plebs.** See Plebeians; also, Rome: The Beginning, and after.....**Politiques.** See France: A. D. 1573–1576.....**Popolani.** See Florence: A. D. 1498–1500.....**Populist or People's.** See United States of Am.: A. D. 1892.....**Prohibitionists.** See Prohibitionists.....**Protectionists.** See Tariff Legislation.....**Puritan.** See Puritans.....**Republican (Earlier).** See United States of Am.: A. D. 1825–1828.—(Later). See United States of Am.: A. D. 1854–1855..... **Ribbonmen.** See Ireland: A. D. 1820–1826. ....**Right.—Right Center.** See Right, Left, and Center.....**Roundheads.** See England: A. D. 1641 (October); also, Roundheads..... **Sansculottes.** See France: A. D. 1791 (October).....**Secesh.** See Boys in Blue..... **Serviles.** See Spain: A. D. 1814–1827..... **Shias.** See Islam.....**Silver-greys, or Snuff-takers.** See United States of Am.: A. D. 1850.....**Socialists.** See Social Movements. ....**Soft-Shell Democrats.** See United States of Am.: A. D. 1845–1846.....**Sons of Liberty.** See United States of Am.: A. D. 1765 The organization of the Sons of Liberty, and 1864 (October).....**Stalwarts.** See Stalwarts.....**Steel Boys.** See Ireland: A. D. 1760–1798.....**Sunni.** See Islam.....**Taborites.** See Bohemia: A. D. 1419–1434; and 1434–1457.....**Tammany Ring.** See New York: A. D. 1863–1871; and Tammany Society..... **Tories.** See Rapparees; England: A. D. 1680; Conservative Party; and Tories of the Am. Revolution.....**Tugenbund.** See Germany: A. D. 1808 (April—December).....**Ultramontanists.** See Ultramontane.....**United Irishmen.** See Ireland: A. D. 1793–1798.....**Utraquists.** See Bohemia: A. D. 1419–1434; and 1434–1457.....**Whigs (American).** See United States of Am.: A. D. 1834.....**Whigs (English).** See Whigs.....**Whiteboys.** See Ireland: A. D. 1760–1798.....**White Hoods.** See Flanders: A. D. 1379, and White Hoods of France.....**Whites.** See Florence: A. D. 1295–1300; and 1301–1313.....**Wide Awakes.** See Wide Awakes.....**Woolly-heads.** See United States of Am.: A. D. 1850.....**Yellows.** See Venezuela: A. D. 1829–1886..... **Yorkinos.** See Mexico: A. D. 1822–1828..... **Young Ireland.** See Ireland: A. D. 1841–1848. ....**Young Italy.** See Italy: A. D. 1831–1848. ....**Zealots.** See Zealots; and Jews: A. D. 66–70.

PARTITION OF THE SPANISH EMPIRE, The Treaties of. See Spain: A. D. 1698–1700.

PARTITIONS OF POLAND. See Poland: A. D. 1763–1773; and 1793–1796.

PARU, The Great. See El Dorado.

PASARGADÆ.—One of the tribes of the ancient Persians, from which came the royal race of the Achæmenids. See Persia: Ancient People and Country.

PASCAGOULAS, The. See American Aborigines: Muskhogean Family.

PASCAL I., Pope, A. D. 817–824....**Pascal II., Pope,** 1099–1118.

PASCUA. See Vectigal.

PASSAROWITZ, Peace of (1718). See Hungary: A. D. 1699–1718; and Turks: A. D. 1714–1718.

PASSAU: Taken by the Bavarians and French. See Germany: A. D. 1703.

PASSAU, Treaty of. See Germany: A. D. 1546–1552.

PASSÉ, The. See American Aborigines: Guck or Coco Group.

PASTEUR, Louis, and his work in Bacteriology. See Medical Science: 19th Century.

PASTORS, The Crusade of the. See Crusades: A. D. 1252.

PASTRENGO, Battle of (1799). See France: A. D. 1798–1799 (August—April).

PASTRY WAR, The. See MEXICO: A. D. 1828–1844.

PATAGONIANS, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: PATAGONIANS.

PATARA, Oracle of. See ORACLES OF THE GREEKS.

PATARENES.—PATERINI.—About the middle of the 11th century, there appeared at Milan a young priest named Ariald who caused a great commotion by attacking the corruptions of clergy and people and preaching repentance and reform. The whole of Milan became "separated into two hotly contending parties. This controversy divided families; it was the one object which commanded universal participation. The popular party, devoted to Ariald and Landulph [a deacon who supported Ariald], was nicknamed 'Pataria', which in the dialect of Milan signified a popular faction; and as a heretical tendency might easily grow out of, or attach itself to, this spirit of separatism so zealously opposed to the corruption of the clergy, it came about that, in the following centuries, the name Patarenes was applied in Italy as a general appellation to denote sects contending against the dominant church and clergy — sects which, for the most part, met with great favour from the people."—A. Neander, *General Hist. of the Christian Religion and Church (Bohn's ed.), v. 6, p. 67.*—"The name Patarini is derived from the quarter of the rag-gatherers, Pataria."—W. Moeller, *Hist. of the Christian Church in the Middle Ages, p. 253, foot-note.*—During the fierce controversy of the 11th century over the question of celibacy for the clergy (see PAPACY: A. D. 1056–1122), the party in Milan which supported Pope Gregory VII. (Hildebrand) in his inflexible warfare against the marriage of priests were called by their opponents Patarines.—H. H. Milman, *Hist. of Latin Christianity, bk. 6, ch. 3.*—See, also, CATHARISTS; ALBIGENSES; and PAULICIANS; and TURKS: A. D. 1402–1451.

PATAVIUM, Early knowledge of. See VENETI OF CISALPINE GAUL.

PATAY, Battle of (1429). See FRANCE: A. D. 1429–1431.

PATCHINAKS. — UZES. — COMANS.—The Patchinaks, or Patzinaks, Uzes and Comans were successive swarms of Turkish nomads which came into southeastern Europe during the 10th, 11th and 12th centuries, following and driving each other into the long and often devastated Danubian provinces of the Byzantine empire, and across the Balkans. The wars of the empire with the Patchinaks were many and seriously exhausting. The Comans are said to have been Turcomans, with the first part of their true name dropped off.—E. Pears, *The Fall of Constantinople, ch. 3.*—See, also, RUSSIANS: A. D. 865–900.

PATER PATRATUS. See FETIALES.

PATER PATRIÆ.—"The first individual, belonging to an epoch strictly historical, who received this title was Cicero, to whom it was voted by the Senate after the suppression of the Catilinarian conspiracy."—W. Ramsay, *Manual of Roman Antiq., ch. 5.*

PATERINI, The. See PATARENES.

PATNA, Massacre at (1763). See INDIA: A. D. 1757–1772.

PATRIARCH OF THE WEST, The.—"It was not long after the dissolution of the Jewish state [consequent on the revolt suppressed by Titus] that it revived again in appearance, under the form of two separate communities mostly dependent upon each other: one under a sovereignty purely spiritual, the other partly temporal and partly spiritual,—but each comprehending all the Jewish families in the two great divisions of the world. At the head of the Jews on this side of the Euphrates appeared the Patriarch of the West; the chief of the Mesopotamian community assumed the striking but more temporal title of 'Resch-Glutha,' or Prince of the Captivity. The origin of both these dignities, especially of the Western patriarchate, is involved in much obscurity."—H. H. Milman, *Hist. of the Jews, bk. 18.*— See, also, JEWS: A. D. 200–400.

PATRIARCHS. See PRIMATES.

PATRICIAN, The class. See COMITIA CURIATA; also, PLEBEIANS.

PATRICIAN, The Later Roman Title.—"Introduced by Constantine at a time when its original meaning had been long forgotten, it was designed to be, and for a while remained, the name not of an office but of a rank, the highest after those of emperor and consul. As such, it was usually conferred upon provincial governors of the first class, and in time also upon barbarian potentates whose vanity the Roman court might wish to flatter. Thus Odoacer, Theodoric, the Burgundian king Sigismund, Clovis himself, had all received it from the Eastern emperor; so too in still later times it was given to Saracenic and Bulgarian princes. In the sixth and seventh centuries an invariable practice seems to have attached it to the Byzantine viceroys of Italy, and thus, as we may conjecture, a natural confusion of ideas had made men take it to be, in some sense, an official title, conveying an extensive though undefined authority, and implying in particular the duty of overseeing the Church and promoting her temporal interests. It was doubtless with such a meaning that the Romans and their bishop bestowed it upon the Frankish kings, acting quite without legal right, for it could emanate from the emperor alone, but choosing it as the title which bound its possessor to render to the church support and defence against her Lombard foes."—J. Bryce, *The Holy Roman Empire, ch. 4.*

PATRICK, St., in Ireland. See IRELAND: 5 — 8TH CENTURIES; and EDUCATION, MEDIÆVAL: IRELAND.

PATRIMONY OF ST. PETER, The.—The territory over which the Pope formerly exercised and still claims temporal sovereignty. See STATES OF THE CHURCH; also, PAPACY: A. D. 755–774, and after.

PATRIOT WAR, The. See CANADA: A. D. 1837–1838.

PATRIPASSIANS. See NOËTIANS.

PATRONAGE, Political. See STALWARTS.

PATRONS OF HUSBANDRY. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1877–1891.

PATROONS OF NEW NETHERLAND, and their colonies. See NEW YORK: A. D. 1621–1646.

PATZINAKS, The. See PATCHINAKS.

PAUL, St., the Apostle, the missionary labors of. See CHRISTIANITY: A. D. 33–100; and ATHENS: B. C. 54 (?).....**Paul, Czar of Russia, A. D. 1796–1801.....Paul I., Pope, 757–767.....Paul II., Pope, 1464–1471.....Paul III., Pope, 1534–1549.....Paul IV., Pope, 1555–1559.....Paul V., Pope, 1605–1621.**

PAULETTE, The. See FRANCE: A. D. 1647–1648.

PAULICIANS, The.—"After a pretty long obscurity the Manichean theory revived with some modification in the western parts of Armenia, and was propagated in the 8th and 9th centuries by a sect denominated Paulicians. Their tenets are not to be collected with absolute certainty from the mouths of their adversaries, and no apology of their own survives. There seems however to be sufficient evidence that the Paulicians, though professing to acknowledge and even to study the apostolical writings, ascribed the creation of the world to an evil deity, whom they supposed also to be the author of the Jewish law, and consequently rejected all the Old Testament. . . . Petrus Siculus enumerates six Paulician heresies. 1. They maintained the existence of two deities, the one evil, and the creator of this world; the other good, . . . the author of that which is to come. 2. They refused to worship the Virgin, and asserted that Christ brought his body from heaven. 3. They rejected the Lord's Supper. 4. And the adoration of the cross. 5. They denied the authority of the Old Testament, but admitted the New, except the epistles of St. Peter, and, perhaps, the Apocalypse. 6. They did not acknowledge the order of priests. There seems every reason to suppose that the Paulicians, notwithstanding their mistakes, were endowed with sincere and zealous piety, and studious of the Scriptures. . . . These errors exposed them to a long and cruel persecution, during which a colony of exiles was planted by one of the Greek emperors in Bulgaria. From this settlement they silently promulgated their Manichean creed over the western regions of Christendom. A large part of the commerce of those countries with Constantinople was carried on for several centuries by the channel of the Danube. This opened an immediate intercourse with the Paulicians, who may be traced up that river through Hungary and Bavaria, or sometimes taking the route of Lombardy, into Switzerland and France. In the last country, and especially in its southern and eastern provinces, they became conspicuous under a variety of names; such as Catharists, Picards, Paterins, but, above all, Albigenses. It is beyond a doubt that many of these sectaries owed their origin to the Paulicians; the appellation of Bulgarians was distinctively bestowed upon them; and, according to some writers, they acknowledged a primate or patriarch resident in that country. . . . It is generally agreed that the Manicheans from Bulgaria did not penetrate into the west of Europe before the year 1000; and they seem to have been in small numbers till about 1140. . . . I will only add, in order to obviate cavilling, that I use the word Albigenses for the Manichean sects, without pretending to assert that their doctrines prevailed more in the neighbourhood of Albi than elsewhere. The main position is that a large part of the Languedocian heretics against whom the crusade was directed had imbibed the Paulician opinions. If any one chooses rather to call them Catharists, it will not be material."—H. Hallam, *Middle Ages, ch.* 9, *pt.* 2, *and foot-notes.*

ALSO IN: E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, ch.* 54.—See, also, CATHARISTS, and ALBIGENSES.

PAULINES, The. See BARNABITES.

PAULISTAS (of Brazil). See BRAZIL: A. D. 1531–1641.

PAULUS HOOK, The storming of. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1778–1779.

PAUSANIUS, The mad conduct of. See GREECE: B. C. 478–477.

PAVIA: Origin of the city. See LIGURIANS.

A. D. 270.—Defeat of the Alemanni. See ALEMANNI: A. D. 270.

A. D. 493-523.—Residence of Theodoric the Ostrogoth. See VERONA: A. D. 493–525.

A. D. 568-571.—Siege by the Lombards.—Made capital of the Lombard kingdom. See LOMBARDS: A. D. 568–573.

A. D. 753-754.—Siege by Charlemagne. See LOMBARDS: A. D. 754–774.

A. D. 924.—Destruction by the Hungarians. See ITALY: A. D. 900–924.

A. D. 1004.—Burned by the German troops. See ITALY: A. D. 961–1039.

11-12th Centuries.—Acquisition of Republican Independence. See ITALY: A. D. 1056–1152.

A. D. 1395.—Relation to the duchy of the Visconti of Milan. See MILAN: A. D. 1277–1447.

A. D. 1524-1525.—Siege and Battle.—Defeat and capture of Francis I., of France. See FRANCE: A. D. 1523–1525.

A. D. 1527.—Taken and plundered by the French. See ITALY: A. D. 1527–1529.

A. D. 1745.—Taken by the French and Spaniards. See ITALY: A. D. 1745.

A. D. 1796.—Capture and pillage by the French. See FRANCE: A. D. 1796 (APRIL—OCTOBER).

PAVON, Battle of. See ARGENTINE REPUBLIC: A. D. 1819–1874.

PAVONIA, The Patroon colony of. See NEW YORK: A. D. 1621–1646.

PAWNEES, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: PAWNEE (CADDOAN) FAMILY.

PAWTUCKET INDIANS, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: ALGONQUIAN FAMILY.

PAXTON BOYS, Massacre of Indians by the. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: SUSQUEHANNAS.

PAYAGUAS, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: PAMPAS TRIBES.

PAYENS, Hugh de, and the founding of the Order of the Templars. See TEMPLARS.

PAYTITI, The Great. See EL DORADO.

PAZZI, Conspiracy of the. See FLORENCE: A. D. 1469–1492.

PEA INDIANS, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: ALGONQUIAN FAMILY.

PEA RIDGE, Battle of. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1862 (JANUARY—MARCH: MISSOURI—ARKANSAS).

PEABODY EDUCATION FUND. See EDUCATION, MODERN: AMERICA: A. D. 1867–1891.

PEACE, The King's. See KING'S PEACE; also LAW, COMMON: A. D. 871–1066, 1110, 1135, and 1300.

PEACE CONVENTION, The. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1861 (FEBRUARY).

PEACE OF AUGUSTUS, AND PEACE OF VESPASIAN. See TEMPLE OF JANUS.

PEACE OF THE DAMES, OR THE LADIES' PEACE. See ITALY: A. D. 1527–1529.

PEACH TREE CREEK, Battle of. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1864 (MAY—SEPTEMBER: GEORGIA).

PEACOCK THRONE, The. See INDIA: A. D. 1662–1748.

PEAGE, OR PEAKE. See WAMPUM.

PEASANT REVOLTS: A. D. 287.—The Bagauds of Gaul. See BAGAUDS.

A. D. 1358.—The Jacquerie of France. See FRANCE: A. D. 1358.

A. D. 1381.—Wat Tyler's rebellion in England. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1381.

A. D. 1450.—Jack Cade's rebellion in England. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1450.

A. D. 1492-1514.—The Bundschuh in Germany. See GERMANY: A. D. 1492–1514.

A. D. 1513.—The Kurucs of Hungary. See HUNGARY: A. D. 1487–1526.

A. D. 1524-1525.—The Peasants' War in Germany. See GERMANY: A. D. 1524–1525.

A. D. 1652-1653.—Peasant War in Switzerland. See SWITZERLAND: A. D. 1652–1789.

PEC-SÆTAN.—Band of Angles who settled on the moorlands of the Peak of Derbyshire.

PEDDAR-WAY, The.—The popular name of an old Roman road in England, which runs from Brancaster, on the Wash, via Colchester, to London.

PEDIÆI.—THE PEDION. See ATHENS: B. C. 594.

PEDRO (called The Cruel), King of Leon and Castile, A. D. 1350–1369....Pedro, King of Portugal, 1357–1367....Pedro I., Emperor of Brazil, 1822–1831; IV., King of Portugal, 1826....Pedro II., Emperor of Brazil, 1831–1889....Pedro II., King of Portugal, 1667–1706....Pedro III., King-Consort of Portugal, 1777–1786....Pedro V., King of Portugal, 1853–1861....Pedro. See, also, PETER.

PEEL, Sir Robert: Administrations of. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1834–1837, 1837–1839, 1841–1842, to 1846; TARIFF LEGISLATION (ENGLAND): A. D. 1842, and 1845–1846; MONEY AND BANKING: A. D. 1844.

PEEP-O'-DAY BOYS. See IRELAND: A. D. 1760–1798; and 1784.

PEERS.—PEERAGE, The British.—"The estate of the peerage is identical with the house of lords."—W. Stubbs, *Const. Hist. of Eng.*, *v.* 2, *p.* 184.—See LORDS, BRITISH HOUSE OF; and PARLIAMENT, THE ENGLISH.

PEERS OF FRANCE, The Twelve. See TWELVE PEERS OF FRANCE.

PEGU, British acquisition of. See INDIA: A. D. 1852.

PEHLEVI LANGUAGE.—"Under the Arsacids, the Old Persian passed into Middle Persian, which at a later time was known by the name of the Parthians, the tribe at that time supreme in Persia. Pahlav and Pehlevi mean Parthian, and, as applied to language, the language of the Parthians, i. e. of the Parthian era. . . . In the latest period of the dominion of the Sassanids, the recent Middle Persian or Parsee took the place of Pehlevi."—M. Duncker, *Hist. of Antiquity, bk.* 7, *ch.* 1.

PEHUELCHES, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: PAMPAS TRIBES.

PEKIN: The origin of the city. See CHINA: A. D. 1259–1294.

A. D. 1860.—English and French forces in the city.—The burning of the Summer Palace. See CHINA: A. D. 1856–1860.

PELAGIANISM.—"Pelagianism was . . . the great intellectual controversy of the church in the fifth century, as Arianism had been in the fourth. . . . Every one is aware that this controversy turned upon the question of free-will and of grace, that is to say, of the relations between the liberty of man and the Divine power, of the influence of God upon the moral activity of men. . . . About the year 405, a British monk, Pelagius (this is the name given him by the Greek and Latin writers; his real name, it appears, was Morgan), was residing at Rome. There has been infinite discussion as to his origin, his moral character, his capacity, his learning; and, under these various heads, much abuse has been lavished upon him; but this abuse would appear to be unfounded, for judging from the most authoritative testimony, from that of St. Augustin himself, Pelagius was a man of good birth, of excellent education, of pure life. A resident, as I have said, at Rome, and now a man of mature age, without laying down any distinct doctrines, without having written any book on the subject, Pelagius began, about the year I have mentioned, 405, to talk much about free-will, to insist urgently upon this moral fact, to expound it. There is no indication that he attacked any person about the matter, or that he sought controversy; he appears to have acted simply upon the belief that human liberty was not held in sufficient account, had not its due share in the religious doctrines of the period. These ideas excited no trouble in Rome, scarcely any debate. Pelagius spoke freely; they listened to him quietly. His principal disciple was Celestius, like him a monk, or so it is thought at least, but younger. . . . In 411 Pelagius and Celestius are no longer at Rome; we find them in Africa, at Hippo and at Carthage. . . . Their doctrines spread. . . . The bishop of Hippo began to be alarmed; he saw in these new ideas error and peril. . . . Saint Augustin was the chief of the doctors of the church, called upon more than any other to maintain the general system of her doctrines. . . . You see, from that time, what a serious aspect the quarrel took: everything was engaged in it, philosophy, politics, and religion, the opinions of Saint Augustin and his business, his self-love and his duty. He entirely abandoned himself to it." In the end, Saint Augustin and his opinions prevailed. The doctrines of Pelagius were condemned by three successive councils of the church, by three successive emperors and by two popes—one of whom was forced to reverse his first decision. His partisans were persecuted and banished. "After the year 418, we discover in history no trace of Pelagius. The name of Celestius is sometimes met with until the year 427; it then disappears. These two men once off the scene, their school rapidly declined."—F. Guizot, *Hist. of Civilization* (*trans. by Hazlitt*), *v.* 2, *lect.* 5.

ALSO IN: P. Schaff, *Hist. of the Christian Church, period* 3, *ch.* 9.—See, also, PORT ROYAL AND THE JANSENISTS.

PELASGIANS, The.—Under this name we have vague knowledge of a people whom the Greeks of historic times refer to as having preceded them in the occupancy of the Hellenic

peninsula and Asia Minor, and whom they looked upon as being kindred to themselves in race. "Such information as the Hellenes . . . possessed about the Pelasgi, was in truth very scanty. They did not look upon them as a mythical people of huge giants — as, for example, in the popular tales of the modern Greeks the ancestors of the latter are represented as mighty warriors, towering to the height of poplar trees. There exist no Pelasgian myths, no Pelasgian gods, to be contrasted with the Greeks. . . . Thucydides, in whom the historic consciousness of the Hellenes finds its clearest expression, also regards the inhabitants of Hellas from the most ancient times, Pelasgi as well as Hellenes, as one nation. . . . And furthermore, according to his opinion genuine sons of these ancient Pelasgi continued through all times to dwell in different regions, and especially in Attica."—E. Curtius, *Hist. of Greece, bk.* 1, *ch.* 1.—"It is inevitable that modern historians should take widely divergent views of a nation concerning which tradition is so uncertain. Some writers, among whom is Kiepert, think that the Pelasgi were a Semitic tribe, who immigrated into Greece. This theory, though it explains their presence on the coast, fails to account for their position at Dodona and in Thessaly. . . . In another view, which has received the assent of Thirlwall and Duncker, Pelasgian is nothing more than the name of the ancient inhabitants of the country, which subsequently gave way to the title Achaean, as this in its turn was supplanted by the term Hellenes. . . . We have no evidence to support the idea of a Pelasgic Age as a period of simple habits and agricultural occupations, which slowly gave way before the more martial age of the Achaeans. The civilization of the 'Achaean Age' exists only in the epic poems, and the 'Pelasgic Age' is but another name for the prehistoric Greeks, of whose agriculture we know nothing."—E. Abbott, *Hist. of Greece, pt.* 1, *ch.* 2.

Also in: M. Duncker, *Hist. of Greece, bk.* 1, *ch.* 2.—See, also, Dorians and Ionians; Œnotrians; Aryans; and Italy: Ancient.

PELAYO, King of the Asturias (or Oviedo) and Leon, A. D. 718–737.

PELHAMS, The. See England: A. D. 1742–1745; and 1757–1760.

PELIGNIANS, The. See Sabines.

PELISIPIA, The proposed State of. See Northwest Territory: A. D. 1784.

PELLA.—A new Macedonian capital founded by Archelaus, the ninth of the kings of Macedonia.

Surrendered to the Ostrogoths. See Goths (Ostrogoths): A. D. 473–488.

PELOPIDS.—PELOPONNESUS.—"Among the ancient legendary genealogies, there was none which figured with greater splendour, or which attracted to itself a higher degree of poetical interest and pathos, than that of the Pelopids: — Tantalus, Pelops, Atreus and Thyestes, Agamemnon and Menelaus and Ægisthus, Helen and Klytaemnestra, Orestes and Elektra and Hermione. Each of these characters is a star of the first magnitude in the Grecian hemisphere. . . . Pelops is the eponym or name-giver of the Peloponnesus: to find an eponym for every conspicuous local name was the invariable turn of Grecian retrospective fancy. The name Peloponnesus is not to be found either in the Iliad or the Odyssey, nor any other denomination which can be attached distinctly and specially to the entire peninsula. But we meet with the name in one of the most ancient post-Homeric poems of which any fragments have been preserved — the Cyprian Verses. . . . The attributes by which the Pelopid Agamemnon and his house are marked out and distinguished from the other heroes of the Iliad, are precisely those which Grecian imagination would naturally seek in an eponymus — superior wealth, power, splendour and regality."— G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece, pt.* 1, *ch.* 7. — "Of the . . . family of myths . . . that of Pelops [is] especially remarkable as attaching itself more manifestly and decisively than any other Heroic myth to Ionia and Lydia. We remember the royal house of Tantalus enthroned on the banks of the Sipylus, and intimately associated with the worship of the Phrygian Mother of the Gods. Members of this royal house emigrate and cross to Hellas from the Ionian ports; they bring with them bands of adventurous companions, a treasure of rich culture and knowledge of the world, arms and ornaments, and splendid implements of furniture, and gain a following among the natives, hitherto combined in no political union. . . . This was the notion formed by men like Thucydides as to the epoch occasioned by the appearance of the Pelopidæ in the earliest ages of the nation; and what element in this notion is either improbable or untenable. Do not all the traditions connected with Achæan princes of the house of Pelops point with one consent over the sea to Lydia?"—E. Curtius, *Hist. of Greece, bk.* 1, *ch.* 3.

PELOPONNESIAN WAR, The. See Greece: B. C. 435–432, to B. C. 405; and Athens: B. C. 431, and after.

PELOPONNESUS, The Doric migration to. See Dorians and Ionians.

PELTIER TRIAL, The. See France: A. D. 1802–1803.

PELUCONES, The.—The name of one of the parties in Chilean politics, supposed to have some resemblance to the English Whigs.—E. J. Payne, *Hist. of European Colonies, p.* 279.

PELUSIUM.—"Behind, as we enter Egypt [from the east] is the treacherous Lake Serbonis; in front the great marsh broadening towards the west; on the right the level melancholy shore of the almost tideless Mediterranean. At the very point of the angle stood of old the great stronghold Pelusium, Sin, in Ezekiel's days, 'the strength of Egypt' (xxx. 15). The most eastward Nile-stream flowed behind the city, and on the north was a port commodious enough to hold an ancient fleet. . . . As the Egyptian monarchy waned, Pelusium grew in importance, for it was the strongest city of the border. Here the last king of the Saïte line, Psammeticus III, son of Amasis, awaited Cambyses. The battle of Pelusium, which crushed the native power, may almost take rank among the decisive battles of the world. Had the Persians failed, they might never have won the command of the Mediterranean, without which they could scarcely have invaded Greece. Of the details of the action we know nothing."—R. S. Poole, *Cities of Egypt, ch.* 11.—It was at Pelusium that Pompey, defeated and flying from Cæsar, was assassinated.

B. C. 47.—Taken by the king of Pergamus. See ALEXANDRIA: B. C. 48–47.

A. D. 616. — Surprised by Chosroes. See EGYPT: A. D. 616–628.

A. D. 640.—Capture by the Moslems. See MAHOMETAN CONQUEST: A. D. 640–646.

PEMAQUID PATENT. See MAINE: A. D. 1629–1631.

A. D. 1664.—Purchased for the Duke of York. See NEW YORK: A. D. 1664.

PEN SELWOOD, Battle of. — The first battle fought, A. D. 1016, between the English king Edmund, or Eadmund, Ironsides, and his Danish rival Cnut, or Canute, for the crown of England. The Dane was beaten.

PENACOOK INDIANS. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: ALGONQUIAN FAMILY.

PENAL LAWS AGAINST THE IRISH CATHOLICS. See IRELAND: A. D. 1691–1782.

PENDLE, Forest of.—A former forest in Lancashire, England, which was popularly believed to be the resort of "Lancashire Witches."

PENDLETON BILL, The. See CIVIL-SERVICE REFORM IN THE UNITED STATES.

PENDRAGON. See DRAGON.

PENESTÆ, The.—In ancient Thessaly there was "a class of serfs, or dependent cultivators, corresponding to the Laconian Helots, who, tilling the lands of the wealthy oligarchs, paid over a proportion of its produce, furnished the retainers by which these great families were surrounded, served as their followers in the cavalry, and were in a condition of villanage,—yet with the important reserve that they could not be sold out of the country, that they had a permanent tenure in the soil, and that they maintained among one another the relations of family and village. This . . . order of men, in Thessaly called the Penestæ, is assimulated by all ancient authors to the Helots of Laconia."—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece, pt. 2, ch. 3.*

PENINSULAR CAMPAIGN OF McCLELLAN. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1862 (MARCH—MAY: VIRGINIA); MAY: VIRGINIA), (JUNE: VIRGINIA), (JUNE—JULY: VIRGINIA), (JULY—AUGUST: VIRGINIA).

PENINSULAR WAR, The Spanish. See SPAIN: A. D. 1807–1808 to 1812–1814.

PENN, William, and the colony of Pennsylvania. See PENNSYLVANIA: A. D. 1681, and after.

PENNAMITE AND YANKEE WAR. See PENNSYLVANIA: A. D. 1753–1799.

PENNSYLVANIA.

The aboriginal inhabitants and their relations to the white colonists. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: DELAWARES, SUSQUEHANNAS, and SHAWANESE.

A. D. 1629-1664.—The Dutch and Swedes on the Delaware. See DELAWARE; A. D. 1629–1631, and after.

A. D. 1632.—Partly embraced in the Maryland grant to Lord Baltimore. See MARYLAND: A. D. 1632.

A. D. 1634.—Partly embraced in the Palatine grant of New Albion. See NEW ALBION.

A. D. 1641.—The settlement from New Haven, on the site of Philadelphia. See NEW JERSEY: A. D. 1640–1655.

A. D. 1673.—Repossession of the Delaware by the Dutch. See NEW YORK: A. D. 1673.

A. D. 1681.—The Proprietary grant to William Penn.—"William Penn was descended from a long line of sailor ancestors. His father, an admiral in the British navy, had held various important naval commands, and in recognition of his services had been honored by knighthood. A member of Parliament, and possessed of a considerable fortune, the path of worldly advancement seemed open and easy for the feet of his son, who had received a liberal education at Oxford, continued in the schools of the Continent. Beautiful in person, engaging in manner, accomplished in manly exercises and the use of the sword, fortune and preferment seemed to wait the acceptance of William Penn. But at the very outset of his career the Divine voice fell upon his ears as upon those of St. Paul." He became a follower of George Fox, and one of the people known as Quakers or Friends. "Many trials awaited the youthful convert. His father cast him off. He underwent a considerable imprisonment in the Tower for 'urging the cause of freedom with importunity.' . . . In time these afflictions abated. The influence of his family saved him from the heavier penalties which fell upon many of his co-religionists. His father on his death-bed reinstated him as his heir. 'Son William,' said the dying man, 'if you and your friends keep to your plain way of preaching and living, you will make an end of the priests.' Some years later we find him exerting an influence at Court which almost amounted to popularity. It is evident that, with all his boldness of opinion and speech, Penn possessed a tact and address which gave him the advantage over most of his sect in dealings with worldly people. . . . In 1680 his influence at Court and with moneyed men enabled him to purchase a large tract of land in east New Jersey, on which to settle a colony of Quakers, a previous colony having been sent out three years before to west New Jersey. Meanwhile a larger project filled his mind. His father had bequeathed to him a claim on the Crown for £16,000. Colonial property was then held in light esteem, and, with the help of some powerful friends, Penn was enabled so to press his claim as to secure the charter for that valuable grant which afterward became the State of Pennsylvania, and which included three degrees of latitude by five of longitude, west from the Delaware. 'This day,' writes Penn, Jan. 5, 1681, 'my country was confirmed to me by the name of Pennsylvania, a name the king [Charles II.] would give it in honour of my father. I chose New Wales, being as this a pretty hilly country. I proposed (when the Secretary, a Welshman, refused to have it called New Wales) Sylvania, and they added Penn to it, and though I much opposed it, and went to the King to have it struck out and altered, he said 'twas past, and he would take it upon him. . . . I feared lest it should be looked upon as a vanity in me, and not as a respect of the King, as it truly was, to my father, whom he often mentions with praise.' 'In return for this

grant of 26,000,000 of acres of the best land in the universe, William Penn, it was agreed, was to deliver annually at Windsor Castle two beaver-skins, pay into the King's treasury one fifth of the gold and silver which the province might yield, and govern the province in conformity with the laws of England and as became a liege of England's King. He was to appoint judges and magistrates, could pardon all crimes except murder and treason, and whatsoever things he could lawfully do himself, he could appoint a deputy to do, he and his heirs forever.' The original grant was fantastically limited by a circle drawn twelve miles distant from Newcastle, northward and westward, to the beginning of the 40th degree of latitude. This was done to accommodate the Duke of York, who wished to retain the three lower counties as an appanage to the State of New York. A few months later he was persuaded to renounce this claim, and the charter of Penn was extended to include the western and southern shores of the Delaware Bay and River from the 43d degree of latitude to the Atlantic. . . . The charter confirmed, a brief account of the country was published, and lands offered for sale on the easy terms of 40 shillings a hundred acres, and one shilling's rent a year in perpetuity. Numerous adventurers, many of them men of wealth and respectability, offered. The articles of agreement included a provision as to 'just and friendly conduct toward the natives.'. . . In April, 1681, he sent forward 'young Mr. Markham,' his relative, with a small party of colonists to take possession of the grant, and prepare for his own coming during the following year. . . . In August, 1682, Penn himself embarked."—Susan Coolidge (S. C. Woolsey), *Short Hist. of Philadelphia, ch.* 2.—"The charter [to Penn], which is given complete in Hazard's Annals, consists of 23 articles, with a preamble. . . . The grant comprises all that part of America, islands included, which is bounded on the east by the Delaware River from a point on a circle twelve miles northward of New Castle town to the 43° north latitude if the Delaware extends so far; if not, as far as it does extend, and thence to the 43° by a meridian line. From this point westward five degrees of longitude on the 43° parallel; the western boundary to the 40th parallel, and thence by a straight line to the place of beginning. . . . Grants Penn rights to and use of rivers, harbors, fisheries, etc. . . . Creates and constitutes him Lord Proprietary of the Province, saving only his allegiance to the King, Penn to hold directly of the kings of England, 'as of our castle of Windsor in the county of Berks, in free and common socage, by fealty only, for all services, and not in capite, or by Knight's service, yielding and paying therefore to us, our heirs and successors, two beaver-skins.'. . . Grants Penn and his successors, his deputies and lieutenants, 'free, full, and absolute power' to make laws for raising money for the public uses of the Province, and for other public purposes at their discretion, by and with the advice and consent of the people or their representatives in assembly. . . . Grants power to appoint officers, judges, magistrates, etc., to pardon offenders."—J. T. Scharf and T. Westcott, *Hist. of Philadelphia, ch.* 7 (*v.* 1).

Also in: T. Clarkson, *Memoirs of Wm. Penn, v.* 1, *ch.* 16-17.—S. Hazard, *Annals of Penn., pp.* 485-504.

A. D. 1681-1682.—Penn's Frame of Government.—Before the departure from England of the first company of colonists, Penn drew up a Frame of Government which he submitted to them, and to which they gave their assent and approval by their signatures, he signing the instrument likewise. The next year this Frame of Government was published by Penn, with a preface, "containing his own thoughts upon the origin, nature, object, and modes of Government. . . . The Frame, which followed this preface, consisted of twenty-four articles; and the Laws, which were annexed to the latter, were forty. By the Frame the government was placed in the Governor and Freemen of the province, out of whom were to be formed two bodies; namely, a Provincial Council and a General Assembly. These were to be chosen by the Freemen; and though the Governor or his Deputy was to be perpetual President, he was to have but a treble vote. The Provincial Council was to consist of seventy-two members. One third part, that is, twenty-four of them, were to serve for three years, one third for two, and the other third for one; so that there might be an annual succession of twenty-four new members, each third part thus continuing for three years and no longer. It was the office of this Council to prepare and propose bills, to see that the laws were executed, to take care of the peace and safety of the province, to settle the situation of ports, cities, market towns, roads, and other public places, to inspect the public treasury, to erect courts of justice, institute schools, and reward the authors of useful discovery. Not less than two thirds of these were necessary to make a quorum; and the consent of not less than two thirds of such quorum in all matters of moment. The General Assembly was to consist the first year of all the freemen, and the next of two hundred. These were to be increased afterwards according to the increase of the population of the province. They were to have no deliberative power; but, when bills were brought to them from the Governor and Provincial Council, to pass or reject them by a plain Yes or No. They were to present sheriffs and justices of the peace to the Governor, a double number for his choice of half. They were to be elected annually. All elections of members, whether to the Provincial Council or General Assembly, were to be by ballot. And this Charter or Frame of Government was not to be altered, changed, or diminished in any part or clause of it, without the consent of the Governor, or his heirs or assigns, and six parts out of seven of the Freemen both in the Provincial Council and General Assembly. With respect to the Laws, which I said before were forty in number, I shall only at present observe of them that they related to whatever may be included under the term 'Good Government of the Province'; some of them to liberty of conscience; others to civil officers and their qualifications; others to offences; others to legal proceedings, such as pleadings, processes, fines, imprisonments, and arrests; others to the natural servants and poor of the province. With respect to all of them it may be observed, that, like the Frame itself, they could not be altered but by the consent of the Governor, or his heirs, and the consent of six parts out of seven of the two bodies before mentioned."—T. Clarkson, *Memoirs of William Penn, v.* 1, *ch.* 18.

ALSO IN: S. Hazard, *Annals of Penn., pp.* 558–574.

A. D. 1682.—Acquisition by Penn of the claims of the Duke of York to Delaware.—"During the negotiations between New Netherland and Maryland in 1659, the Dutch insisted that, as Lord Baltimore's patent covered only savage or uninhabited territory, it could not affect their own possession of the Delaware region. Accordingly, they held it against Maryland until it was taken from them by the Duke of York in 1664. But James's title by conquest had never been confirmed to him by a grant from the king; and Cecilius Calvert, the second Lord Baltimore, insisted that Delaware belonged to Maryland. To quiet controversy, the duke had offered to buy off Baltimore's claim, to which he would not agree. Penn afterward refused a large offer by Fenwick 'to get of the duke his interest in Newcastle and those parts' for West Jersey. Thus stood the matter when the Pennsylvania charter was sealed. Its proprietor soon found that his province, wholly inland, wanted a front on the sea. As Delaware was 'necessary' to Pennsylvania, Penn 'endeavored to get it' from the duke by maintaining that Baltimore's pretension 'was against law, civil and common.' Charles Calvert, the third Lord Baltimore, was 'very free' in talking against the Duke of York's rights; but he could not circumvent Penn. The astute Quaker readily got from James a quit-claim of all his interest in the territory included within the proper bounds of Pennsylvania. After a struggle, Penn also gained the more important conveyances [August, 1682] to himself of the duke's interest in all the region within a circle of twelve miles [radius] around Newcastle, and extending southward as far as Cape Henlopen. The triumphant Penn set sail the next week. At Newcastle he received from James's agents formal possession of the surrounding territory, and of the region farther south."—J. R. Brodhead, *Hist. of N. Y., v.* 2, *ch.* 7.

A. D. 1682-1685.—Penn's arrival in his province.—His treaty with the Indians.—The founding of Philadelphia.—Penn sailed, in person, for his province on the 1st of September, 1682, on the ship "Welcome," with 100 fellow passengers, mostly Friends, and landed at Newcastle after a dreary voyage, during which thirty of his companions had died of smallpox. "Next day he called the people together in the Dutch court-house, when he went through the legal forms of taking possession. . . . Penn's great powers being legally established, he addressed the people in profoundest silence. He spoke of the reasons for his coming—the great idea which he had nursed from his youth upwards—his desire to found a free and virtuous state, in which the people should rule themselves. . . . He spoke of the constitution he had published for Pennsylvania as containing his theory of government; and promised the settlers on the lower reaches of the Delaware, that the same principles should be adopted in their territory. Every man in his provinces, he said, should enjoy liberty of conscience and his share of political power. . . . The people listened to this speech with wonder and delight. . . . They had but one request to make in answer; that he would stay amongst them and reign over them in person. They besought him to annex their territory to Pennsylvania, in order that the white settlers might have one country, one parliament, and one ruler. He promised, at their desire, to take the question of a union of the two provinces into consideration, and submit it to an assembly then about to meet at Upland. So he took his leave. Ascending the Delaware . . . the adventurers soon arrived at the Swedish town of Upland, then the place of chief importance in the province. . . . Penn changed the name from Upland to Chester, and as Chester it is known. Markham and the three commissioners had done their work so well that in a short time after Penn's arrival, the first General Assembly, elected by universal suffrage, was ready to meet. . . . As soon as Penn had given them assurances similar to those which he had made in Newcastle, they proceeded to discuss, amend, and accept the Frame of Government and the Provisional Laws. The settlers on the Delaware sent representatives to this Assembly, and one of their first acts was to declare the two provinces united. The constitution was adopted without important alteration; and to the forty laws were added twenty-one others, and the infant code was passed in form. . . . Penn paid some visits to the neighbouring seats of government in New York, Maryland, and the Jerseys. At West River, Lord Baltimore came forth to meet him with a retinue of the chief persons in the province. . . . It was impossible to adjust the boundary, and the two proprietors separated with the resolution to maintain their several rights. . . . The lands already bought from the Redmen were now put up for sale at four-pence an acre, with a reserve of one shilling for every hundred acres as quit-rent; the latter sum intended to form a state revenue for the Governor's support. Amidst these sales and settlements he recollected George Fox, for whose use and profit he set aside a thousand acres of the best land in the province. . . . Penn was no less careful for the Redskins. Laying on one side all ceremonial manners, he won their hearts by his easy confidence and familiar speech. He walked with them alone into the forests. He sat with them on the ground to watch the young men dance. He joined in their feasts, and ate their roasted hominy and acorns. . . . Having now become intimate with Taminent and other of the native kings, who had approved these treaties, seeing great advantages in them for their people, he proposed to hold a conference with the chiefs and warriors, to confirm the former treaties and form a lasting league of peace. On the banks of the Delaware, in the suburbs of the rising city of Philadelphia, lay a natural amphitheatre, used from time immemorial as a place of meeting for the native tribes. The name of Sakimaxing—now corrupted by the white men into Shackamaxon—means the place of kings. At this spot stood an aged elm-tree, one of those glorious elms which mark the forests of the New World. It was a hundred and fifty-five years old; under its spreading branches friendly nations had been wont to meet; and here the Redskins smoked the calumet of peace long before the pale-faces landed on those shores. Markham had appointed this locality for his first conference, and the land commissioners wisely followed his example. Old traditions had made the place sacred to one of the contracting parties,—and when Penn

proposed his solemn conference, he named Sakimaxing [or Shackamaxon] as a place of meeting with the Indian kings. Artists have painted, poets sung, philosophers praised this meeting of the white men and the red [October 14, 1682]. . . . All being seated, the old king announced to the Governor that the natives were prepared to hear and consider his words. Penn then rose to address them. . . . He and his children, he went on to say, never fired the rifle, never trusted to the sword; they met the red men on the broad path of good faith and good will. They meant no harm, and had no fear. He read the treaty of friendship, and explained its clauses. It recited that from that day the children of Onas and the nations of the Lenni Lenapé should be brothers to each other,—that all paths should be free and open—that the doors of the white men should be open to the red men, and the lodges of the red men should be open to the white men,—that the children of Onas should not believe any false reports of the Lenni Lenapé, nor the Lenni Lenapé of the children of Onas, but should come and see for themselves, . . . that if any son of Onas were to do any harm to any Redskin, or any Redskin were to do harm to a son of Onas, the sufferer should not offer to right himself, but should complain to the chiefs and to Onas, that justice might be declared by twelve honest men, and the wrong buried in a pit with no bottom,—that the Lenni Lenapé should assist the white men, and the white men should assist the Lenni Lenapé, against all such as would disturb them or do them hurt; and, lastly, that both Christians and Indians should tell their children of this league and chain of friendship, that it might grow stronger and stronger, and be kept bright and clean, without rust or spot, while the waters ran down the creeks and rivers, and while the sun and moon and stars endured. He laid the scroll on the ground. The sachems received his proposal for themselves and for their children. No oaths, no seals, no mummeries, were used; the treaty was ratified on both sides with yea,—and, unlike treaties which are sworn and sealed, was kept. When Penn had sailed, he held a note in his mind of six things to be done on landing: (1) to organize his government; (2) to visit Friends in Delaware, Pennsylvania and New Jersey; (3) to conciliate the Indians; (4) to see the Governor of New York, who had previously governed his province; (5) to fix the site for his capital city; (6) to arrange his differences with Lord Baltimore. The subject of his chief city occupied his anxious thought, and Markham had collected information for his use. Some people wished to see Chester made his capital; but the surveyor, Thomas Holme, agreed with Penn that the best locality in almost every respect was the neck of land lying at the junction of the Delaware and the Skuylkill rivers. . . . The point was known as Wicocoa. . . . The land was owned by three Swedes, from whom Penn purchased it on their own terms; and then, with the assistance of Holme, he drew his plan. . . . Not content to begin humbly, and allow house to be added to house, and street to street, as people wanted them, he formed the whole scheme of his city—its name, its form, its streets, its docks, and open spaces—fair and perfect in his mind, before a single stone was laid. According to his original design, Philadelphia was to cover with its houses, squares, and gardens, twelve square miles. . . . One year from the date of Penn's landing in the New World, a hundred houses had been built; two years later there were six hundred houses."—W. H. Dixon, *Hist. of William Penn, ch.* 24–25.

Also in: J. T. Scharf and T. Westcott, *Hist. of Philadelphia, v.* 1, *ch.* 9.—*Memoirs of the Penn. Hist. Soc., v.* 6 (*The Belt of Wampum, &c.*).—W. C. Bryant and S. H. Gay, *Popular Hist. of the U. S., v.* 2, *ch.* 20.

A. D. 1685.—The Maryland Boundary question.—Points in dispute with Lord Baltimore.—"The grant to Penn confused the old controversy between Virginia and Lord Baltimore as to their boundary, and led to fresh controversies. The question soon arose: What do the descriptions, 'the beginning of the fortieth,' and 'the beginning of the three and fortieth degree of northern latitude,' mean? If they meant the 40th and 43d parallels of north latitude, as most historians have held, Penn's province was the zone, three degrees of latitude in width, that leaves Philadelphia a little to the south and Syracuse a little to the north; but if those descriptions meant the belts lying between 39° and 40°, and 42° and 43°, as some authors have held, then Penn's southern and northern boundaries were 39° and 42° north. A glance at the map of Pennsylvania will show the reader how different the territorial dispositions would have been if either one of these constructions had been carried out. The first construction would avoid disputes on the south, unless with Virginia west of the mountains; on the north it would not conflict with New York, but would most seriously conflict with Connecticut and Massachusetts west of the Delaware. The second construction involved disputes with the two southern colonies concerning the degree 39–40 to the farthest limit of Pennsylvania, and it also overlapped Connecticut's claim to the degree 41–42. Perhaps we cannot certainly say what was the intention of the king, or Penn's first understanding; but the Quaker proprietary and his successors adopted substantially the second construction, and thus involved their province in the most bitter disputes. The first quarrel was with Lord Baltimore. It has been well said that this 'notable quarrel' 'continued more than eighty years; was the cause of endless trouble between individuals; occupied the attention not only of the proprietors of the respective provinces, but of the Lords of Trade and Plantations, of the High Court of Chancery, and of the Privy Councils of at least three monarchs; it greatly retarded the settlement and development of a beautiful and fertile country, and brought about numerous tumults, which sometimes ended in bloodshed.'"—B. A. Hinsdale, *The Old Northwest, ch.* 7.—"As the Duke of York claimed, by right of conquest, the settlements on the western shores of the Bay of Delaware, and had, by his deed of 1682, transferred to William Penn his title to that country, embracing the town of Newcastle and twelve miles around it (as a reasonable portion of land attached to it), and as far down as what was then called Cape Henlopen; an important subject of controversy was the true situation of that cape, and the ascertainment of the southern and western boundaries of the country along the bay, as transferred by the Duke's deed. . . . After two personal interviews in America, the Proprietaries

separated without coming to any arrangement and with mutual recriminations and dissatisfaction. And they each wrote to the Lords of Plantations excusing themselves and blaming the other. . . . At length, in 1685, one important step was taken toward the decision of the conflicting claims of Maryland and Pennsylvania, by a decree of King James' Council, which ordered, 'that for avoiding further differences, the tract of land lying between the Bay of Delaware and the eastern sea, on the one side, and the Chesapeake Bay on the other, be divided into equal parts, by a line from the latitude of Cape Henlopen to the 40th degree of north latitude, the southern boundary of Pennsylvania by Charter; and that the one half thereof, lying towards the Bay of Delaware and the eastern sea, be adjudged to belong to his majesty, and the other half to Lord Baltimore, as comprised in his charter.' . . . This decree of King James, which evidently exhibits a partiality towards the claims of Penn, in decreeing the eastern half of the peninsula to his majesty, with whom Lord Baltimore could not presume, and indeed had declined to dispute, instead of to the Proprietary himself, by no means removed the difficulties which hung over this tedious, expensive, and vexatious litigation. For . . . there existed as much uncertainty with respect to the true situation of Cape Henlopen and the ascertainment of the middle of the Peninsula, as any points in contest."—J. Dunlop, *Memoir on the Controversy between William Penn and Lord Baltimore* (*Penn. Hist. Soc. Memoirs, v.* 1).—See, below: 1760–1767.

A. D. 1691-1702.—Practical separation of Delaware. See DELAWARE: A. D. 1691–1702.

A. D. 1692-1696.—Keith's schism.—Penn deprived of his government, but restored.—Early resistance to the proprietary yoke.—"While New England and New York were suffering from war, superstition, and the bitterness of faction, Pennsylvania was not without internal troubles. These troubles originated with George Keith, a Scotch Quaker, formerly surveyor-general of East Jersey, and at this time master of the Quaker school at Philadelphia, and champion of the Quakers against Cotton Mather and the Boston ministers. Pressing the doctrines of non-resistance to their logical conclusion, Keith advanced the opinion that Quaker principles were not consistent with the exercise of political authority. He also attacked negro slavery as inconsistent with those principles. There is no surer way of giving mortal offense to a sect or party than to call upon it to be consistent with its own professed doctrines. Keith was disowned by the yearly meeting, but he forthwith instituted a meeting of his own, to which he gave the name of Christian Quakers. In reply to a 'Testimony of Denial' put forth against him, he published an 'Address,' in which he handled his adversaries with very little ceremony. He was fined by the Quaker magistrates for insolence, and Bradford, the only printer in the colony, was called to account for having published Keith's address. Though he obtained a discharge, Bradford, however, judged it expedient to remove with his types to New York, which now [1692] first obtained a printing press. The Episcopalians and other non-Quakers professed great sympathy for Keith, and raised a loud outcry against Quaker intolerance. Keith himself presently embraced Episcopacy, went to England, and took orders there. The Quaker magistrates were accused of hostility to the Church of England, and in the alleged maladministration of his agents, joined with his own suspected loyalty, a pretense was found for depriving Penn of the government—a step taken by the Privy Council without any of the forms, or, indeed, any authority of law, though justified by the opinions of some of the leading Whig lawyers of that day." Governor Fletcher of New York was now authorized for a time to administer the government of Pennsylvania and Delaware. "He accordingly visited Philadelphia, and called an Assembly in which deputies from both provinces were present. Penn's frame of government was disregarded, the Assembly being modeled after that of New York. Fletcher hoped to obtain a salary for himself and some contributions toward the defense of the northern frontier. The Quakers, very reluctant to vote money at all, had special scruples about the lawfulness of war. They were also very suspicious of designs against their liberties, and refused to enter on any business until the existing laws and liberties of the province had been first expressly confirmed. This concession reluctantly made, Fletcher obtained the grant of a small sum of money, not, however, without stipulating that it 'should not be dipped in blood.' . . . The suspicions against Penn soon dying away, the administration of his province was restored to him [1694]. But the pressure of his private affairs—for he was very much in debt—detained him in England, and he sent a commission to Markham [his relative and representative in Pennsylvania] to act as his deputy. An Assembly called by Markham refused to recognize the binding force of Penn's frame of government, which, indeed, had been totally disregarded by Fletcher. To the restrictions on their authority imposed by that frame they would not submit. A second Assembly [1696] proved equally obstinate, and, as the only means of obtaining a vote of the money required of the province toward the defense of New York, Markham was obliged to agree to a new act of settlement, securing to the Assembly the right of originating laws. A power of disapproval was reserved, however, to the proprietary, and this act never received Penn's sanction."—R. Hildreth, *Hist. of the U. S., ch.* 21 (*v.* 2).

ALSO IN: G. E. Ellis, *Life of Penn, ch.* 10 (*Library of Am. Biog., series* 2, *v.* 12).—G. P. Fisher, *The Colonial Era, ch.* 16.

A. D. 1696-1749.—Suppression of colonial manufactures. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1696–1749.

A. D. 1701-1718.—The new Charter of Privileges and the city charter of Philadelphia.—The divorcing of Delaware.—Differences with the Proprietary.—The death of Penn.—It was not until 1699 that Penn returned to his domain after an absence of fifteen years, and his brief stay of two years was not made wholly agreeable to him. Between him and his colonists there were many points of friction, as was inevitable under the relationship in which they stood to one another. The assembly of the province would not be persuaded to contribute to the fortification of the northern frontier of the king's dominions (in New York) against the French and Indians. Penn's influence, however, prevailed upon that body to adopt measures for suppres-

sing both piracy and illicit trade. With much difficulty, moreover, he settled with his subjects the terms of a new constitution of government, or Charter of Privileges, as it was called. The old Frame of Government was formally abandoned and the government of Pennsylvania was now organized upon an entirely new footing. "The new charter for the province and territories, signed by Penn, October 25, 1701, was more republican in character than those of the neighboring colonies. It not only provided for an assembly of the people with great powers, including those of creating courts, but to a certain extent it submitted to the choice of the people the nomination of some of the county officers. The section concerning liberty of conscience did not discriminate against the members of the Church of Rome. The closing section fulfilled the promise already made by Penn, that in case the representatives of the two territorial districts [Pennsylvania proper, held under Penn's original grant, and the Lower Counties, afterwards constituting Delaware, which he acquired from the Duke of York] could not agree within three years to join in legislative business, the Lower Counties should be separated from Pennsylvania. On the same day Penn established by letters-patent a council of state for the province, 'to consult and assist the proprietary himself or his deputy with the best of their advice and council in public affairs and matters relating to the government and the peace and well-being of the people; and in the absence of the proprietary, or upon the deputy's absence out of the province, his death, or other incapacity, to exercise all and singular the powers of government.' The original town and borough of Philadelphia, having by this time 'become near equal to the city of New York in trade and riches,' was raised, by patent of the 25th of October, 1701, to the rank of a city, and, like the province, could boast of having a more liberal charter than her neighbors; for the municipal officers were to be elected by the representatives of the people of the city, and not appointed by the governor, as in New York. The government of the province had been entrusted by Penn to Andrew Hamilton, also governor for the proprietors in New Jersey, with James Logan as provincial secretary, to whom was likewise confided the management of the proprietary estates, thus making him in reality the representative of Penn and the leader of his party. Hamilton died in December, 1702; but before his death he had endeavored in vain to bring the representatives of the two sections of his government together again. The Delaware members remained obstinate, and finally, while Edward Shippen, a member of the council and first mayor of Philadelphia, was acting as president, it was settled that they should have separate assemblies, entirely independent of each other. The first separate assembly for Pennsylvania proper met at Philadelphia, in October, 1703, and by its first resolution showed that the Quakers, so dominant in the province, were beginning to acquire a taste for authority, and meant to color their religion with the hue of political power." In December, 1703, John Evans, a young Welshman, appointed deputy-governor by Penn, arrived at Philadelphia, and was soon involved in quarrels with the assemblies. "At one time they had for ground the refusal of the Quakers to support the war which was waging against the French and Indians on the frontiers. At another they disagreed upon the establishment of a judiciary. These disturbances produced financial disruptions, and Penn himself suffered therefrom to such an extent that he was thrown into a London prison, and had finally to mortgage his province for £6,600. The recall of Evans in 1709, and the appointment of Charles Gookin in his stead, did not mend matters. Logan, Penn's intimate friend and representative, was finally compelled to leave the country; and, going to England (1710), he induced Penn to write a letter to the Pennsylvania assembly, in which he threatened to sell the province to the crown, a surrender by which he was to receive £12,000. The transfer was in fact prevented by an attack of apoplexy from which Penn suffered in 1712. The epistle, however, brought the refractory assembly to terms." In 1717 Gookin involved himself in fresh troubles and was recalled. Sir William Keith was then appointed — "the last governor commissioned by Penn himself; for the great founder of Pennsylvania died in 1718. . . . After Penn's death his heirs went to law among themselves about the government and proprietary rights in Pennsylvania."—B. Fernow, *Middle Colonies* (*Narrative and Critical Hist. of Am., v.* 5, *ch.* 3).

Also in: G. E. Ellis, *Life of Penn* (*Library of Am. Biog., series* 2, *v.* 12), *ch.* 11–12.—R. Proud, *Hist. of Pennsylvania, ch.* 14–22 (*v.* 1–2).—*Penn and Logan Correspondence* (*Penn. Hist. Soc. Memoirs, v.* 9–10).

A. D. 1709-1710.—Immigration of Palatines and other Germans. See Palatines.

A. D. 1740-1741. — First settlements and missions of the Moravian Brethren. See Moravian Brethren.

A. D. 1743.—Origin of the University of Pennsylvania. See Education, Modern: America: A. D. 1683–1779.

A. D. 1744-1748.—King George's War. See New England: A. D. 1744; 1745; and 1745–1748.

A. D. 1748-1754.—First movements beyond the mountains to dispute possession with the French. See Ohio (Valley): A. D. 1748–1754.

A. D. 1753-1799. — Connecticut claims and settlements in the Wyoming Valley. — The Pennamite and Yankee War. — "The charter bounds [of Connecticut] extended west to the Pacific Ocean [see Connecticut: A. D. 1662–1664]: this would have carried Connecticut over a strip covering the northern two fifths of the present State of Pennsylvania. Stuart faithlessness interfered with this doubly. Almost immediately after the grant of the charter, Charles granted to his brother James the Dutch colony of New Netherland, thus interrupting the continuity of Connecticut. Rather than resist the king's brother, Connecticut agreed and ratified the interruption. In 1681 a more serious interference took place. Charles granted to Penn the province of Pennsylvania, extending westward five degrees between the 40th and 43d parallels of north latitude." Under the final compromise of Penn's boundary dispute with Lord Baltimore the northern line of Pennsylvania was moved southward to latitude 42° instead of 43°; but it still absorbed five degrees in length of the Connecticut western belt. "The territory taken from Connecticut by the Penn grant would be

bounded southerly on the present map by a straight line entering Pennsylvania about Stroudsburg, just north of the Delaware Water Gap, and running west through Hazelton, Catawissa, Clearfield, and New Castle, taking in all the northern coal, iron, and oil fields. It was a royal heritage, but the Penns made no attempt to settle it, and Connecticut until the middle of the 18th century had no energy to spare from the task of winning her home territory 'out of the fire, as it were, by hard blows and for small recompense.' This task had been fairly well done by 1750, and in 1753 a movement to colonize in the Wyoming country was set on foot in Windham county. It spread by degrees until the Susquehanna Company was formed the next year, with nearly 700 members, of whom 638 were of Connecticut. Their agents made a treaty with the Five Nations July 11, 1754, by which they bought for £2,000 a tract of land beginning at the 41st degree of latitude, the southerly boundary of Connecticut; thence running north, following the line of the Susquehanna at a distance of ten miles from it, to the present northern boundary of Pennsylvania; thence 120 miles west; thence south to the 41st degree and back to the point of beginning. In May, 1755, the Connecticut general assembly expressed its acquiescence in the scheme, if the king should approve it; and it approved also a plan of Samuel Hazard, of Philadelphia, for another colony, to be placed west of Pennsylvania, and within the chartered limits of Connecticut. The court might have taken stronger ground than this; for, at the meeting of commissioners from the various colonies at Albany, in 1754, the representatives of Pennsylvania being present, no opposition was made to a resolution that Connecticut and Massachusetts, by charter right, extended west to the South Sea. The formation of the Susquehanna Company brought out objections from Pennsylvania, but the company sent out surveyors and plotted its tract. Settlement was begun on the Delaware River in 1757, and in the Susquehanna purchase in 1762. This was a temporary settlement, the settlers going home for the winter. A permanent venture was made the next year on the flats below Wilkes Barre, but it was destroyed by the Indians the same year. In 1768 the company marked out five townships, and sent out forty settlers for the first, Kingston. Most of them, including the famous Captain Zebulon Butler, had served in the French and Indian War; and their first step was to build the 'Forty Fort.' The Penns, after their usual policy, had refused to sell lands, but had leased plots to a number of men on condition of their 'defending the lands from the Connecticut claimants.' The forty Connecticut men found these in possession when they arrived in February, 1769, and a war of writs and arrests followed for the remainder of the year. The Pennsylvania men had one too powerful argument, in the shape of a four-pounder gun, and they retained possession at the end of the year. Early in 1770 the forty reappeared, captured the four-pounder, and secured possession. For a time in 1771 the Pennsylvania men returned, put up a fort of their own, and engaged in a partisan warfare; but the numbers of the Connecticut men were rapidly increasing, and they remained masters until the opening of the Revolution, when they numbered some 3,000. . . . But for the Revolution, the check occasioned by the massacre [of 1778—see UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1778 (JULY)], and the appearance of a popular government in place of the Penns, nothing could have prevented the establishment of Connecticut's authority over all the regions embraced in her western claims. . . . The articles of confederation went into force early in 1781. One of their provisions empowered congress to appoint courts of arbitration to decide disputes between States as to boundaries. Pennsylvania at once availed herself of this, and applied for a court to decide the Wyoming dispute. Connecticut asked for time, in order to get papers from England; but congress overruled the motion, and ordered the court to meet at Trenton in November, 1782. After forty-one days of argument, the court came to the unanimous conclusion that Wyoming, or the Susquehanna district, belonged to Pennsylvania and not to Connecticut." Connecticut yielded to the decision at once; but, in 1786, when, following New York and Virginia, she was called upon to make a cession of her western territorial claims to congress (see UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1781–1786) she compensated herself for the loss of the Susquehanna district by reserving from the cession "a tract of about the same length and width as the Wyoming grant, west of Pennsylvania, in northeastern Ohio . . . ; and this was the tract known as the Western Reserve of Connecticut. It contained about 3,500,000 acres. . . . The unfortunate Wyoming settlers, deserted by their own State, and left to the mercy of rival claimants, had a hard time of it for years. The militia of the neighboring counties of Pennsylvania was mustered to enforce the writs of Pennsylvania courts; the property of the Connecticut men was destroyed, their fences were cast down, and their rights ignored; and the 'Pennamite and Yankee War' began. . . . The old Susquehanna Company was reorganized in 1785–86, and made ready to support its settlers by force. New Yankee faces came crowding into the disputed territory. Among them was Ethan Allen, and with him came some Green Mountain Boys." It was not until 1799 that the controversy came to an end, by the passage of an act which confirmed the title of the actual settlers.—A. Johnston, *Connecticut, ch.* 15.

ALSO IN: C. Miner, *Hist. of Wyoming, letters* 5–12.—W. L. Stone, *Poetry and Hist. of Wyoming, ch.* 4–5.

A. D. 1754.—Building of Fort Duquesne by the French.—The first armed collision in the western valley. See OHIO (VALLEY): A. D. 1754.

A. D. 1754.—The Colonial Congress at Albany, and Franklin's Plan of Union. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1754.

A. D. 1755.—The opening of the French and Indian War.—Braddock's defeat.—The frontier ravaged. See OHIO (VALLEY): A. D. 1755.

A. D. 1755-1760.—French and Indian War.—Conquest of Canada and the west. See CANADA: A. D. 1755, 1756, 1756–1757, 1758, 1759, 1760; and NOVA SCOTIA: A. D. 1755.

A. D. 1757-1762.—The question of taxation in dispute with the proprietaries.—Franklin's mission to England.—"For a long while past the relationship between the Penns, unworthy sons of the great William, and now the proprie-

taries, on the one side, and their quasi subjects, the people of the Province, upon the other, had been steadily becoming more and more strained, until something very like a crisis had [in 1757] been reached. As usual in English and Anglo-American communities, it was a quarrel over dollars, or rather over pounds sterling, a question of taxation, which was producing the alienation. At bottom, there was the trouble which always pertains to absenteeism; the proprietaries lived in England, and regarded their vast American estate, with about 200,000 white inhabitants, only as a source of revenue. . . . The chief point in dispute was, whether or not the waste lands, still directly owned by the proprietaries, and other lands let by them at quitrents, should be taxed in the same manner as like property of other owners. They refused to submit to such taxation; the Assembly of Burgesses insisted. In ordinary times the proprietaries prevailed; for the governor was their nominee and removable at their pleasure; they gave him general instructions to assent to no law taxing their holdings, and he naturally obeyed his masters. But since governors got their salaries only by virtue of a vote of the Assembly, it seems that they sometimes disregarded instructions, in the sacred cause of their own interests. After a while, therefore, the proprietaries, made shrewd by experience, devised the scheme of placing their unfortunate sub-rulers under bonds. This went far towards settling the matter. Yet in such a crisis and stress as were now present in the colony . . . it certainly seemed that the rich and idle proprietaries might stand on the same footing with their poor and laboring subjects. They lived comfortably in England upon revenues estimated to amount to the then enormous sum of £20,000 sterling; while the colonists were struggling under unusual losses, as well as enormous expenses, growing out of the war and Indian ravages. At such a time their parsimony, their 'incredible meanness,' as Franklin called it, was cruel as well as stupid. At last the Assembly flatly refused to raise any money unless the proprietaries should be burdened like the rest. All should pay together, or all should go to destruction together. The Penns too stood obstinate, facing the not less resolute Assembly. It was indeed a deadlock! Yet the times were such that neither party could afford to maintain its ground indefinitely. So a temporary arrangement was made, whereby of £60,000 sterling to be raised the proprietaries agreed to contribute £5,000, and the Assembly agreed to accept the same in lieu or commutation for their tax. But neither side abandoned its principle. Before long more money was needed, and the dispute was as fierce as ever. The burgesses now thought that it would be well to carry a statement of their case before the king in council and the lords of trade. In February, 1757, they named their speaker, Isaac Norris, and Franklin to be their emissaries 'to represent in England the unhappy situation of the Province,' and to seek redress by an act of Parliament. Norris, an aged man, begged to be excused; Franklin accepted. . . . A portion of his business also was to endeavor to induce the king to resume the Province of Pennsylvania as his own. A clause in the charter had reserved this right, which could be exercised on payment of a certain sum of money. The colonists now preferred to be an appanage of the crown rather than a fief of the Penns." In this latter object of his mission Franklin did not succeed; but he accomplished its main purpose, procuring, after long delays, from the board of trade, a decision which subjected the proprietary estate to its fair share of taxation. He returned home after an absence of five years.—J. T. Morse, Jr., *Benjamin Franklin, ch.* 3.

Also in: J. Parton, *Life of Franklin, pt.* 3 (*v.* 1).

A. D. 1760-1767.—Settlement of the Maryland boundary dispute.—Mason and Dixon's line.—The decision of 1685 (see above), in the boundary dispute between the proprietaries of Pennsylvania and Maryland, "formed the basis of a settlement between the respective heirs of the two proprietaries in 1732. Three years afterward, the subject became a question in chancery; in 1750 the present boundaries were decreed by Lord Hardwicke; ten years later, they were, by agreement, more accurately defined; and, in 1761, commissioners began to designate the limit of Maryland on the side of Pennsylvania and Delaware. In 1763, Charles Mason and Jeremiah Dixon, two mathematicians and surveyors [sent over from England by the proprietaries], were engaged to mark the lines. In 1764, they entered upon their task, with good instruments and a corps of axemen; by the middle of June, 1765, they had traced the parallel of latitude to the Susquehannah; a year later, they climbed the Little Alleghany; in 1767, they carried forward their work, under an escort from the Six Nations, to an Indian war-path, 244 miles from the Delaware River. Others continued Mason and Dixon's line to the bound of Pennsylvania on the south-west."—G. Bancroft, *Hist. of the U. S.* (*Author's last rev.*), *pt.* 2, *ch.* 16.—"The east and west line which they [Mason and Dixon] ran and marked . . . is the Mason and Dixon's line of history, so long the boundary between the free and the slave States. Its precise latitude is 39° 43′ 26.3″ north. The Penns did not, therefore, gain the degree 39–40, but they did gain a zone one-fourth of a degree in width, south of the 40th degree, to their western limit, because the decision of 1760 controlled that of 1779, made with Virginia. . . . Pennsylvania is narrower by nearly three-fourths of a degree than the charter of 1681 contemplated. No doubt, however, the Penns considered the narrow strip gained at the south more valuable than the broad one lost at the north."—B. A. Hinsdale, *The Old Northwest, ch.* 7.

Also in: T. Donaldson, *The Public Domain, p.* 50.—*Pennsylvania Archives, v.* 4, *pp.* 1–37.—W. H. Browne, *Maryland, pp.* 238–239.

A. D. 1763-1764.—Pontiac's War.—Bouquet's expedition. See Pontiac's War.

A. D. 1763-1766.—The question of taxation by Parliament.—The Sugar Act.—The Stamp Act and its repeal.—The Declaratory Act.—The Stamp Act Congress. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1760–1775; 1763–1764; 1765; and 1766.

A. D. 1765.—Patriotic self-denials.—Non-importation agreements. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1764–1767.

A. D. 1766-1768.—The Townshend duties.—The Circular Letter of Massachusetts. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1766–1767; and 1767–1768.

A. D. 1768.—The boundary treaty with the Six Nations at Fort Stanwix. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1765–1768.

A. D. 1768-1774.—Opening events of the Revolution. See BOSTON: A. D. 1768, to 1773; and UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1770, to 1774.

A. D. 1774.—The western territorial claims of Virginia pursued.—Lord Dunmore's War with the Indians. See OHIO (VALLEY): A. D. 1774.

A. D. 1775.—The Beginning of the War of the American Revolution.—Lexington.—Concord.—Action taken upon the news.—Ticonderoga.—Bunker Hill.—The Second Continental Congress. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1775.

A. D. 1776.—The end of royal and proprietary government.—Adoption of a State Constitution.—"Congress, on the 15th of May, 1776, recommended . . . 'the respective Assemblies and conventions of the United Colonies, where no government sufficient to the exigencies of their affairs has been hitherto established, to adopt such government as shall, in the opinion of the representatives of the people, best conduce to the happiness and safety of their constituents in particular, and America in general.' A diversity of opinion existed in the Province upon this resolution. . . . The Assembly referred the resolve of Congress to a committee, but took no further action, nor did the committee ever make a report. 'The old Assembly,' says Westcott, 'which had adjourned on the 14th of June, to meet on the 14th of August, could not obtain a quorum, and adjourned again to the 23d of September. It then interposed a feeble remonstrance against the invasion of its prerogatives by the Convention, but it was a dying protest. The Declaration of Independence had given the old State Government a mortal blow, and it soon expired without a sigh—thus ending forever the Proprietary and royal authority in Pennsylvania.' In the meantime, the Committee of Correspondence for Philadelphia issued a circular to all the county committees for a conference in that city on Tuesday, the 18th day of June. . . . The Conference at once unanimously resolved, 'That the present government of this Province is not competent to the exigencies of our affairs, and that it is necessary that a Provincial Convention be called by this Conference for the express purpose of forming a new government in this Province on the authority of the people only.' Acting upon these resolves, preparations were immediately taken to secure a proper representation in the Convention. . . . Every voter was obliged to take an oath of renunciation of the authority of George III., and one of allegiance to the State of Pennsylvania, and a religious test was prescribed for all members of the Convention. . . . The delegates to the Convention to frame a constitution for the new government consisted of the representative men of the State—men selected for their ability, patriotism, and personal popularity. They met at Philadelphia, on the 15th of July, . . . and organized by the selection of Benjamin Franklin, president, George Ross, vice-president, and John Morris and Jacob Garrigues, secretaries. . . . On the 28th of September, the Convention completed its labors by adopting the first State Constitution, which went into immediate effect, without a vote of the people. . . . The legislative power of the frame of government was vested in a General Assembly of one House, elected annually. The supreme executive power was vested in a President, chosen annually by the Assembly and Council, by joint ballot—the Council consisting of twelve persons, elected in classes, for a term of three years. A Council of Censors, consisting of two persons from each city and county, was to be elected in 1783, and in every seventh year thereafter, whose duty it was to make inquiry as to whether the Constitution had been preserved inviolate during the last septennary, and whether the executive or legislative branches of the government had performed their duties."—W. H. Egle, *Hist. of Penn., ch.* 9.—See, also, UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1776–1779.

A. D. 1776-1777.—The Declaration of Independence.—The struggle for the Hudson and the Delaware.—Battles of the Brandywine and Germantown.—The British in Philadelphia. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1776 and 1777; and PHILADELPHIA: A. D. 1777–1778.

A. D. 1777-1779.—The Articles of Confederation.—The alliance with France.—British evacuation of Philadelphia.—The war on the northern border. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1777–1781, to 1779.

A. D. 1778 (July).—The Wyoming Massacre. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1778 (JULY).

A. D. 1779-1786.—Final settlement of boundaries with Virginia. See VIRGINIA: A. D. 1779–1786.

A. D. 1780.—Emancipation of Slaves. See SLAVERY, NEGRO: A. D. 1688–1780.

A. D. 1780-1783.—The treason of Arnold.—The war in the south.—Surrender of Cornwallis.—Peace with Great Britain. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1780, to 1783.

A. D. 1781.—Mutiny of the Pennsylvania Line. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1781 (JANUARY).

A. D. 1787.—Formation and adoption of the Federal Constitution. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1787; and 1787–1789.

A. D. 1794.—The Whiskey Insurrection.—"In every part of the United States except Pennsylvania, and in by far the larger number of the counties of that state, the officers of the Federal Government had been able to carry the excise law [passed in March, 1791, on the recommendation of Hamilton], unpopular as it generally was, into execution; but resistance having been made in a few of the western counties, and their defiance of law increasing with the forbearance of the Government in that State, prosecutions had been ordered against the offenders. In July, the Marshal of the District, Lenox, who was serving the process, and General Neville, the Inspector, were attacked by a body of armed men, and compelled to desist from the execution of their official duties. The next day, a much larger number, amounting to 500 men, assembled, and endeavored to seize the person of General Neville. Failing in that, they exacted a promise from the Marshal that he would serve no more process on the west side of the Alleghany; and attacking the Inspector's house, they set fire to it, and destroyed it with its contents. On this occasion, the leader of the assailants was killed, and several of them wounded. Both the Inspector and Marshal were required to

resign; but they refused, and sought safety in flight. A meeting was held a few days later, at Mingo Creek meeting-house, which recommended to all the townships in the four western counties of Pennsylvania, and the neighboring counties of Virginia, to meet, by their delegates, at Parkinson's ferry, on the Monongahela, on the 14th of August, 'to take into consideration the situation of the western country.' Three days after this meeting, a party of the malcontents seized the mail, carried it to Canonsburg, seven miles distant, and there opened the letters from Pittsburg to Philadelphia, to discover who were hostile to them. They then addressed a circular letter to the officers of the militia in the disaffected counties, informing them of the intercepted letters, and calling on them to rendezvous at Braddock's Field on the 1st of August, with arms in good order, and four days' provision. . . . This circular was signed by seven persons, but the prime mover was David Bradford, a lawyer, who was the prosecuting attorney of Washington County. In consequence of this summons, a large body of men, which has been estimated at from five to seven thousand, assembled at Braddock's Field on the day appointed. . . . Bradford took upon himself the military command, which was readily yielded to him. . . . Bradford proposed the expulsion from Pittsburg of several persons whose hostility had been discovered by the letters they had intercepted; but his motion was carried only as to two persons, Gibson and Neville, son of the Inspector. They then decided to proceed to Pittsburg. Some assented to this, to prevent the mischief which others meditated. But for this, and the liberal refreshments furnished by the people of Pittsburg, it was thought that the town would have been burnt. . . . The President issued a proclamation reciting the acts of treason, commanding the insurgents to disperse, and warning others against abetting them. He, at the same time, wishing to try lenient measures, appointed three Commissioners to repair to the scene of the insurrection, to confer with the insurgents, and to offer them pardon on condition of a satisfactory assurance of their future obedience to the laws. . . . Governor Mifflin followed the example of the President in appointing Commissioners to confer with the insurgents, with power to grant pardons, and he issued an admonitory proclamation, after which he convened the Legislature to meet on the 3d of November. The Federal and the State Commissioners reached the insurgent district while the convention at Parkinson's ferry was in session. It assembled on the 14th of August, and consisted of 226 delegates, all from the western counties of Pennsylvania, except six from Ohio County in Virginia. They appointed Cook their Chairman, and Albert Gallatin, Secretary, though he at first declined the appointment. . . . The Commissioners required . . . an explicit assurance of submission to the laws; a recommendation to their associates of a like submission; and meetings of the citizens to be held to confirm these assurances. All public prosecutions were to be suspended until the following July, when, if there had been no violation of the law in the interval, there should be a general amnesty. These terms were deemed reasonable by the subcommittee: but before the meeting of sixty took place, a body of armed men entered Brownsville, the place appointed for the meeting, and so alarmed the friends of accommodation, that they seemed to be driven from their purpose. Gallatin, however, was an exception; and the next day, he addressed the committee of sixty in favor of acceding to the proposals of the Commissioners; but nothing more could be effected than to pass a resolution that it would be to the interest of the people to accept those terms, without any promise or pledge of submission. . . . On the whole, it was the opinion of the well-disposed part of the population, that the inspection laws could not be executed in that part of the State; and that the interposition of the militia was indispensable. The Commissioners returned to Philadelphia, and on their report the President issued a second proclamation, on the 25th of September, in which he announced the march of the militia, and again commanded obedience to the laws. The order requiring the militia to march was promptly obeyed in all the States except Pennsylvania, in which some pleaded defects in the militia law; but even in that State, after the Legislature met, the Governor was authorised to accept the services of volunteers. . . . The news that the militia were on the march increased the numbers of the moderate party. . . . Bradford, who was foremost in urging resistance to the law, was the first to seek safety in flight. He sought refuge in New Orleans. A second convention was called to meet at Parkinson's ferry on the second of October. A resolution of submission was passed, and a committee of two was appointed to convey it to the President at Carlisle. . . . On the return of the committee, the Parkinson ferry convention met for the third time, and resolutions were passed, declaring the sufficiency of the civil authorities to execute the laws; affirming that the excise duties would be paid, and recommending all delinquents to surrender themselves. . . . Lee, then, as Commander-in-chief, issued a proclamation granting an amnesty to all who had submitted to the laws; and calling upon the inhabitants to take the oath of allegiance to the United States. Orders were issued and executed to seize those offenders who had not signed the declaration of submission, and send them to Philadelphia; and thus was this purpose of resisting the execution of the excise law completely defeated, and entire order restored in less than four months from the time of the burning of Neville's house, which was the first overt act of resistance. It was, however, deemed prudent to retain a force of 2,500 militia during the winter, under General Morgan, to prevent a return of that spirit of disaffection which had so long prevailed in Pennsylvania."—Geo. Tucker, *Hist. of the U. S.*, *v.* 1, *ch.* 7.

ALSO IN: J. T. Morse, *Life of Hamilton*, *v.* 2, *ch.* 4.—T. Ward, *The Insurrection of* 1794 (*Memoirs of Penn. Hist. Soc.*, *v.* 6).—J. B. McMaster, *Hist. of the People of the U. S.*, *ch.* 9 (*v.* 2).

A. D. 1861.—First troops sent to Washington. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1861 (APRIL).

A. D. 1863.—Lee's invasion.—Battle of Gettysburg. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1863 (JUNE—JULY: PENNSYLVANIA).

A. D. 1864.—Early's invasion.—Burning of Chambersburg. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1864 (JULY: VIRGINIA—MARYLAND).

PENNY POSTAGE. See Post.

PENSACOLA: Unauthorized capture by General Jackson (1818). See Florida: A. D. 1816–1818.

PENTACOSIOMEDIMNI, The. See Athens: B. C. 594.

PENTAPOLIS IN AFRICA. See Cyrene.

PENTATHLON, The.—The five exercises of running, leaping, wrestling, throwing the diskos, and throwing the spear, formed what the Greeks called the pentathlon. "At the four great national festivals all these had to be gone through on one and the same day, and the prize was awarded to him only who had been victorious in all of them."—E. Guhl and W. Koner, *Life of the Greeks and Romans, sect.* 52.

PEORIAS, The. See American Aborigines: Algonquian Family.

PEPIN. See Pippin.

PEPLUM, The.—"The peplum constituted the outermost covering of the body. Among the Greeks it was worn in common by both sexes, but was chiefly reserved for occasions of ceremony or of public appearance, and, as well in its texture as in its shape, seemed to answer to our shawl. When very long and ample, so as to admit of being wound twice round the body—first under the arms, and the second time over the shoulders—it assumed the name of diplax. In rainy or cold weather it was drawn over the head. At other times this peculiar mode of wearing it was expressive of humility or of grief."—T. Hope, *Costume of the Ancients, v.* 1.

PEPPERELL, Sir William, and the expedition against Louisburg. See New England: A. D. 1745.

PEQUOTS.—PEQUOT WAR. See American Aborigines: Algonquian Family, and Shawanese; also, New England: A. D. 1637.

PERA, The Genoese established at. See Genoa: A. D. 1261–1299.

PERCEVAL MINISTRY, The. See England: A. D. 1806–1812.

PERDICCAS, and the wars of the Diadochi. See Macedonia: B. C. 323–316.

PERDUELLIO, The Crime of.—"'Perduellis,' derived from 'duellum' e. q. 'bellum,' properly speaking signifies 'a public enemy,' and hence Perduellio was employed [among the Romans] in legal phraseology to denote the crime of hostility to one's native country, and is usually represented as corresponding, in a general sense, to our term High Treason."—W. Ramsay, *Manual of Roman Antiq., ch.* 9.—See Majestas.

PERED, Battle of (1849). See Austria: A. D. 1848–1849.

PEREGRINI.—"The term 'Peregrinus,' with which in early times 'Hostis' (i. e. stranger) was synonymous, embraced, in its widest acceptation, every one possessed of personal freedom who was not a Civis Romanus. Generally, however, Peregrinus was not applied to all foreigners indiscriminately, but to those persons only, who, although not Cives, were connected with Rome."—W. Ramsay, *Manual of Roman Antiq., ch.* 3.—See, also, Cives Romani.

PERGAMUM, OR PERGAMUS.—This ancient city in northwestern Asia Minor, within the province of Mysia, on the north of the river Caïcus, became, during the troubled century that followed the death of Alexander, first the seat of an important principality, and then the capital of a rich and flourishing kingdom, to which it gave its name. It seems to have owed its fortunes to a great deposit of treasures—part of the plunder of Asia—which Lysimachus, one of the generals and successors of Alexander, left for safe keeping within its walls, under the care of an eunuch, named Philetærus. This Philetærus found excuses, after a time, for renouncing allegiance to Lysimachus, appropriating the treasures and using them to make himself lord of Pergamum. He was succeeded by a nephew, Eumenes, and he in turn by his cousin Attalus. The latter, "who had succeeded to the possession of Pergamum in 241 [B. C.], met and vanquished the Galatians in a great battle, which gave him such popularity that he was able to assume the title of king, and extend his influence far beyond his inherited dominion. . . . The court of Pergamum continued to flourish till it controlled the larger part of Asia Minor. In his long reign this king represented almost as much as the King of Egypt the art and culture of Hellenism. His great victory over the Galatians was celebrated by the dedication of so many splendid offerings to various shrines, that the Pergamene school made a distinct impression upon the world's taste. Critics have enumerated seventeen remaining types, which appear to have come from statues of that time—the best known is the so-called 'Dying Gladiator,' who is really a dying Galatian. . . . Perhaps the literature of the court was even more remarkable. Starting on the model of Alexandria, with a great library, Attalus was far more fortunate than the Ptolemies in making his university the home of Stoic philosophy."—J. P. Mahaffy, *Story of Alexander's Empire, ch.* 20.—From the assumption of the crown by Attalus I. the kingdom of Pergamus existed about a century. Its last king bequeathed it to the Romans in 133 B. C. and it became a Roman province. Its splendid library of 200,000 volumes was given to Cleopatra a century later by Antony, and was added to that of Alexandria. The name of the city is perpetuated in the word parchment, which is derived therefrom. Its ruins are found at a place called Bergamah. See, also, Seleucidæ: B. C. 224–187; Alexandria: B. C. 282–246; and Rome: B. C. 47–46.

A. D. 1336.—Conquest by the Ottoman Turks. See Turks (Ottoman): A. D. 1326–1359.

PERGAMUS, Citadel of. See Troja.

PERICLES, Age of. See Athens: B. C. 466–454; and 445–429.

PERINTHUS: B. C. 340.—Siege by Philip of Macedon. See Greece: B. C. 340.

PERIOECI, The. See Sparta: The City.

PERIPLUS.—The term periplus, in the usage of Greek and Roman writers, signified a voyage round the coast of some sea. Example: "The Periplus of the Erythrean Sea."

PERIZZITES, The.—"The name 'Perizzites,' where mentioned in the Bible, is not meant to designate any particular race, but country people, in contradistinction to those dwelling in towns."—F. Lenormant, *Manual of Ancient Hist., bk.* 6, *ch.* 1.

PERMANENT SETTLEMENT OF BENGAL LAND REVENUE. See India: A. D. 1785–1793.

PERONNE, The Treaty of. See Burgundy: A. D. 1467–1468.

PERPETUAL EDICT, The. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1575–1577.

PERPIGNAN: A. D. 1642.—Siege and capture by the French. See SPAIN: A. D. 1640–1642.

PERRHÆBIANS, The.—"There had dwelt in the valley of the Peneus [Thessaly] from the earliest times a Pelasgic nation, which offered up thanks to the gods for the possession of so fruitful a territory at the festival of Peloria. . . . Larissa was the ancient capital of this nation. But at a very early time the primitive inhabitants were either expelled or reduced to subjection by more northern tribes. Those who had retired into the mountains became the Perrhæbian nation, and always retained a certain degree of independence. In the Homeric catalogue the Perrhæbians are mentioned as dwelling on the hill Cyphus, under Olympus."—C. O. Müller, *Hist. and Antiq. of the Doric Race, bk.* 1, *ch.* 1.—Dr. Curtius is of the opinion that the Dorians were a subdivision of the Perrhæbians.—*Hist. of Greece, bk.* 1, *ch.* 4.

PERRY, Commodore Matthew C.: Expedition to Japan. See JAPAN: A. D. 1852–1888.

PERRY, Commodore Oliver H.: Victory on Lake Erie. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1812–1813.

PERRYVILLE, Battle of. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1862 (JUNE—OCTOBER: TENNESSEE—KENTUCKY).

PERSARGADÆ. See PERSIA, ANCIENT PEOPLE, &c.

PERSARMENIA.—While the Persians possessed Armenia Major, east of the Euphrates, and the Romans held Armenia Minor, west of that river, the former region was sometimes called Persarmenia.

PERSECUTIONS, Religious.—Of Albigenses. See ALBIGENSES.....Of Christians under the Roman Empire. See ROME: A. D. 64–68; 96–138; 192–284; 303–305; and CHRISTIANITY: A. D. 100–312.....Of Hussites in Bohemia. See BOHEMIA: A. D. 1419–1434, and after.....Of Jews. See JEWS.....Of Lollards. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1360–1414.... Of Protestants in England. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1555–1558.....Of Protestants in France. See FRANCE: A. D. 1532–1547; 1559–1561 to 1598–1599; 1661–1680; 1681–1698. ....Of Protestants in the Netherlands. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1521–1555 to 1594–1609..... Of Roman Catholics in England. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1572–1603; 1585–1587; 1587–1588; 1678–1679.....Of Roman Catholics in Ireland. See IRELAND: A. D. 1691–1782.....Of Christians in Japan. See JAPAN: A. D. 1549–1686.....Of the Waldenses. See WALDENSES.....See, also, INQUISITION.

PERSEIDÆ, The. See ARGOS.—ARGOLIS.

PERSEPOLIS: Origin. See PERSIA, ANCIENT PEOPLE.

B. C. 330.—Destruction by Alexander.—Although Persepolis was surrendered to him on his approach to it (B. C. 331), Alexander the Great determined to destroy the city. "In this their home the Persian kings had accumulated their national edifices, their regal sepulchres, the inscriptions commemorative of their religious or legendary sentiment, with many trophies and acquisitions arising out of their conquests. For the purposes of the Great King's empire, Babylon, or Susa, or Ekbatana, were more central and convenient residences; but Persepolis was still regarded as the heart of Persian nationality. It was the chief magazine, though not the only one, of those annual accumulations from the imperial revenue, which each king successively increased, and which none seems to have ever diminished. . . . After appropriating the regal treasure—to the alleged amount of 120,000 talents in gold and silver (=£27,600,000 sterling)—Alexander set fire to the citadel. . . . The persons and property of the inhabitants were abandoned to the licence of the soldiers, who obtained an immense booty, not merely in gold and silver, but also in rich clothing, furniture, and ostentatious ornaments of every kind. The male inhabitants were slain, the females dragged into servitude; except such as obtained safety by flight, or burned themselves with their property in their own houses."—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece, pt.* 2, *ch.* 93.

PERSIA: Ancient people and country.—"Persia Proper seems to have corresponded nearly to that province of the modern Iran which still bears the ancient name slightly modified, being called Farsistan or Fars. . . . Persia Proper lay upon the gulf to which it has given name, extending from the mouth of the Tab (Oroatis) to the point where the gulf joins the Indian Ocean. It was bounded on the west by Susiana, on the north by Media Magna, on the east by Mycia, and on the south by the sea. Its length seems to have been about 450, and its average width about 250 miles. . . . The earliest known capital of the region was Pasargadæ, or Persagadæ, as the name is sometimes written, of which the ruins still exist near Murgab, in lat. 30° 15′, long. 53° 17′. Here is the famous tomb of Cyrus. . . . At the distance of thirty miles from Pasargadæ, or of more than forty by the ordinary road, grew up the second capital, Persepolis. . . . The Empire, which, commencing from Persia Proper, spread itself, toward the close of the sixth century before Christ, over the surrounding tracts, [extended from the Caspian Sea and the Indian Desert to the Mediterranean and the Propontis]. . . . The earliest appearance of the Persians in history is in the inscriptions of the Assyrian kings, which begin to notice them about the middle of the ninth century, B. C. At this time Shalmanezer II. [the Assyrian king] found them in south-western Armenia, where they were in close contact with the Medes, of whom, however, they seem to have been wholly independent. . . . It is not until the reign of Sennacherib that we once more find them brought into contact with the power which aspired to be mistress of Asia. At the time of their re-appearance they are no longer in Armenia, but have descended the line of Zagros and reached the districts which lie north and north-east of Susiana. . . . It is probable that they did not settle into an organized monarchy much before the fall of Nineveh. . . . The history of the Persian 'Empire' dates from the conquest of Astyages [the Median king] by Cyrus, and therefore commences with the year B. C. 558 [or, according to Sayce, B. C. 549—see below]."—G. Rawlinson, *Five Great Monarchies: Persia, ch.* 1 *and* 7.

ALSO IN: A. H. Sayce, *Ancient Empires of the East, app.* 5.—See, also, ARIANS; IRAN; and ACHÆMENIDS.

The ancient religion. See ZOROASTRIANS.

B. C. 549-521.—The founding of the empire by Cyrus the Great, King of Elam.—His conquest of Media, Persia, Lydia, and Babylonia.—The restoration of the Jews.—Conquest of Egypt by Kambyses.—"It was in B. C. 549 that Astyages was overthrown [see MEDIA]. On his march against Kyros [Cyrus] his own soldiers, drawn probably from his Aryan subjects, revolted against him and gave him into the hands of his enemy. 'The land of Ekbatana and the royal city' were ravaged and plundered by the conqueror; the Aryan Medes at once acknowledged the supremacy of Kyros, and the empire of Kyaxares was destroyed. Some time, however, was still needed to complete the conquest; the older Medic population still held out in the more distant regions of the empire, and probably received encouragement and promises of help from Babylonia. In B. C. 546, however, Kyros marched from Arbela, crossed the Tigris, and destroyed the last relics of Median independence. . . . The following year saw the opening of the campaign against Babylonia [see BABYLONIA: B. C. 625–539]. But the Babylonian army, encamped near Sippara, formed a barrier which the Persians were unable to overcome; and trusting, therefore, to undermine the power of Nabonidos by secret intrigues with his subjects, Kyros proceeded against Krœsos. A single campaign sufficed to capture Sardes and its monarch, and to add Asia Minor to the Persian dominions [see LYDIANS, and ASIA MINOR: B. C. 724–539]. The Persian conqueror was now free to attack Babylonia. Here his intrigues were already bearing fruit. The Jewish exiles were anxiously expecting him to redeem them from captivity, and the tribes on the sea coast were ready to welcome a new master. In B. C. 538 the blow was struck. The Persian army entered Babylonia from the south. The army of Nabonidos was defeated at Rata in June; on the 14th of that month Sippara opened its gates, and two days later Gobryas, the Persian general, marched into Babylon itself 'without battle and fighting.' . . . In October Kyros himself entered his new capital in triumph."—A. H. Sayce, *The Ancient Empires of the East: Herodotus* 1–3. *Appendix* 5.—"The history of the downfall of the great Babylonian Empire, and of the causes, humanly speaking, which brought about a restoration of the Jews, has recently been revealed to us by the progress of Assyrian discovery. We now possess the account given by Cyrus himself, of the overthrow of Nabonidos, the Babylonian king, and of the conqueror's permission to the captives in Babylonia to return to their homes. The account is contained in two documents, written, like most other Assyrian and Babylonian records, upon clay, and lately brought from Babylonia to England by Mr. Rassam. One of these documents is a tablet which chronicles the events of each year in the reign of Nabonidos, the last Babylonian monarch, and continues the history into the first year of Cyrus, as king of Babylon. The other is a cylinder, on which Cyrus glorifies himself and his son Kambyses, and professes his adherence to the worship of Bel-Merodach, the patron-god of Babylon. The tablet-inscription is, unfortunately, somewhat mutilated, especially at the beginning and the end, and little can be made out of the annals of the first five years of Nabonidos, except that he was occupied with disturbances in Syria. In the sixth year the record becomes clear and continuous. . . . The inscriptions . . . present us with an account of the overthrow of the Babylonian Empire, which is in many important respects very different from that handed down to us by classical writers. We possess in them the contemporaneous account of one who was the chief actor in the events he records, and have ceased to be dependent upon Greek and Latin writers, who could not read a single cuneiform character, and were separated by a long lapse of time from the age of Nabonidos and Cyrus. Perhaps the first fact which will strike the mind of the reader with astonishment is that Cyrus does not call himself and his ancestors kings of Persia, but of Elam. The word used is Anzan or Ansan, which an old Babylonian geographical tablet explains as the native name of the country which the Assyrians and Hebrews called Elam. This statement is verified by early inscriptions found at Susa and other places in the neighbourhood, and belonging to the ancient monarchs of Elam, who contended on equal terms with Babylonia and Assyria until they were at last conquered by the Assyrian king Assur-bani-pal, and their country made an Assyrian province. In these inscriptions they take the imperial title of 'king of Anzan.' The annalistic tablet lets us see when Cyrus first became king of Persia. In the sixth year of Nabonidos (B. C. 549) Cyrus is still king of Elam; in the ninth year he has become king of Persia. Between these two years, therefore, he must have gained possession of Persia either by conquest or in some peaceable way. When he overthrew Astyages his rule did not as yet extend so far. At the same time Cyrus must have been of Persian descent, since he traces his ancestry back to Teispes, whom Darius, the son of Hystaspes, in his great inscription on the sacred rock of Behistun, claims as his own forefather. . . . The fact that Susa or Shushan was the original capital of Cyrus explains why it remained the leading city of the Persian Empire; and we can also now understand why it is that in Isaiah xxi. 2, the prophet bids Elam and Media, and not Persia and Media, 'go up' against Babylon. That Cyrus was an Elamite, however, is not the only startling revelation which the newly-discovered inscriptions have made to us. We learn from them that he was a polytheist who worshipped Bel-Merodach and Nebo, and paid public homage to the deities of Babylon. We have learned a similar fact in regard to his son Kambyses from the Egyptian monuments. These have shown us that the account of the murder of the sacred bull Apis by Kambyses given by Herodotus is a fiction; a tablet accompanying the huge granite sarcophagus of the very bull he was supposed to have wounded has been found with the image of Kambyses sculptured upon it kneeling before the Egyptian god. The belief that Cyrus was a monotheist grew out of the belief that he was a Persian, and, like other Persians, a follower of the Zoroastrian faith; there is nothing in Scripture to warrant it. Cyrus was God's shepherd only because he was His chosen instrument in bringing about the restoration of Israel. . . . The first work of Cyrus was to ingratiate himself with the conquered population by affecting a show of zeal and piety towards their gods, and with the nations which had been kept in captivity in Babylonia, by sending them and their deities back to their homes.

Among these nations were the Jews, who had perhaps assisted the king of Elam in his attack upon Nabonidos. Experience had taught Cyrus the danger of allowing a disaffected people to live in the country of their conquerors. He therefore reversed the old policy of the Assyrian and Babylonian kings, which consisted in transporting the larger portion of a conquered population to another country, and sought instead to win their gratitude and affection by allowing them to return to their native lands. He saw, moreover, that the Jews, if restored from exile, would not only protect the southwestern corner of his empire from the Egyptians, but would form a base for his intended invasion of Egypt itself. . . . The number of exiles who took advantage of the edict of Cyrus, and accompanied Zerubbabel to Jerusalem, amounted to 42,360. It is probable, however, that this means only the heads of families; if so, the whole body of those who left Babylon, including women and children, would have been about 200,000. . . . The conquest of Babylonia by Cyrus took place in the year 538 B. C. He was already master of Persia, Media, and Lydia; and the overthrow of the empire of Nebuchadnezzar extended his dominions from the mountains of the Hindu Kush on the east to the shores of the Mediterranean on the west. Egypt alone of the older empires of the Oriental world remained independent, but its doom could not be long delayed. The career of Cyrus had indeed been marvellous. He had begun as the king only of Anzan or Elam, whose power seemed but 'small' and contemptible to his neighbour the great Babylonian monarch. But his victory over the Median king Astyages and the destruction of the Median Empire made him at once one of the most formidable princes in Western Asia. Henceforth the seat of his power was moved from Susa or Shushan to Ekbatana, called Achmetha in Scripture, Hagmatan in Persian, the capital of Media. . . . The conquest of Media was quickly followed by that of Persia, which appears to have been under the government of a collateral branch of the family of Cyrus. Henceforward the king of Elam becomes also the king of Persia. The empire of Lydia, which extended over the greater part of Asia Minor, fell before the army of Cyrus about B. C. 540. . . . The latter years of the life of Cyrus were spent in extending and consolidating his power among the wild tribes and unknown regions of the Far East. When he died, all was ready for the threatened invasion of Egypt. This was carried out by his son and successor Kambyses, who had been made 'king of Babylon' three years before his father's death, Cyrus reserving to himself the imperial title of 'King of the world.'. . . As soon as Kambyses became sole sovereign, Babylon necessarily took rank with Shushan and Ekbatana. It was the third centre of the great empire, and in later days the Persian monarchs were accustomed to make it their official residence during the winter season. . . . Kambyses was so fascinated by his new province that he refused to leave it. The greater part of his reign was spent in Egypt, where he so thoroughly established his power and influence that it was the only part of the empire which did not rise in revolt at his death. . . . Soon after his father's death he stained his hands with the blood of his brother Bardes, called Smerdis by Herodotus, to whom Cyrus had assigned the eastern part of his empire. Bardes was put to death secretly at Susa, it is said. . . . A Magian, Gaumata or Gomates by name, who resembled Bardes in appearance, came forward to personate the murdered prince, and Persia, Media, and other provinces at once broke into rebellion against their long-absent king. When the news of this revolt reached Kambyses he appointed Aryandes satrap of Egypt, and, if we may believe the Greek accounts, set out to oppose the usurper. He had not proceeded far, however, before he fell by his own hand. The false Bardes was now master of the empire. Darius, in his inscription on the rock of Behistun, tells us that 'he put to death many people who had known Bardes, to prevent its being known that he was not Bardes, son of Cyrus.' At the same time he remitted the taxes paid by the provinces, and proclaimed freedom for three years from military service. But he had not reigned more than seven months before a conspiracy was formed against him. Darius, son of Hystaspes, attacked him at the head of the conspirators, in the land of Nisæa in Media, and there slew him, on the 10th day of April, B. C. 521. Darius, like Kambyses, belonged to the royal Persian race of Akhæmenes."
—A. H. Sayce, *Introduction to the Books of Ezra, Nehemiah and Esther, ch.* 1 *and* 3.

Also in: The same, *Fresh Light from the Ancient Monuments, ch.* 7.—Z. A. Ragozin, *The Story of Media, Babylon and Persia, ch.* 10–12.

B. C. 521-493. — The reign of Darius I. — His Indian and Scythian expeditions.—The Ionian revolt and its suppression.—Aid given to the insurgents by Athens.—"Darius I., the son of Hystaspes, is rightly regarded as the second founder of the Persian empire. His reign is dated from the first day of the year answering to B. C. 521; and it lasted 36 years, to Dec. 23, B. C. 486. . . . Throughout the Behistun Inscription Darius represents himself as the hereditary champion of the Achaemenids, against Gomates and all other rebels. . . . It is 'by the grace of Ormazd' that he does everything. . . . This restoration of the Zoroastrian worship, and the putting down of several rebellions, are the matters recorded in the great trilingual inscription at Behistun, which Sir Henry Rawlinson dates, from internal evidence, in the sixth year of Darius (B. C. 516). . . . The empire of which Darius became king embraced, as he says, the following provinces: 'Persia, Susiana, Babylonia, Assyria, Arabia, Egypt; those which are of the sea (the islands), Saparda, Ionia, Media, Armenia, Cappadocia, Parthia, Zarangia, Aria, Chorasmia, Bactria, Sogdiana, Gandaria, the Sacae, Sattagydia, Arachotia, and Mecia: in all twenty-three provinces.'. . . All the central provinces constituting the original empire, from the mountains of Armenia to the head of the Persian Gulf, as well as several of those of the Iranian table-land, had to be reconquered. . . . Having thus restored the empire, Darius pursued new military expeditions and conquests in the true spirit of its founder. To the energy of youth was added the fear that quiet might breed new revolts; and by such motives, if we may believe Herodotus, he was urged by Queen Atossa — at the instigation of the Greek physician, Democedes — to the conquest of Greece; while he himself was minded to construct a bridge which should join Asia to Europe, and so to carry war into Scythia. It seems to have been

according to an Oriental idea of right, and not as a mere pretext, that he claimed to punish the Scythians for their invasion of Media in the time of Cyaxares. So he contented himself, for the present, with sending spies to Greece under the guidance of Democedes, and with the reduction of Samos. The Scythian expedition, however, appears to have been preceded by the extension of the empire eastward from the mountains of Afghanistan — the limit reached by Cyrus — over the valley of the Indus. . . . The part of India thus added to the empire, including the Punjab and apparently Scinde, yielded a tribute exceeding that of any other province. . . . The Scythian Expedition of Darius occupies the greater part of the Fourth Book of Herodotus. . . . The great result of the expedition, in which the king and his army narrowly escaped destruction, was the gaining of a permanent footing in Europe by the conquest of Thrace and the submission of Macedonia. . . . It was probably in B. C. 508 that Darius, having collected a fleet of 600 ships from the Greeks of Asia, and an army of 700,000 or 800,000 men from all the nations of his empire, crossed the Hellespont by a bridge of boats, and marched to the Danube, conquering on his way the Thracians within, and the Getæ beyond, the Great Balkan. The Danube was crossed by a bridge formed of the vessels of the Ionians, just above the apex of its Delta. The confusion in the geography of Herodotus makes it as difficult as it is unprofitable to trace the direction and extent of the march, which Herodotus carries beyond the Tanais (Don), and probably as far north as 50° lat. The Scythians retreated before Darius, avoiding a pitched battle, and using every stratagem to detain the Persians in the country till they should perish from famine." Darius retreated in time to save his army. "Leaving his sick behind, with the campfires lighted and the asses tethered, to make the enemy believe that he was still in their front, he retreated in the night. The pursuing Scythians missed his line of march, and came first to the place where the Ionian ships bridged the Danube. Failing to persuade the Greek generals to break by the same act both the bridge and the yoke of Darius, they marched back to encounter the Persian army. But their own previous destruction of the wells led them into a different route; and Darius got safe, but with difficulty, to the Danube. . . . The Hellespont was crossed by means of the fleet with which the strait had been guarded by Megabazus, or, more probably, Megabyzus; and the second opportunity was barred against a rising of the Greek colonies. . . . He left Megabazus in Europe with 80,000 troops to complete the reduction of all Thrace." Megabazus not only executed this commission, but reduced the kingdom of Macedonia to vassalage before returning to his master, in B. C. 506.—P. Smith, *Ancient Hist. of the East, bk.* 3, *ch.* 27.—"Darius returned to Susa, leaving the western provinces in profound peace under the government of his brother Artaphernes. A trifling incident lighted the flame of rebellion. One of those political conflicts, which we have seen occurring throughout Greece, broke out in Naxos, an island of the Cyclades (B. C. 502). The exiles of the oligarchical party applied for aid to Aristagoras, the tyrant of Miletus, who persuaded Artaphernes to send an expedition against Naxos. The Persian commander, incensed by the interference of Aristagoras on a point of discipline, warned the Naxians, and so caused the failure of the expedition and ruined the credit of Aristagoras, who saw no course open to him but revolt. . . . With the consent of the Milesian citizens, Aristagoras seized the tyrants who were on board of the fleet that had returned from Naxos; he laid down his own power; popular governments were proclaimed in all the cities and islands; and Ionia revolted from Darius (B. C. 501). Aristagoras went to Sparta . . . and tried to tempt the king, Cleomenes, by displaying the greatness of the Persian empire; but his admission that Susa was three months' journey from the sea ruined his cause. He had better success at Athens; for the Athenians knew that Artaphernes had been made their enemy by Hippias. They voted twenty ships in aid of the Ionians, and the squadron was increased by five ships of the Eretrians. Having united with the Ionian fleet, they disembarked at Ephesus, marched up the country, and surprised Sardis, which was accidentally burnt during the pillage. Their forces were utterly inadequate to hold the city; and their return was not effected without a severe defeat by the pursuing army. The Athenians reembarked and sailed home, while the Ionians dispersed to their cities to make those preparations which should have preceded the attack. Their powerful fleet gained for them the adhesion of the Hellespontine cities as far as Byzantium, of Caria, Caunus, and Cyprus; but this island was recovered by the Persians within a year. The Ionians protracted the insurrection for six years. Their cause was early abandoned by Aristagoras, who fled to the coast of Thrace and there perished. . . . The fate of the revolt turned at last on the siege of Miletus. The city was protected by the Ionian fleet, for which the Phoenician navy of Artaphernes was no match. But there was fatal disunion and want of discipline on board, and the defection of the Samians gave the Persians an easy victory off Ladé (B. C. 495). Miletus suffered the worst horrors of a storm, and the other cities and islands were treated with scarcely less severity. This third subjugation of Ionia inflicted the most lasting blow on the prosperity of the colonies (B. C. 493). Throughout his narrative of these events, Herodotus declares his opinion of the impolicy of the interference of the Athenians. The ships they voted, he says, were the beginning of evils both to the Greeks and the barbarians. When the news of the burning of Sardis was brought to Darius, he called for his bow, and shot an arrow towards the sky, with a prayer to Auramazda for help to revenge himself on the Athenians. Then he bade one of his servants repeat to him thrice, as he sat down to dinner, the words, 'Master, remember the Athenians.' Upon the suppression of the Ionian revolt, he appointed his son-in-law Mardonius to succeed Artaphernes, enjoining him to bring these insolent Athenians and Eretrians to Susa."—P. Smith, *Hist. of the World: Ancient, ch.* 13 (*v.* 1).

Also in: G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece, pt.* 2, *ch.* 33–35 (*v.* 4).—C. Thirlwall, *Hist. of Greece, ch.* 14 (*v.* 2).

B. C. 509.—Alliance solicited, but subjection refused by the Athenians. See Athens: B. C. 509–506.

B. C. 492-491.—First expedition against Greece and its failure.—Wrathful preparations of the king for subjugation of the Greeks. See GREECE: B. C. 492–491.

B. C. 490-479.—Wars with the Greeks. See GREECE: B. C. 490, to B. C. 479.

B. C. 486-405.—From Xerxes I. to Artaxerxes II.—The disastrous invasion of Greece.—Loss of Egypt.—Recovery of Asia Minor.—Decay of the empire.—"Xerxes I, who succeeded Darius, B. C. 486, commenced his reign by the reduction of Egypt, B. C. 485, which he entrusted to his brother, Achæmenes. He then provoked and chastised a rebellion of the Babylonians, enriching himself with the plunder of their temples. After this he turned his attention to the invasion of Greece [where he experienced the disastrous defeats of Salamis, Platæa and Mycale—see GREECE: B. C. 480, to B. C. 479]. . . . It was now the turn of the Greeks to retaliate on their prostrate foe. First under the lead of Sparta and then under that of Athens they freed the islands of the Ægean from the Persian yoke, expelled the Persian garrisons from Europe, and even ravaged the Asiatic coast and made descents on it at their pleasure. For twelve years no Persian fleet ventured to dispute with them the sovereignty of the seas; and when at last, in B. C. 466, a naval force was collected to protect Cilicia and Cyprus, it was defeated and destroyed by Cimon at the Eurymedon [see ATHENS: B. C. 470–466]. Soon after this Xerxes' reign came to an end. This weak prince, . . . on his return to Asia, found consolation for his military failure in the delights of the seraglio, and ceased to trouble himself much about affairs of State. . . . The bloody and licentious deeds which stain the whole of the later Persian history commence with Xerxes, who suffered the natural penalty of his follies and his crimes when, after reigning twenty years, he was murdered by the captain of his guard, Artabanus, and Aspamitres, his chamberlain. . . . Artabanus placed on the throne the youngest son of Xerxes, Artaxerxes I [B. C. 465]. . . . The eldest son, Darius, accused by Artabanus of his father's assassination, was executed; the second, Hystaspes, who was satrap of Bactria, claimed the crown; and, attempting to enforce his claim, was defeated and slain in battle. About the same time the crimes of Artabanus were discovered, and he was put to death. Artaxerxes then reigned quietly for nearly forty years. He was a mild prince, possessed of several good qualities; but the weakness of his character caused a rapid declension of the empire under his sway. The revolt of Egypt [B. C. 460–455] was indeed suppressed after a while, through the vigorous measures of the satrap of Syria, Megabyzus; and the Athenians, who had fomented it, were punished by the complete destruction of their fleet, and the loss of almost all their men [see ATHENS: B. C. 460–449]. . . . Bent on recovering her prestige, Athens, in B. C. 449, despatched a fleet to the Levant, under Cimon, which sailed to Cyprus and laid siege to Citium. There Cimon died; but the fleet, which had been under his orders, attacked and completely defeated a large Persian armament off Salamis, besides detaching a squadron to assist Amyrtæus, who still held out in the Delta. Persia, dreading the loss of Cyprus and Egypt, consented to an inglorious peace [the much disputed 'Peace of Cimon,' or 'Peace of Callias'—see ATHENS: B. C. 460–449]. . . . Scarcely less damaging to Persia was the revolt of Megabyzus, which followed. This powerful noble . . . excited a rebellion in Syria [B. C. 447], and so alarmed Artaxerxes that he was allowed to dictate the terms on which he would consent to be reconciled to his sovereign. An example was thus set of successful rebellion on the part of a satrap, which could not but have disastrous consequences. . . . The disorders of the court continued, and indeed increased, under Artaxerxes I, who allowed his mother Amestris, and his sister Amytis, who was married to Megabyzus, to indulge freely the cruelty and licentiousness of their dispositions. Artaxerxes died B. C. 425, and left his crown to his only legitimate son, Xerxes II. Revolutions in the government now succeeded each other with great rapidity. Xerxes II, after reigning forty-five days, was assassinated by his half-brother, Secydianus, or Sogdianus, an illegitimate son of Artaxerxes, who seized the throne, but was murdered in his turn, after a reign of six months and a half, by another brother, Ochus. Ochus, on ascending the throne, took the name of Darius, and is known in history as Darius Nothus. He was married to Parysatis, his aunt, a daughter of Xerxes I, and reigned nineteen years, B. C. 424–405, under her tutelage. His reign . . . was on the whole disastrous. Revolt succeeded to revolt; and, though most of the insurrections were quelled, it was at the cost of what remained of Persian honour and self-respect. Corruption was used instead of force against the rebellious armies. . . . The revolts of satraps were followed by national outbreaks, which, though sometimes quelled, were in other instances successful. In B. C. 408, the Medes, who had patiently acquiesced in Persian rule for more than a century, made an effort to shake off the yoke, but were defeated and reduced to subjection. Three years later, B. C. 405, Egypt once more rebelled, under Nepherites, and succeeded in establishing its independence. The Persians were expelled from Africa, and a native prince seated himself on the throne of the Pharaohs. It was some compensation for this loss, and perhaps for others towards the north and north-east of the empire, that in Asia Minor the authority of the Great King was once more established over the Greek cities. It was the Peloponnesian War, rather than the Peace of Callias, which had prevented any collision between the great powers of Europe and Asia for 37 years. Both Athens and Sparta had their hands full; and though it might have been expected that Persia would have at once taken advantage of the quarrel to reclaim at least her lost continental dominion, yet she seems to have refrained, through moderation or fear, until the Athenian disasters in Sicily encouraged her to make an effort. She then invited the Spartans to Asia, and by the treaties which she concluded with them, and the aid which she gave them, reacquired without a struggle all the Greek cities of the coast [B. C. 412]. . . . Darius Nothus died B. C. 405, and was succeeded by his eldest son, Arsaces, who on his accession took the name of Artaxerxes. Artaxerxes II, called by the Greeks Mnemon, on account of the excellence of his memory, had from the very first a rival in his brother Cyrus."—G. Rawlinson, *Manual of Ancient Hist., bk.* 2, *sect.* 24–39.

ALSO IN: The same, *The Five Great Monarchies, v. 3: Persia, ch. 7.*

B. C. 413.—Tribute again demanded from the Greek cities in Asia Minor.—Hostility to Athens.—Subsidies to her enemies. See GREECE: B. C. 413.

B. C. 401-400.—The expedition of Cyrus the Younger, and the Retreat of the Ten Thousand.—Cyrus the Younger, so called to distinguish him from the great founder of the Persian empire, was the second son of Darius Nothus, king of Persia, and expected to succeed his father on the throne through the influence of his mother, Parysatis. During his father's life he was appointed satrap of Lydia, Phrygia and Cappadocia, with supreme military command in all Asia Minor. On the death of Darius, B. C. 404, Cyrus found himself thwarted in his hopes of the succession, and laid plans at once for overthrowing the elder brother, Artaxerxes, who had been placed on the throne. He had acquired an extensive acquaintance with the Greeks and had had much to do with them, in his administration of Asia Minor, during the Peloponnesian War. That acquaintance had produced in his mind a great opinion of their invincible qualities in war, and had shown him the practicability of forming, with the means which he commanded, a compact army of Greek mercenaries which no Persian force could withstand. He executed his plan of gathering such a column of Greek soldiers, without awakening his brother's suspicions, and set out upon his expedition from Sardes to Susa, in March B. C. 401. As he advanced, finding himself unopposed, the troops of Artaxerxes retreating before him, he and his Asiatic followers grew rash in their confidence, and careless of discipline and order. Hence it happened that when the threatened Persian monarch did confront them, with a great army, at Cunaxa, on the Euphrates, in Babylonia, they were taken by surprise and routed, and the pretender, Cyrus, was slain on the field. The Greeks—who numbered about 13,000, but whose ranks were soon thinned and who are famous in history as the Ten Thousand,—stood unshaken, and felt still equal to the conquest of the Persian capital, if any object in advancing upon it had remained to them. But the death of Cyrus left them in a strange situation,—deserted by every Asiatic ally, without supplies, without knowledge of the country, in the midst of a hostile population. Their own commander, moreover, had been slain, and no one held authority over them. But they possessed what no other people of their time could claim—the capacity for self-control. They chose from their ranks a general, the Athenian Xenophon, and endowed him with all necessary powers. Then they set their faces homewards, in a long retreat from the lower Euphrates to the Euxine, from the Euxine to the Bosporus, and so into Greece. "Although this eight months' military expedition possesses no immediate significance for political history, yet it is of high importance, not only for our knowledge of the East, but also for that of the Greek character; and the accurate description which we owe to Xenophon is therefore one of the most valuable documents of antiquity. . . . This army is a typical chart, in many colours, of the Greek population—a picture, on a small scale, of the whole people, with all its virtues and faults, its qualities of strength and its qualities of weakness, a wandering political community which, according to home usage, holds its assemblies and passes its resolutions, and at the same time a wild and not easily manageable band of free-lances. . . . And how very remarkable it is, that in this mixed multitude of Greeks it is an Athenian who by his qualities towers above all the rest, and becomes the real preserver of the entire army! The Athenian Xenophon had only accompanied the expedition as a volunteer, having been introduced by Proxenus to Cyrus, and thereupon moved by his sense of honour to abide with the man whose great talents he admired. . . . The Athenian alone possessed that superiority of culture which was necessary for giving order and self-control to the band of warriors, barbarized by their selfish life, and for enabling him to serve them in the greatest variety of situations as spokesman, as general, and as negotiator; and to him it was essentially due that, in spite of their unspeakable trials, through hostile tribes and desolate snow-ranges, 8,000 Greeks after all, by wanderings many and devious, in the end reached the coast. They fancied themselves safe when, at the beginning of March, they had reached the sea at Trapezus. But their greatest difficulties were only to begin here, where they first again came into contact with Greeks." Sparta, then supreme in Greece, feared to offend the Great King by showing any friendliness to this fugitive remnant of the unfortunate expedition of Cyrus. The gates of her cities were coldly shut against them, and they were driven to enter the service of a Thracian prince, in order to obtain subsistence. But another year found Sparta involved in war with Persia, and the surviving Cyreans, as they came to be called, were then summoned to Asia Minor for a new campaign against the enemy they hated most.—E. Curtius, *Hist. of Greece, bk. 5, ch. 3.*

ALSO IN: G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece, ch. 69–71.*—Xenophon, *Anabasis.*

B. C. 399-387.—War with Sparta.—Alliance with Athens, Thebes, Corinth and Argos.—The Peace of Antalcidas.—Recovery of Ionian cities. See GREECE: B. C. 399–387.

B. C. 366.—Intervention in Greece solicited by Thebes.—The Great King's rescript. See GREECE: B. C. 371–362.

B. C. 337-336.—Preparations for invasion by Philip of Macedonia. See GREECE: B. C. 357–336.

B. C. 334-330.—Conquest by Alexander the Great. See MACEDONIA &C.: B. C. 334–330.

B. C. 323-150.—Under the Successors of Alexander.—In the empire of the Seleucidæ. See MACEDONIA: B. C. 323–316; and SELEUCIDÆ.

B. C. 150-A. D. 226.—Embraced in the Parthian empire.—Recovery of national independence.—Rise of the Sassanian monarchy.—"About B. C. 163, an energetic [Parthian] prince, Mithridates I., commenced a series of conquests towards the West, which terminated (about B. C. 150) in the transference from the Syro-Macedonian to the Parthian rule of Media Magna, Susiana, Persia, Babylonia, and Assyria Proper. It would seem that the Persians offered no resistance to the progress of the new conqueror. . . . The treatment of the Persians by their Parthian lords seems, on the whole, to have been marked by moderation. . . . It was a principle of the Parthian governmental system to allow the subject peoples, to a large extent,

to govern themselves. These people generally, and notably the Persians, were ruled by native kings, who succeeded to the throne by hereditary right, had the full power of life and death, and ruled very much as they pleased, so long as they paid regularly the tribute imposed upon them by the 'King of Kings,' and sent him a respectable contingent when he was about to engage in a military expedition."—G. Rawlinson, *The Seventh Great Oriental Monarchy, ch.* 1.—"The formidable power of the Parthians . . . was in its turn subverted by Ardshir, or Artaxerxes, the founder of a new dynasty, which, under the name of Sassanides [see SASSANIAN DYNASTY], governed Persia till the invasion of the Arabs. This great revolution, whose fatal influence was soon experienced by the Romans, happened in the fourth year of Alexander Severus [A. D. 226]. . . . Artaxerxes had served with great reputation in the armies of Artaban, the last king of the Parthians; and it appears that he was driven into exile and rebellion by royal ingratitude, the customary reward for superior merit. His birth was obscure, and the obscurity equally gave room to the aspersions of his enemies and the flattery of his adherents. If we credit the scandal of the former, Artaxerxes sprang from the illegitimate commerce of a tanner's wife with a common soldier. The latter represents him as descended from a branch of the ancient kings of Persia. . . . As the lineal heir of the monarchy, he asserted his right to the throne, and challenged the noble task of delivering the Persians from the oppression under which they groaned above five centuries, since the death of Darius. The Parthians were defeated in three great battles. In the last of these their king Artaban was slain, and the spirit of the nation was for ever broken. The authority of Artaxerxes was solemnly acknowledged in a great assembly held at Balkh in Khorasan."—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, ch.* 8 (*v.* 1).

A. D. 226-627.—Wars with the Romans.—The revolution in Asia which subverted the Parthian empire and brought into existence a new Persian monarchy—the monarchy of the Sassanides—occurred A. D. 226. The founder of the new throne, Artaxerxes, no sooner felt firm in his seat than he sent an imposing embassy to bear to the Roman emperor—then Alexander Severus—his haughty demand that all Asia should be yielded to him and that Roman arms and Roman authority should be withdrawn to the western shores of the Ægean and the Propontis. This was the beginning of a series of wars, extending through four centuries and ending only with the Mahometan conquests which swept Roman and Persian power, alike, out of the contested field. The first campaigns of the Romans against Artaxerxes were of doubtful result. In the reign of Sapor, son of Artaxerxes, the war was renewed, with unprecedented humiliation and disaster to the Roman arms. Valerian, the emperor, was surrounded and taken prisoner, after a bloody battle fought near Edessa (A. D. 260),—remaining until his death a captive in the hands of his insolent conqueror and subjected to every indignity (see ROME: A. D. 192–284). Syria was overrun by the Persian armies, and its splendid capital, Antioch, surprised, pillaged, and savagely wrecked, while the inhabitants were mostly slain or reduced to slavery. Cilicia and Cappadocia were next devastated in like manner. Cæsarea, the Cappadocian capital, being taken after an obstinate siege, suffered pillage and unmerciful massacre. The victorious career of Sapor, which Rome failed to arrest, was checked by the rising power of Palmyra (see PALMYRA). Fifteen years later, Aurelian, who had destroyed Palmyra, was marching to attack Persia when he fell by the hands of domestic enemies and traitors. It was not until A. D. 283, in the reign of Carus, that Rome and Persia crossed swords again. Carus ravaged Mesopotamia, captured Seleucia and Ctesiphon and passed beyond the Tigris, when he met with a mysterious death and his victorious army retreated. A dozen years passed before the quarrel was taken up again, by Diocletian (see ROME: A. D. 284–305). That vigorous monarch sent one of his Cæsars—Galerius—into the field, while he stationed himself at Antioch to direct the war. In his first campaign (A. D. 297), Galerius was defeated, on the old fatal field of Carrhæ. In his second campaign (A. D. 297–298) he won a decisive victory and forced on the Persian king, Narses, a humiliating treaty, which renounced Mesopotamia, ceded five provinces beyond the Tigris, made the Araxes, or Aboras, the boundary between the two empires, and gave other advantages to the Romans. There was peace, then, for forty years, until another Sapor, grandson of Narses, had mounted the Persian throne. Constantine the Great was dead and his divided empire seemed less formidable to the neighboring power. "During the long period of the reign of Constantius [A. D. 337–361] the provinces of the East were afflicted by the calamities of the Persian war. . . . The armies of Rome and Persia encountered each other in nine bloody fields, in two of which Constantius himself commanded in person. The event of the day was most commonly adverse to the Romans." In the great battle of Singara, fought A. D. 348, the Romans were victors at first, but allowed themselves to be surprised at night, while plundering the enemy's camp, and were routed with great slaughter. Three sieges of Nisibis, in Mesopotamia—the bulwark of Roman power in the East—were among the memorable incidents of these wars. In 338, in 346, and again in 350, it repulsed the Persian king with shame and loss. Less fortunate was the city of Amida [modern Diarbekir], in Armenia, besieged by Sapor, in 359. It was taken, at the last, by storm, and the inhabitants put to the sword. On the accession of Julian, the Persian war was welcomed by the ambitious young emperor as an opportunity for emulating the glory of Alexander, after rivalling that of Cæsar in Gaul. In the early spring of 363, he led forth a great army from Antioch, and traversed the sandy plains of Mesopotamia to the Persian capital of Ctesiphon, reducing and destroying the strong cities of Perisabor and Maogamalcha on his march. Finding Ctesiphon too strong in its fortifications to encourage a siege, he crossed the Tigris, burned his fleet and advanced boldly into the hostile country beyond. It was a fatal expedition. Led astray by perfidious guides, harassed by a swarm of enemies, and scantily supplied with provisions, the Romans were soon forced to an almost desperate retreat. If Julian had lived, he might possibly have sustained the courage of his men and rescued them from their situation; but he fell, mortally wounded, in repelling one of the incessant attacks of the Persian

cavalry. An officer named Jovian was then hastily proclaimed emperor, and by his agency an ignominious treaty was arranged with the Persian king. It gave up all the conquests of Galerius, together with Nisibis, Singara and other Roman strongholds in Mesopotamia; on which hard terms the Roman army was permitted to recross the Tigris and find a refuge in regions of its own. The peace thus shamefully purchased endured for more than half-a-century. Religious fanaticism kindled war afresh, A. D. 422, between Persia and the eastern empire; but the events are little known. It seems to have resulted, practically, in the division of Armenia which gave Lesser Armenia to the Romans as a province and made the Greater Armenia, soon afterwards, a Persian satrapy, called Persarmenia. The truce which ensued was respected for eighty years. In the year 502, while Anastasius reigned at Constantinople and Kobad was king of Persia, there was a recurrence of war, which ended, however, in 505, without any territorial changes. The unhappy city of Amida was again captured in this war, after a siege of three months, and 80,000 of its inhabitants perished under the Persian swords. Preparatory to future conflicts, Anastasius now founded and Justinian afterwards strengthened the powerfully fortified city of Dara, near Nisibis. The value of the new outpost was put to the proof in 526, when hostilities again broke out. The last great Roman general, Belisarius, was in command at Dara during the first years of this war, and finally held the general command. In 529 he fought a great battle in front of Dara and won a decisive victory. The next year he suffered a defeat at Sura and in 532 the two powers arranged a treaty of peace which they vauntingly called "The Endless Peace"; but Justinian (who was now emperor) paid 11,000 pounds of gold for it. "The Endless Peace" was so quickly ended that the year 540 found the Persian king Chosroes, or Nushirvan, at the head of an army in Syria ravaging the country and despoiling the cities. Antioch, just restored by Justinian, after an earthquake which, in 526, had nearly levelled it with the ground, was stormed, pillaged, half burned, and its streets drenched with blood. The seat of war was soon transferred to the Caucasian region of Colchis, or Lazica (modern Mingrelia), and became what is known in history as the Lazic War [see LAZICA], which was protracted until 561, when Justinian consented to a treaty which pledged the empire to pay 30,000 pieces of gold annually to the Persian king, while the latter surrendered his claim to Colchis. But war broke out afresh in 572 and continued till 591, when the armies of the Romans restored to the Persian throne another Chosroes, grandson of the first, who had fled to them from a rebellion which deposed and destroyed his unworthy father. Twelve years later this Chosroes became the most formidable enemy to the empire that it had encountered in the East. In successive campaigns he stripped from it Syria and Palestine, Egypt, Cyrenaica, and the greater part of Asia Minor, even to the shores of the Bosphorus. Taking the city of Chalcedon in 616, after a lengthy siege, he established a camp and army at that post, within sight of Constantinople, and held it for ten years, insulting and threatening the imperial capital. But he found a worthy antagonist in Heraclius, who became emperor of the Roman East in 610, and who proved himself to be one of the greatest of soldiers. It was twelve years after the beginning of his reign before Heraclius could gather in hand, from the shrunken and exhausted empire, such resources as would enable him to turn aggressively upon the Persian enemy. Then, in three campaigns, between 622 and 627, he completely reversed the situation. After a decisive battle, fought December 1, A. D. 627, on the very site of ancient Nineveh, the royal city of Dastagerd was taken and spoiled, and the king, stripped of all his conquests and his glory, was a fugitive (see ROME: A. D. 565–628). A conspiracy and an assassination soon ended his career and his son made peace. It was a lasting peace, as between Romans and Persians; for eight years afterwards the Persians were in their death struggle with the warriors of Mahomet.—G. Rawlinson, *The Seventh Great Oriental Monarchy.*

ALSO IN: E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, ch.* 18, 24–25, 40, 42, 46.

A. D. 632-651.—Mahometan Conquest. See MAHOMETAN CONQUEST: A. D. 632–651.

A. D. 901-998.—The Samanide and Bouide dynasties. See SAMANIDES; and MAHOMETAN CONQUEST: A. D. 815–945.

A. D. 999-1038.—Under the Gaznevides. See TURKS: A. D. 999–1183.

A. D. 1050-1193.—Under the Seljuk Turks. See TURKS (SELJUK): 1004–1063, and after.

A. D. 1150-1250.—The period of the Atabegs. See ATABEGS.

A. D. 1193.—Conquest by the Khuarezmians. See KHUAREZM: 12TH CENTURY.

A. D. 1220-1226.—Conquest by Jingiz Khan. See MONGOLS: A. D. 1153–1227; and KHORASSAN: A. D. 1220–1221.

A. D. 1258-1393.—The Mongol empire of the Ilkhans.—Khulagu, or Houlagou, grandson of Jingis Khan, who extinguished the caliphate at Bagdad, A. D. 1258, and completed the Mongol conquest of Persia and Mesopotamia (see BAGDAD: A. D. 1258), "received the investiture of his conquests and of the country south of the Oxus. He founded an empire there, known as that of the Ilkhans. Like the Khans of the Golden Horde, the successors of Batu, they for a long time acknowledged the suzereignty of the Khakan of the Mongols in the East."—H. H. Howorth, *Hist. of the Mongols, pt.* 1, *p.* 211.—Khulagu "fixed his residence at Maragha, in Aderbijan, a beautiful town, situated on a fine plain watered by a small but pure stream, which, rising in the high mountains of Sahund, flows past the walls of the city, and empties itself in the neighbouring lake of Oormia. . . . At this delightful spot Hulakoo [or Khulagu] appears to have employed his last years in a manner worthy of a great monarch. Philosophers and astronomers were assembled from every part of his dominions, who laboured in works of science under the direction of his favourite, Nasser-u-deen." The title of the Ilkhans, given to Khulagu and his successors, signified simply the lords or chiefs (the Khans). Their empire was extinguished in 1393 by the conquests of Timour.—Sir J. Malcolm, *Hist. of Persia, ch.* 10 (*v.* 1).—"It was under Sultan Ghazan, who reigned from 1294 to 1303, that Mahometanism again became the established religion of Persia. In the second year of his reign, Ghazan Khan publicly declared his conversion to the faith of the Koran.

. . : After Sultan Ghazan the power of the Mongolian dynasty in Persia rapidly declined. The empire soon began to break in pieces. . . . The royal house became extinct, while another branch of the descendants of Hulaku established themselves at Bagdad. At last Persia became a mere scene of anarchy and confusion, utterly incapable of offering any serious resistance to the greatest of Mussulman conquerors, the invincible and merciless Timour."—E. A. Freeman, *Hist. and Conq. of the Saracens, lect.* 6.

A. D. 1386-1393.—Conquest by Timour. See TIMOUR.

A. D. 1499-1887.—The founding of the Sefavean dynasty.—Triumph of the Sheahs.—Subjugation by the Afghans.—Deliverance by Nadir Shah.—The Khajar dynasty.—"At an early period in the rise of Islamism, the followers of Mohammed became divided on the question of the succession to the caliphate, or leadership, vacated by the death of Mohammed. Some, who were in majority, believed that it lay with the descendants of the caliph, Moawiyeh, while others as firmly clung to the opinion that the succession lay with the sons of Alee and Fatimeh, the daughter of the prophet, Hassan and Houssein, and their descendants. In a desperate conflict on the banks of the Euphrates, nearly all the male descendants of the prophet were slain [see MAHOMETAN CONQUEST &c.: A. D. 680], and almost the entire Mohammedan peoples, from India to Spain, thenceforward became Sunnees—that is, they embraced belief in the succession of the line of the house of Moawiyeh, called the Ommiades. But there was an exception to this uniformity of belief. The Persians, as has been seen, were a people deeply given to religious beliefs and mystical speculations to the point of fanaticism. Without any apparent reason many of them became Sheahs [or Shiahs], or believers in the claims of the house of Alee and Fatimeh [see ISLAM]. . . . Naturally for centuries the Sheahs suffered much persecution from the Sunnees, as the rulers of Persia, until the 15th century, were generally Sunnees. But this only stimulated the burning zeal of the Sheahs, and in the end resulted in bringing about the independence of Persia under a dynasty of her own race. In the 14th century there resided at Ardebil a priest named the Sheikh Saifus, who was held in the highest repute for his holy life. He was a lineal descendant of Musa, the seventh Holy Imam. His son, Sadr-ud-Deen, not only enjoyed a similar fame for piety, but used it to such good account as to become chieftain of the province where he lived. Junaid, the grandson of Sadr-ud-Deen, had three sons, of whom the youngest, named Ismail, was born about the year 1480. When only eighteen years of age, the young Ismail entered the province of Ghilan, on the shores of the Caspian, and by the sheer force of genius raised a small army, with which he captured Baku. His success brought recruits to his standard, and at the head of 16,000 men he defeated the chieftain of Alamut, the general sent against him, and, marching on Tabreez, seized it without a blow. In 1499 Ismail, the founder of the Sefavean dynasty, was proclaimed Shah of Persia. Since that period, with the exception of the brief invasion of Mahmood the Afghan, Persia has been an independent and at times a very powerful nation. The establishment of the Sefavean dynasty also brought about the existence of a Sheah government, and gave great strength to that sect of the Mohammedans, between whom and other Islamites there was always great bitterness and much bloodshed. Ismail speedily carried his sway as far as the Tigris in the southwest and to Kharism and Candahar in the north and east. He lost one great battle with the Turks under Selim II. at Tabreez [or Chaldiran—see TURKS: A. D. 1481–1520], but with honor, as the Persians were outnumbered; but it is said he was so cast down by that event he never was seen to smile again. He died in 1524, leaving the record of a glorious reign. His three immediate successors, Tahmasp, Ismail II., and Mohammed Khudabenda, did little to sustain the fame and power of their country, and the new empire must soon have yielded to the attacks of its enemies at home and abroad, if a prince of extraordinary ability had not succeeded to the throne when the new dynasty seemed on the verge of ruin. Shah Abbass, called the Great, was crowned in the year 1586, and died in 1628, at the age of seventy, after a reign of forty-two years [see TURKS: A. D. 1623–1640]. This monarch was one of the greatest sovereigns who ever sat on the throne of Persia. . . . It was the misfortune of Persia that the Sefavean line rapidly degenerated after the death of Shah Abbass. . . . Taking advantage of the low state of the Sefavean dynasty, Mahmood, an Afghan chieftain, invaded Persia in 1722 with an army of 50,000 men. Such was the condition of the empire that he had little difficulty in capturing Ispahan, although it had a population of 600,000. He slaughtered every male member of the royal family except Houssein the weak sovereign, his son Tahmasp, and two grandchildren; all the artists of Ispahan and scores of thousands besides were slain. That magnificent capital has never recovered from the blow. Mahmood died in 1725, and was succeeded by his cousin Ashraf. But the brief rule of the Afghans terminated in 1727. Nadir Kuli, a Persian soldier of fortune, or in other words a brigand of extraordinary ability, joined Tahmasp II., who had escaped and collected a small force in the north of Persia. Nadir marched on Ispahan and defeated the Afghans in several battles; Ashraf was slain and Tahmasp II. was crowned. But Nadir dethroned Tahmasp II. in 1732, being a man of vast ambition as well as desire to increase the renown of Persia; and he caused that unfortunate sovereign to be made way with some years later. Soon after Nadir Kuli proclaimed himself king of Persia with the title of Nadir Kuli Khan. Nadir was a man of ability equal to his ambition. He not only beat the Turks with comparative ease, but he organized an expedition that conquered Afghanistan and proceeded eastward until Delhi fell into his hands, with immense slaughter [see INDIA: A. D. 1662–1748]. . . . He was assassinated in 1747. Nadir Kuli Khan was a man of great genius, but he died too soon to establish an enduring dynasty, and after his death civil wars rapidly succeeded each other until the rise of the present or Khajar dynasty, which succeeded the reign of the good Kerim Khan the Zend, who reigned twenty years at Shiraz. Aga Mohammed Khan, the founder of the Khajar dynasty, succeeded in 1794 in crushing the last pretender to the throne, after a terrible civil war, and once more

reunited the provinces of Persia under one sceptre. . . . Aga Mohammed Khan was succeeded, after his assassination, by his nephew Feth Alee Shah, a monarch of good disposition and some ability. It was his misfortune to be drawn into two wars with Russia, who stripped Persia of her Circassian provinces, notwithstanding the stout resistance made by the Persian armies. Feth Alee Shah was succeeded by his grandson Mohammed Shah, a sovereign of moderate talents. No events of unusual interest mark his reign, excepting the siege of Herat which was captured in the present reign from the Afghans. He died in 1848, and was succeeded by his son Nasr-ed-Deen Shah, the present [1887] sovereign of Persia."—S. G. W. Benjamin, *The Story of Persia, ch.* 20.

Also in: C. R. Markham, *General Sketch of the Hist. of Persia, ch.* 10–20.—Sir J. Malcolm, *Hist. of Persia, ch.* 12–20 (*v.* 1–2).—R. G. Watson, *Hist. of Persia*, 1800–1858.

A. D. 1894.—The reigning Shah.—Nasr-ed-Deen is still, in 1894, the reigning sovereign. He is blessed with a family of four sons and fifteen daughters.

PERSIAN SIBYL. See Sibyls.

PERSIANS, Education of the ancient. See Education, Ancient.

PERSONAL LIBERTY LAWS. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1860 (December) President Buchanan's surrender.

PERTH: A. D. 1559.—The Reformation Riot. See Scotland: A. D. 1558–1560.

A. D. 1715.—Headquarters of the Jacobite Rebellion. See Scotland: A. D. 1715.

PERTH, The Five Articles of. See Scotland: A. D. 1618.

PERTINAX, Roman Emperor, A. D. 193.

PERU: Origin of the name. — "There was a chief in the territory to the south of the Gulf of San Miguel, on the Pacific coast, named Biru, and this country was visited by Gaspar de Morales and Francisco Pizarro in 1515. For the next ten years Biru was the most southern land known to the Spaniards; and the consequence was that the unknown regions farther south, including the rumored empire abounding in gold, came to be designated as Biru, or Peru. It was thus that the land of the Yncas got the name of Peru from the Spaniards, some years before it was actually discovered."—C. R. Markham, *Narrative and Critical Hist. of Am., v.* 2, *ch.* 8.

Also in: A. Helps, *Spanish Conquest in America, bk.* 6, *ch.* 2.

The aboriginal inhabitants and their civilization.—The extraordinary paternal despotism of the Incas.—"The bulk of the population [of Peru] is composed of the aboriginal Indians, the natives who had been there from time immemorial when America was discovered. The central tribe of these Indians was that of the Yncas, inhabiting the region in the Sierra which has already been described as the Cuzco section. Such a country was well adapted for the cradle of an imperial tribe. . . . The Ynca race was originally divided into six tribes, whose lands are indicated by the rivers which formed their limits. Of these tribes the Yncas themselves had their original seat between the rivers Apurimac and Paucartampu, with the lovely valley of the Vilcamayu bisecting it. The Canas dwelt in the upper part of that valley up to the Vilcañota Pass, and on the mountains on either side. The Quichuas were in the valleys round the head waters of the Apurimac and Abancay. The Chancas extended from the neighbourhood of Ayacucho (Guamanga) to the Apurimac. The Huancas occupied the valley of the Xauxa up to the saddle of the Cerro Pasco, and the Rucanas were in the mountainous region between the central and western cordilleras. These six tribes eventually formed the conquering Ynca race. Their language was introduced into every conquered province, and was carefully taught to the people, so that the Spaniards correctly called it the 'Lengua General' of Peru. This language was called Quichua, after the tribe inhabiting the upper part of the valleys of the Pachachaca and Apurimac. Their territory consisted chiefly of uplands covered with long grass, and the name has been derived from the abundance of straw in this region. 'Quehuani' is to twist; 'quehuasca' is the participle; and 'ychu' is straw. Together, 'Quehuasca-Ychu,' or twisted straw, abbreviated into Quichua. The name was given to the language by Friar San Tomas in his grammar published in 1560, who perhaps first collected words among the Quichuas and so gave it their name, which was adopted by all subsequent grammarians. But the proper name would have been the Ynca language. The aboriginal people in the basin of Lake Titicaca were called Collas, and they spoke a language which is closely allied to the Quichua. . . . The Collas were conquered by the Yncas in very remote times, and their language, now incorrectly called Aymara, received many Quichua additions; for it originally contained few words to express abstract ideas, and none for many things which are indispensable in the first beginnings of civilized life. One branch of the Collas (now called Aymaras) was a savage tribe inhabiting the shores and islands of Lake Titicaca, called Urus. . . . The Ynca and Colla (Aymara) tribes eventually combined to form the great armies which spread the rule of Ynca sovereigns over a much larger extent of country. . . . In the happy days of the Yncas they cultivated many of the arts, and had some practical knowledge of astronomy. They had domesticated all the animals in their country capable of domestication, understood mining and the working of metals, excelled as masons, weavers, dyers, and potters, and were good farmers. They brought the science of administration to a high pitch of perfection, and composed imaginative songs and dramas of considerable merit. . . . The coast of Peru was inhabited by a people entirely different from the Indians of the Sierra. There are some slight indications of the aborigines having been a diminutive race of fishermen who were driven out by the more civilized people, called Yuncas. . . . The Yncas conquered the coast valleys about a century before the discovery of America, and the Spaniards completed the destruction of the Yunca people."—C. R. Markham, *Peru, ch.* 3.—"In the minuter mechanical arts, both [the Aztecs of Mexico and the Incas of Peru] showed considerable skill; but in the construction of important public works, of roads, aqueducts, canals, and in agriculture in all its details, the Peruvians were much superior.

Strange that they should have fallen so far below their rivals in their efforts after a higher intellectual culture, in astronomical science, more especially, and in the art of communicating thought by visible symbols. . . . We shall look in vain in the history of the East for a parallel to the absolute control exercised by the Incas over their subjects. . . . It was a theocracy more potent in its operation than that of the Jews; for, though the sanction of the law might be as great among the latter, the law was expounded by a human lawgiver, the servant and representative of Divinity. But the Inca was both the lawgiver and the law. He was not merely the representative of Divinity, or, like the Pope, its vicegerent, but he was Divinity itself. The violation of his ordinance was sacrilege. Never was there a scheme of government enforced by such terrible sanctions, or which bore so oppressively on the subjects of it. For it reached not only to the visible acts, but to the private conduct, the words, the very thoughts of its vassals. . . . Under this extraordinary polity, a people advanced in many of the social refinements, well skilled in manufactures and agriculture, were unacquainted . . . with money. They had nothing that deserved to be called property. They could follow no craft, could engage in no labor, no amusement, but such as was specially provided by law. They could not change their residence or their dress without a license from the government. They could not even exercise the freedom which is conceded to the most abject in other countries, that of selecting their own wives. The imperative spirit of despotism would not allow them to be happy or miserable in any way but that established by law. The power of free agency — the inestimable and inborn right of every human being — was annihilated in Peru."—W. H. Prescott, *Hist. of the Conquest of Peru, bk.* 1, *ch.* 5 (*v.* 1).

Also in: *The Standard Natural Hist.* (*J. S. Kingsley, ed.*), *v.* 6, *pp.* 215–226.—J. Fiske, *The Discovery of America, ch.* 9 (*v.* 2).—E. J. Payne, *Hist. of the New World called America, bk.* 2 (*v.* 1).—See, also, American Aborigines, Andesians.

The empire of the Incas.—"The Inca empire had attained its greatest extension and power precisely at the period of the discovery by Columbus, under the reign of Huayna Capac, who, rather than Huascar or Atahualpa, should be called the last of the Incas. His father, the Inca Tupac Yupanqui, had pushed his conquests on the south, beyond the great desert of Atacama, to the river Maule in Chili; while, at the same time, Huayna Capac himself had reduced the powerful and refined kingdom of the Sciris of Quito [see Ecuador], on the north. From their great dominating central plateau, the Incas had pressed down to the Pacific, on the one hand, and to the dense forests of the Amazonian valleys on the other. Throughout this wide region and over all its nations, principalities, and tribes, Huayna Capac at the beginning of the 16th century ruled supreme. His empire extended from four degrees above the equator to the 34th southern parallel of latitude, a distance of not far from 3,000 miles; while from east to west it spread, with varying width, from the Pacific to the valleys of Paucartambo and Chuquisaca, an average distance of not far from 400 miles, covering an area, therefore, of more than one million square miles, equal to about one-third of the total area of the United States, or to the whole of the United States to the eastward of the Mississippi River. . . . In the islands of Lake Titicaca, if tradition be our guide, were developed the germs of Inca civilization. Thence, it is said, went the founders of the Inca dynasty, past the high divide between the waters flowing into the lake and those falling into the Amazon, and skirting the valley of the river Vilcanota for more than 200 miles, they established their seat in the bolson [valley] of Cuzco. . . . It is not only central in position, salubrious and productive, but the barriers which separate it from the neighboring valleys are relatively low, with passes which may be traversed with comparative ease; while they are, at the same time, readily defensible. The rule of the first Inca seems not to have extended beyond this valley, and the passes leading into it are strongly fortified, showing the direction whence hostilities were anticipated in the early days of the empire, before the chiefs of Cuzco began their career of conquest and aggregation, reducing the people of the bolson of Anta in the north, and that of Urcos in the south. . . . The survey of the monuments of Peru brings the conviction that the ancient population was not nearly so numerous as the accounts of the chroniclers would lead us to suppose. From what I have said, it will be clear that but a small portion of the country is inhabitable, or capable of supporting a considerable number of people. The rich and productive valleys and bolsones are hardly more than specks on the map; and although there is every evidence that their capacities of production were taxed to the very utmost, still their capacities were limited. The ancient inhabitants built their dwellings among rough rocks, on arid slopes of hills, and walled up their dead in caves and clefts, or buried them among irreclaimable sands, in order to utilize the scanty cultivable soil for agriculture. They excavated great areas in the deserts until they reached moisture enough to support vegetation, and then brought guano from the islands to fertilize these sunken gardens. They terraced up every hill and mountain-side, and gathered the soil from the crevices of the rocks to fill the narrow platforms, until not a foot of surface, on which could grow a single stalk of maize or a single handful of quinoa, was left unimproved. China, perhaps Japan and some portions of India, may afford a parallel to the extreme utilization of the soil which was effected in Peru at the time of the Inca Empire. No doubt the Indian population lived, as it still lives, on the scantiest fare, on the very minimum of food; but it had not then, as now, the ox, the hog, the goat, and the sheep, nor yet many of the grains and fruits which contribute most to the support of dense populations. . . . The present population of the three states which were wholly or in part included in the Inca Empire — namely, Equador, Peru and Bolivia — does not exceed five millions. I think it would be safe to estimate the population under the Inca rule at about double that number, or perhaps somewhere between ten and twelve millions; notwithstanding Las Casas, the good, but not very accurate, Bishop of Chiapa tells us that, 'in the Province of Peru alone the Spaniards killed above forty millions of people.'"—E. G. Squier, *Peru, ch.* 1.

A. D. 1527-1528.—Discovery by the Spaniards. See America: A. D. 1524–1528.

A. D. 1528-1531.—The commission and the preparations of Pizarro.—"In the spring of 1528, Pizarro and one of his comrades, taking with them some natives of Peru and some products of that country, set out [from Panama] to tell their tale at the court of Castile. Pizarro . . . found the Emperor Charles V. at Toledo, and met with a gracious reception. . . . His tales of the wealth which he had witnessed were the more readily believed in consequence of the experiences of another Spaniard whom he now met at court, the famous conqueror of Mexico. Yet affairs in Spain progressed with proverbial slowness, and it was not until the expiry of a year from the date of his arrival in the country that the capitulation was signed defining the powers of Pizarro. By this agreement he was granted the right of discovery and conquest in Peru, or New Castile, with the titles of Captain-general of the province and Adelantado, or lieutenant-governor. He was likewise to enjoy a considerable salary, and to have the right to erect certain fortresses under his government, and, in short, to exercise the prerogatives of a viceroy. Almagro was merely appointed commander of the fortress of Tumbez, with the rank of Hidalgo; whilst Father Luque became bishop of the same place. . . . Pizarro, on his part, was bound to raise within six months a force of 250 men; whilst the government on theirs engaged to furnish some assistance in the purchase of artillery and stores." Thus commissioned, Pizarro left Seville in January, 1530, hastening back to Panama, accompanied or followed by four half-brothers, who were destined to stormy careers in Peru. Naturally, his comrade and partner Almagro was ill pleased with the provision made for him, and the partnership came near to wreck; but some sort of reconciliation was brought about, and the two adventurers joined hands again in preparations for a second visit to Peru, with intentions boding evil to the unhappy natives of that too bountiful land. It was early in January 1531 that Pizarro sailed southward from the Isthmus for the third and last time.—R. G. Watson, *Spanish and Portuguese South Am.*, *v.* 1, *ch.* 6–7.

A. D. 1531-1533.—Pizarro's conquest.—Treacherous murder of Atahualpa.—"Pizarro sailed from Panama on the 28th of December, 1531, with three small vessels carrying one hundred and eighty-three men and thirty-seven horses. In thirteen days he arrived at the bay of San Mateo, where he landed the horses and soldiers to march along the shore, sending back the ships to get more men and horses at Panama and Nicaragua. They returned with twenty-six horses and thirty more men. With this force Pizarro continued his march along the sea-coast, which was well peopled; and on arriving at the bay of Guayaquil, he crossed over in the ships to the island of Puna. Here a devastating war was waged with the unfortunate natives, and from Puna the conqueror proceeded again in his ships to the Peruvian town of Tumbez. The country was in a state of confusion, owing to a long and desolating war of succession between Huascar and Atahualpa, the two sons of the great Ynca Huayna Capac, and was thus an easy prey to the invaders. Huascar had been defeated and made prisoner by the generals of his brother, and Atahualpa was on his way from Quito to Cusco, the capital of the empire, to enjoy the fruits of his victory. He was reported to be at Caxamarca, on the eastern side of the mountain; and Pizarro, with his small force, set out from Tumbez on the 18th of May, 1532. . . . The first part of Pizarro's march was southward from Tumbez, in the rainless coast region. After crossing a vast desert he came to Tangarara, in the fertile valleys of the Chira, where he founded the city of San Miguel, the site of which was afterwards removed to the valley of Piura. The accountant Antonio Navarro and the royal treasurer Riquelme were left in command at San Miguel, and Pizarro resumed his march in search of the Ynca Atahualpa on the 24th of September, 1532. He detached the gallant cavalier, Hernando de Soto, into the sierra of Huancabamba, to reconnoitre, and pacify the country. De Soto rejoined the main body after an absence of about ten days. The brother of Atahualpa, named Titu Atauchi, arrived as an envoy, with presents, and a message to the effect that the Ynca desired friendship with the strangers. Crossing the vast desert of Sechura, Pizarro reached the fertile valley of Motupe, and marched thence to the foot of the cordilleras in the valley of the Jequetepeque. Here he rested for a day or two, to arrange the order for the ascent. He took with him forty horses and sixty foot, instructing Hernando de Soto to follow him with the main body and the baggage. News arrived that the Ynca Atahualpa had reached the neighborhood of Caxamarca about three days before, and that he desired peace. Pizarro pressed forward, crossed the cordillera, and on Friday, the 15th of November, 1532, he entered Caxamarca with his whole force. Here he found excellent accommodation in the large masonry buildings, and was well satisfied with the strategic position. Atahualpa was established in a large camp outside, where Hernando de Soto had an interview with him. Atahualpa announced his intention of visiting the Christian commander, and Pizarro arranged and perpetrated a black act of treachery. He kept all his men under arms. The Ynca, suspecting nothing, came into the great square of Cusco in grand regal procession. He was suddenly attacked and made prisoner, and his people were massacred. The Ynca offered a ransom, which he described as gold enough to fill a room twenty-two feet long and seventeen wide, to a height equal to a man's stature and a half. He undertook to do this in two months, and sent orders for the collection of golden vases and ornaments in all parts of the empire. Soon the treasure began to arrive, while Atahualpa was deceived by false promises, and he beguiled his captivity by acquiring Spanish and learning to play at chess and cards. Meanwhile Pizarro sent an expedition under his brother Hernando, to visit the famous temple of Pachacamac on the coast; and three soldiers were also despatched to Cusco, the capital of the empire, to hurry forward the treasure. They set out in February, 1533, but behaved with so much imprudence and insolence at Cusco as to endanger their own lives and the success of their mission. Pizarro therefore ordered two officers of distinction, Hernando de Soto and Pedro del Barco, to follow them and remedy the mischief which they were doing. On Easter eve, being the 14th of April, 1533, Almagro arrived at Caxamarca with a reinforcement of 150 Spaniards and 84 horses. On the 3rd of May it was ordered

that the gold already arrived should be melted down for distribution; but another large instalment came on the 14th of June. An immense quantity consisted of slabs, with holes at the corners, which had been torn off the walls of temples and palaces; and there were vessels and ornaments of all shapes and sizes. After the royal fifth had been deducted, the rest was divided among the conquerors. The total sum of 4,605,670 ducats would be equal to about £3,500,000 of modern money. After the partition of the treasure, the murder of the Ynca was seriously proposed as a measure of good policy. The crime was committed by order of Pizarro, and with the concurrence of Almagro and the friar Valverde. It was expected that the sovereign's death would be followed by the dispersion of his army, and the submission of the people. This judicial murder was committed in the square of Caxamarca on the 29th of August, 1533. Hernando de Soto was absent at the time, and on his return he expressed the warmest indignation. Several other honorable cavaliers protested against the execution. Their names are even more worthy of being remembered than those of the heroic sixteen who crossed the line on the sea-shore at Gallo."—C. R. Markham, *Pizarro and the Conquest and Settlement of Peru and Chili* (*Narrative and Critical Hist. of Am., v.* 2, *ch.* 8).

Also in: W. H. Prescott, *Hist. of the Conquest of Peru, bk.* 3, *ch.* 1–8 (*v.* 1).—J. Fiske, *The Discovery of America, ch.* 10 (*v.* 2).

A. D. 1533-1548.—The fighting of the Spanish conquerors over the spoils.—"The feud between the Pizarros and the Almagros, which forms the next great series of events in American history, is one of the most memorable quarrels in the world. . . . This dire contest in America destroyed almost every person of any note who came within its influence, desolated the country where it originated, prevented the growth of colonization, and changed for the worse the whole course of legislation for the Spanish colonies. Its effects were distinctly visible for a century afterward. . . . There were no signs, however, of the depth and fatality of this feud between the Pizarros and Almagros at the period immediately succeeding the execution of Atahuallpa. That act of injustice having been perpetrated, Pizarro gave the royal borla [a peculiar head-dress worn by the reigning Incas, described as a tassel of fine crimson wool] to a brother of the late Inca [who died two months later, of shame and rage at his helpless position], and set out from Cassamarca on his way to Cusco. It was now time to extend his conquests and to make himself master of the chief city in Peru." After a slight resistance, the Spaniards entered "the great and holy city of Cusco," the capital of the Incas, on the 15th of November, 1533. According to the Spanish descriptions it was a remarkable city, constructed with great regularity, having paved streets, with a stone conduit of water running through the middle of each, with grand squares and many splendid palaces and temples. "In Cusco and its environs, including the whole valley which could be seen from the top of the tower, it is said that there were 'a hundred thousand' houses. Among these were shops, and store-houses, and places for the reception of tribute. . . . The great Temple of the Sun had, before the Spaniards rifled Cusco, been a building of singular gorgeousness. The interior was plated with gold; and on each side of the central image of the Sun were ranged the embalmed bodies of the Incas, sitting upon their golden thrones raised upon pedestals of gold. All round the outside of the building, at the top of the walls, ran a coronal of gold about three feet in depth." For three years the Spaniards held undisturbed possession of Cusco, reducing it to the forms of a Spanish municipality, converting the great Temple of the Sun into a Dominican monastery and turning many palaces into cathedrals and churches. In the meantime, Fernando Pizarro, one of the four brothers of the conqueror, returned from his mission to Spain, whither he had been sent with full accounts of the conquest and with the king's fifth of its spoils. He brought back the title of Marquis for Francisco, and a governor's commission, the province placed under him to be called New Castile. For Pizarro's associate and partner, Almagro, there was also a governorship, but it was one which remained to be conquered. He was authorized to take possession and govern a province, which should be called New Toledo, beginning at the southern boundary of Pizarro's government and extending southward 200 leagues. This was the beginning of quarrels, which Pizarro's brothers were accused of embittering by their insolence. Almagro claimed Cusco, as lying within the limits of his province. Pizarro was engaged in founding a new capital city near the coast, which he began to build in 1535, calling it Los Reyes, but which afterwards received the name of Lima; he would not, however, give up Cusco. The dispute was adjusted in the end, and Almagro set out for the conquest of his province (Chile), much of which had formed part of the dominions of the Inca, and for the subduing of which he commanded the aid of a large army of Peruvians, under two chiefs of the royal family. A few months after this, in the spring of 1536, the nominally reigning Inca, Manco, escaped from his Spanish masters at Cusco, into the mountains, and organized a furious and formidable rising, which brought the Spaniards, both at Cusco and Los Reyes, into great peril, for many months. Before the revolt had been overcome, Almagro returned, unsuccessful and disappointed, from his expedition into Chile, and freshly determined to assert and enforce his claim to Cusco. It is said that he endeavored, at first, to make common cause with the Inca Manco; but his overtures were rejected. He then attacked the Inca and defeated him; marched rapidly on Cusco, arriving before the city April 18, 1537; surprised the garrison while negotiations were going on and gained full possession of the town. Fernando and Gonzalo, two brothers of the Marquis Pizarro, were placed in prison. The latter sent a force of 500 men, under his lieutenant, Alvarado, against the intruder; but Alvarado was encountered on the way and badly beaten. In November there was a meeting brought about, between Pizarro and Almagro, in the hope of some compromise, but they parted from it in sharper enmity than before. Meantime, the younger Pizarro had escaped from his captivity at Cusco, and Fernando had been released. In the spring of 1538 Fernando led an army against the Almagristas, defeated them (April 6, 1538) in a desperate battle near Cusco and entered the city in triumph. Almagro

was taken prisoner, subjected to a formal trial, condemned and executed. The Pizarros were now completely masters of the country and maintained their domination for a few years, extending the Spanish conquests into Chile under Pedro de Valdivia, and exploring and occupying other regions. But in 1541, old hatreds and fresh discontents came to a head in a plot which bore fruit in the assassination of the governor, the Marquis Pizarro, now past 70 years of age. A young half-caste son of old Almagro was installed in the governorship by the conspirators, and when, the next year, a new royally commissioned governor, Vaca de Castro, arrived from Spain, young Almagro was mad enough to resist him. His rebellion was overcome speedily and he suffered death. Vaca de Castro was superseded in 1544 by a viceroy, Blasco Nuñez Vela, sent out by the emperor, Charles V., to enforce the "New Laws," lately framed in Spain, under the influence of Las Casas, to protect the natives, by a gradual abolition of the "repartimientos" and "encomiendas." A rebellion occurred, in which Gonzalo Pizarro took the lead, and the Spanish government was forced to annul the "New Laws." Pizarro, however, still refused to submit, and was only overcome after a civil war of two years, which ended in his defeat and death. This closed the turbulent career of the Pizarro brothers in Peru; but the country did not settle into peace until after some years.—Sir A. Helps, *The Spanish Conquest in Am., bk.* 17–18 (*v.* 4).

Also in: W. H. Prescott, *Hist. of the Conquest of Peru.*

A. D. 1539-1541.—Gonzalo Pizarro's expedition to the head waters of the Amazon and Orellana's voyage down the great river. See Amazons River.

A. D. 1550-1816.—Under the Spanish Viceroys.—"When the President la Gasca had conquered Gonsalo Pizarro and returned to Spain, a peaceful viceroy arrived in Peru, sprung from one of the noblest families of the peninsula. This was Don Antonio de Mendoza. . . . Don Antonio died in 1551, after a very brief enjoyment of his power; but from this date, during the whole period of the rule of kings of the Austrian House, the Peruvian Viceroyalty was always filled by members of the greatest families of Spain. . . . At an immense distance from the mother country, and ruling at one time nearly the whole of South America, including the present republics of Venezuela, New Granada, Ecuador, Peru, Chilé, Bolivia, and La Plata, the court of the Viceroys was surrounded by regal pomp and magnificence. . . . The archbishop of Lima ranked next to the viceroy, and filled his post during his absence from the capital. . . . It was not long after the conquest before the inquisition, that fearful engine of the despotic power of Spain, was established in Peru. . . . The Indians were exempted from its jurisdiction in theory, but whether, in practice, this unfortunate and persecuted people always escaped may be considered as doubtful. It was only in the beginning of the present century, and shortly before the commencement of the war of independence, that this fearful tribunal was abolished." Under the senseless government of Philip II. the seeds of decay and ruin were planted in every part of the Spanish empire. "Though receiving from the silver mines of Peru and Mexico the largest revenue of any sovereign in Europe, his coffers were always empty, and of $35,000,000 received from America in 1595, not one rial remained in Spain in 1596. . . . Then followed the reigns of his worthless descendants and their profligate ministers; and fast and heedlessly did they drive this unfortunate country on the high road to ruin and poverty. On the establishment of the Bourbon kings of Spain in 1714, a more enlightened policy began to show itself in the various measures of government; and the trade to the colonies, which had hitherto been confined by the strictest monopoly, was slightly opened. At this time, the commerce of Peru and Mexico was carried on by what was called the 'flota,' consisting of three men-of-war and about fifteen merchant-vessels, of from 400 to 1,000 tons. Every kind of manufactured article of merchandise was embarked on board this fleet, so that all the trading ports of Europe were interested in its cargo, and Spain itself sent out little more than wines and brandy. The flota sailed from Cadiz, and was not allowed to break bulk on any account during the voyage. Arriving at Vera Cruz, it took in, for the return voyage, cargoes of silver, cocoa, indigo, cochineal, tobacco, and sugar; and sailed to the rendezvous at Havannah, where it awaited the galleons from Porto Bello, with all the riches of Peru. The galleons were vessels of about 500 tons; and an immense fair, which collected merchants from all parts of South America, was commenced at Porto Bello on their arrival." About the middle of the 18th century, "a marked change appears to have come over the colonial policy of Spain; and the enlightened government of the good Count Florida Blanca, who was prime minister for 20 years, introduced a few attempts at administrative reform, not before they were needed, into the colonial government. The enormous viceroyalty of Peru, long found to be too large for a single command, was divided; and viceroys were appointed in La Plata and New Granada, while another royal audience was established at Quito. The haughty grandees of Spain also ceased to come out to Peru; and in their places practical men, who had done good service as captains-general of Chilé, were appointed viceroys, such as Don Manuel Amat, in 1761, and Don Agustin Jaurequi, in 1780. At last, Don Ambrosio O'Higgins, whose father was a poor Irish adventurer, who kept a little retail shop in the square at Lima, became viceroy of Peru, and was created Marquis of Osorno. . . . His son, the famous General O'Higgins, was one of the liberators of Chilé. O'Higgins was followed in the viceroyalty by the Marquis of Aviles, and in 1806, Don José Abascal, an excellent ruler, assumed the reins of government. . . . But the rule of Spain was drawing to a close. The successor of Abascal, General Pezuela, was the last viceroy who peacefully succeeded. . . . Many things had tended to prepare the minds of the Creole population for revolt. The partial opening of foreign trade by Florida Blanca; the knowledge of their own enslaved condition, obtained through the medium of their increasing intercourse with independent states; and, finally, the invasion of the mother country by Napoleon's armies, brought popular excitement in South America to such a height that it required but a spark to ignite the inflammable materials."—C. R. Mark-

ham, *Cuzco, and Lima, ch.* 9.—The natives of Spanish descent had received heroic examples of revolt from the Inca Peruvians. "In November, 1780, a chief named Tupac Amaru rose in rebellion. His original object was to obtain guarantees for the due observance of the laws and their just administration. But when his moderate demands were only answered by cruel taunts and brutal menaces, he saw that independence or death were the only alternatives. He was a descendant of the ancient sovereigns, and he was proclaimed Ynca of Peru. A vast army joined him, as if by magic, and the Spanish dominion was shaken to its foundations. The insurrection all but succeeded, and a doubtful war was maintained for two years and a half. It lasted until July, 1783, and the cruelties which followed its suppression were due to the cowardly terror of panic-stricken tyrants. Tupac Amaru did not suffer in vain. . . . From the cruel death of the Ynca date the feelings which resulted in the independence of Peru. In 1814, another native chief, named Pumacagua, raised the cry of independence at Cuzco, and the sons of those who fell with Tupac Amaru flocked in thousands to his standard. The patriot army entered Arequipa in triumph, and was joined by many Spanish Americans, including the enthusiastic young poet, Melgar. Untrained valor succumbed to discipline, and in March, 1815, the insurrection was stamped out, but with less cruelty than disgraced the Spanish name in 1783."—The same, *Peru, p.* 150.

A. D. 1579.—The piracies of Drake. See AMERICA: A. D. 1572–1580.

A. D. 1776.—Separation of the viceroyalty of Buenos Ayres. See ARGENTINE REPUBLIC: A. D. 1580–1777.

A. D. 1820-1826.—The Struggle for Independence.—Help from Chile and Colombia.—San Martin and Bolivar, the Liberators.—The decisive battle of Ayacucho.—"The great struggle for independence in the Spanish provinces of South America had been elsewhere, for the most part, crowned with success before Peru became the theatre for important action. Here the Spaniards maintained possession of their last stronghold upon the continent, and, but for assistance from the neighbouring independent provinces, there would hardly have appeared a prospect of overthrowing the viceroyal government. . . . In the month of August, 1820, independence having been established in Chili [see CHILE: A. D. 1810–1818], an army of between 4,000 and 5,000 men was assembled at Valparaiso for the purpose of breaking up the royalist strongholds of Peru, and of freeing that province from the dominion of Spain. The command was held by General Jose de San Martin, the emancipator of Chili, to whose exertions the expedition was mainly attributable. Such vessels of war as could be procured were fitted out and placed under command of Lord Cochrane. In the month following, the whole force was landed and quartered at Pisco, on the Peruvian coast, without opposition from the royalist forces, which retreated to Lima, about 100 miles northward. An attempt at negotiation having failed, the army of invasion was again in motion in the month of October. The naval force anchored off Callao, where, on the night of November 5th, Lord Cochrane [afterwards Lord Dundonald], commanding in person, succeeded in cutting out and capturing the Spanish frigate Esmerelda, which lay under the protection of the guns of the fort, and in company with a number of smaller armed vessels. This exploit is considered as one of the most brilliant achievements of the kind on record. The main body of the Chilian troops was transported to Huara, about 75 miles north of the capital. . . . As San Martin, after some months' delay at Huara, advanced upon Lima, the city was thrown into the utmost confusion. The Spanish authorities found it necessary to evacuate the place. . . . The general [San Martin] entered the city on the 12th of July, 1821, unaccompanied by his army, and experienced little difficulty in satisfying the terrified inhabitants as to his good faith and the honesty of his intentions. All went on prosperously for the cause, and on the 28th the independence of Peru was formally proclaimed, amid the greatest exhibition of enthusiasm on the part of the populace. On the 3d of the ensuing month San Martin assumed the title of Protector of Peru. No important military movements took place during a considerable subsequent period. The fortress at Callao remained in possession of the royalists" until the 21st of September, when it capitulated. "The independent army remained at Lima, for the most part unemployed, during a number of months subsequent to these events, and their presence began to be felt as a burden by the inhabitants. In April, 1822, a severe reverse was felt in the surprise and capture, by Canterac [the viceroy], of a very considerable body of the revolutionary forces, at Ica. . . . An interview took place in the month of July, of this year [1821], between the Protector and the great champion of freedom in South America, Bolivar, then in the full pride of success in the northern provinces. The result of the meeting was the augmentation of the force at Lima by 2,000 Columbian troops. During San Martin's absence the tyranny of his minister, Monteagudo, who made the deputy protector, the Marquis of Truxillo, a mere tool for the execution of his private projects, excited an outbreak, which was only quelled by the arrest and removal of the offending party. In the succeeding month the first independent congress was assembled at the capital, and San Martin, having resigned his authority, soon after took his departure for Chili. Congress appointed a junta of three persons to discharge the duties of the executive. Under this administration the affairs of the new republic fell into great disorder." In June, 1823, the Spanish viceroy regained possession of Lima, but withdrew his troops from it again a month later. Nevertheless, "all hopes of success in the enterprise of the revolution now seemed to rest upon the arrival of foreign assistance, and this was fortunately at hand. Simon Bolivar, the liberator of Venezuela, and the most distinguished of the champions of freedom in South America, had so far reduced the affairs of the recently constituted northern states [see COLOMBIAN STATES: A. D. 1810–1819; and 1819–1830] to order and security, that he was enabled to turn his attention to the distressed condition of the Peruvian patriots. He proceeded at once to the scene of action, and entered Lima on the 1st of September, 1823. . . . He was received with great rejoicing, and was at once invested with supreme power, both civil and military. . . . In February, 1824, an insurrection of the garrison at Callao resulted

in the recapture of this important stronghold by the Spaniards, and a few weeks later the capital shared the same fate. The revolutionary congress broke up, after declaring its own dissolution and the confirmation of Bolivar's authority as supreme dictator. This gloomy state of affairs only served to call forth the full energies of the great general. He had under his command about 10,000 troops, the majority of whom were Columbians, stationed near Patavilca. The available forces of the royalists were at this period numerically far superior to those of the patriots." An action which did not become general took place on the plains of Junin, but no decisive engagement occurred until the 9th of December, 1824, "when the decisive battle of Ayacucho, one of the most remarkable in its details and important in its results ever fought in South America, gave a deathblow to Spanish power in Peru. The attack was commenced by the royalists, under command of the viceroy. Their numbers very considerably exceeded those of the patriots, being set down at over 9,000, while those of the latter fell short of 6,000. . . . After a single hour's hard fighting, the assailants were routed and driven back to the heights of Condorcanqui, where, previous to the battle, they had taken a position. Their loss was 1,400 in killed and 700 wounded. The patriots lost in killed and wounded a little less than 1,000." Before the day closed, Canterac, the viceroy, entered the patriot camp and arranged the terms of a capitulation with General Sucre — who had commanded in the battle and won its honors, Bolivar not being present. "His whole remaining army became prisoners of war, and by the terms of the capitulation all the Spanish forces in Peru were also bound to surrender." A strong body of Spanish troops held out, however, in Upper Peru (afterwards Bolivia) until April, 1825, and the royalists who had taken refuge at Callao endured with desperate obstinacy a siege which was protracted until January, 1826, when most of them had perished of hunger and disease. "Bolivar was still clothed with the powers of a dictator in Peru. . . . He was anxious to bring about the adoption by the Peruvians of the civil code known as the Bolivian constitution, but it proved generally unsatisfactory. While he remained in the country, it is said, 'the people overwhelmed him with professions of gratitude, and addressed him in language unsuitable to any being below the Deity.' A reaction took place notwithstanding, and numbers were found ready to accuse this truly great man of selfish personal ambition." — H. Brownell, *North and South America: Peru, ch.* 12-13.

Also in: Earl of Dundonald, *Autobiog. of a Seaman, Sequel, ch.* 3.—J. Miller, *Memoirs of General Miller, ch.* 12-27 (*v.* 1-2).—T. Sutcliffe, *Sixteen Years in Chile and Peru, ch.* 2-3.

A. D. 1825-1826.—The founding of the Republic of Bolivia in upper Peru.—The Bolivian Constitution.—"Bolivar reassembled the deputies of the Congress of Lower Peru, February 10, 1825, and in his message to that body resigned the dictatorship, adding, 'I felicitate Peru on her being delivered from whatever is most dreadful on earth; from war by the victory of Ayacucho, and from despotism by my resignation. Proscribe for ever, I entreat you, this tremendous authority, which was the sepulchre of Rome.' On the same occasion he also said; 'My continuance in this republic is an absurd and monstrous phenomenon; it is the approbrium of Peru;' with other expressions equally strong; while at the same time, at the pressing solicitation of the Congress, he consented, notwithstanding his many declarations of reluctance, to remain at the head of the republic. Nothing could exceed the blind submissiveness of this Congress to Bolivar. After investing him with dictatorial authority for another year, they voted him a grant of a million of dollars, which he twice refused, with a disinterestedness that does him the greatest honor. . . . Liberality of feeling, and entire freedom from rapacity of spirit, must be admitted as prominent traits in his character. After continuing in session about a month, the Congress came to a resolution, that as they had granted absolute and unconditional power to Bolivar, in regard to all subjects, whether legislative or executive, it was unnecessary, and incompatible with his authority, that they should continue to exercise their functions; and they accordingly separated. Bolivar, being left without check or control in the government, after issuing a decree for installing a new Congress at Lima the ensuing year, departed from Lima in April, for the purpose of visiting the interior provinces of Upper and Lower Peru. . . . There is reason to believe, that the flattering reception, with which he was greeted on this tour, largely contributed to foster those views of ambition respecting Peru, which he betrayed in the sequel. Certain it is, at least, that the extravagant gratitude of the inhabitants of Peru, gave him occasion to assume the task of a legislator, and thus to bring his political principles more directly before the world. When the victory of Ayacucho left the provinces of Upper Peru free to act, the great question presented to their consideration was, whether Upper Peru should be united to Lower Peru, or reannexed to Buenos Ayres, or constitute an independent state. Under the auspices of the Liberator and of Sucre [Bolivar's chief of staff], a general assembly was convened at Chuquisaco in August, 1825, which declared the will of the people to be, that Upper Peru should become a separate republic, and decreed that it should be called Bolivia in honor of the Liberator. Here their functions should properly have ceased, with the fulfilment of the object for which they met. Regardless, however, of the limited extent of their powers, they proceeded to exercise the authority of a general Congress. They conferred the supreme executive powers on Bolivar, so long as he should reside within the territory of the republic. Sucre was made captain-general of the army, with the title of Grand Marshal of Ayacucho, and his name was bestowed upon the capital. Medals, statues, and pictures were bountifully and profusely decreed, in honor of both Sucre and Bolivar. To the latter was voted a million of dollars, as an acknowledgment of his preeminent services to the country. With the same characteristic magnanimity, which he displayed on a like occasion in Lower Peru, he refused to accept the grant for his own benefit, but desired that it might be appropriated to purchasing the emancipation of about a thousand negroes held in servitude in Bolivia. Finally, they solicited Bolivar to prepare for the new republic a fundamental code, that should perpetuate his political principles in the very frame and constitution of the state.

Captivated by the idea of creating a nation, from its very foundation, Bolivar consented to undertake the task, if, indeed, which has been confidently asserted to be the case, he did not himself procure the request to be made. The Liberator left Chuquisaca in January, 1826, and returned to Lima, to assist at the installation of the Congress summoned to meet there in February. He transmitted the form of a constitution for Bolivia from Lima, accompanied with an address, bearing date May 25, 1826. Of this extraordinary instrument, we feel at a loss to decide in what terms to speak. Bolivar has again and again declared, that it contains his confession of political faith. He gave all the powers of his mind to its preparation; he proclaimed it as the well-weighed result of his anxious meditations. . . . This constitution proposes a consolidated or central, not a federal, form of government; and thus far it is unobjectionable. Every ten citizens are to name an elector, whose tenure of office is four years. The Legislative power is to be vested in three branches, called tribunes, senators, and censors. Tribunes are to be elected for four years, senators for eight, and censors for life. So complicated is the arrangement proposed for the enactment of laws by means of this novel legislature, and so arbitrary and unnatural the distribution of powers among the several branches, that it would be impracticable for any people, having just notions of legislative proceedings, to conduct public business in the projected mode; and much more impracticable for men, like the South Americans, not at all familiar with the business of orderly legislation. But the most odious feature in the constitution relates to the nature and appointment of the executive authority. It is placed in the hands of a president, elected in the first instance by the legislative body, holding his office for life, without responsibility for the acts of his administration, and having the appointment of his successor. The whole patronage of the state, every appointment of any importance, from the vice-president and secretaries of state down to the officers of the revenue, belongs to him; in him is placed the absolute control of all the military force of the nation, it being at the same time specially provided, that a permanent armed force shall be constantly maintained. For the mighty power, the irresistible influence, which this plan imparts to the executive, the only corresponding security, assured to the people, is the inviolability of persons and property. The constituent Congress of Bolivia assembled at Chuquisaca, May 25, 1826, and passively adopted the proposed constitution to the letter, as if it had been a charter granted by a sovereign prince to his subjects, instead of a plan of government submitted to a deliberative assembly for their consideration. It took effect accordingly, as the constitution of Bolivia, and was sworn to by the people; and General Sucre was elected president for life under it, although one of its provisions expressly required, that the president should be a native of Bolivia."—C. Cushing, *Bolivar and the Bolivian Constitution* (*N. A. Rev., Jan.* 1830).

A. D. 1826-1876.—Retirement of Bolivar.—Attempted confederation with Bolivia and war with Chile.—The succession of military presidents.—Abolition of Slavery.—War with Spain.—"As Bolivar . . . was again prevailed upon [1826] by the Peruvians to accept the dictatorship of the northern republic, and was at the same time President of the United States of Colombia, he was by far the most powerful man on the continent of America. For a time it was supposed that the balance of power on the southern continent was falling into Colombian hands. . . . But the power of Bolivar, even in his own country, rested on a tottering basis. Much more was this the case in the greater Viceroyalty. The Peruvian generals, who ruled the opinion of the country, were incurably jealous of him and his army, and got rid of the latter as soon as they could clear off the arrears of pay. They looked upon the Code Bolivar itself as a badge of servitude, and were not sorry when the domestic disturbances of Colombia summoned the Dictator from among them [September, 1826]. The Peruvians, who owed a heavy debt, both in money and gratitude, to Colombia, now altogether repudiated Bolivar, his code, and his government; and the Bolivians followed their example by expelling Sucre and his Colombian troops (1828). The revolution which expelled the Colombian element was mainly a national and military one: but it was no doubt assisted by whatever of liberalism existed in the country. Bolivar had now shown himself in Colombia to be the apostle of military tyranny, and he was not likely to assume another character in Peru. The ascendency of Colombia in the Perus was thus of short duration; but the people of the two Perus only exchanged Colombian dictatorship for that of the generals of their own nation." —E. J. Payne, *Hist. of European Colonies, pp.* 290-291.—"A Peruvian Congress met in 1827, after General Bolivar had returned to Colombia, and elected Don José Lamar, the leader of the Peruvian infantry at Ayacucho, as President of the Republic; but his defeat in an attempt to wrest Guayaquil from Colombia led to his fall, and Agustin Gamarra, an Ynca Indian of Cuzco, succeeded him in 1829. Although successful soldiers secured the presidential chair, the administration in the early days of the Republic contained men of rank, and others of integrity and talent. . . . General Gamarra served his regular term of office, and after a discreditable display of sedition he was succeeded in 1834 by Don Luis José Orbegoso. Then followed an attempt to unite Peru and Bolivia in a confederation. The plan was conceived by Don Andres Santa Cruz, an Ynca Indian of high descent, who had been President of Bolivia since 1829. Orbegoso concurred, and the scheme, which had in it some elements of hopefulness and success, was carried out, but not without deplorable bloodshed. The Peru-Bolivian Confederation was divided into three States—North Peru, South Peru, and Bolivia. During the ascendancy of Santa Cruz, Peru enjoyed a period of peace and prosperity. But his power excited the jealousy of Chile, and that Republic united with Peruvian malcontents, headed by General Gamarra, to destroy it. A Chilian army landed, and Santa Cruz was hopelessly defeated in the battle of Yungay, which was fought in the Callejon de Huaylas, on the banks of the river Santa, on January 20th, 1839. A Congress assembled at the little town of Huancayo, in the Sierra, which acknowledged Gamarra as President of the Republic, and proclaimed a new Constitution on November 16th, 1839. But the new state of things was of short duration. On the

pretext of danger from the party of Santa Cruz, war was declared upon Bolivia, which resulted in the defeat of the Peruvians at the battle of Yngavi, near the banks of Lake Titicaca, on November 20th, 1841, and the death of Gamarra. A very discreditable period of anarchy ensued, during which Gamarra's generals fought with each other for supremacy, which was ended by the success of another Indian, and on April 19th, 1845, General Don Ramon Castilla was proclaimed Constitutional President of Peru. . . . Uneducated and ignorant, his administrative merits were small, but his firm and vigorous grasp of power secured for Peru long periods of peace. . . . At the end of Castilla's term of office General Echenique succeeded him; but in 1854 Castilla placed himself at the head of a revolution, and again found himself in power. A new Constitution was promulgated in 1856; the tribute of the Indians and negro slavery were abolished, and a grant of $1,710,000 was voted as compensation to the owners of slaves. The mass of the people ceased to be taxed. The revenue was entirely derived from sales of guano, customs duties, licences, and stamps. . . . When Castilla retired from office in 1862, he was succeeded by General San Roman, an old Ynca Indian of Puno, whose father had fought under Pumacagua. The Republic had then existed for 40 years, during which time it had been torn by civil or external wars for nine years and had enjoyed 31 years of peace and order. Very great advances had been made in prosperity during the years of peace. . . . General San Roman died in 1863, his Vice President, General Pezet, was replaced [through a revolution] by Colonel Don Mariano Ignacio Prado, and a war with Spain practically ended with the repulse of the Spanish fleet from Callao on May 2nd, 1866. The war was unjust, the pretext being the alleged ill-treatment of some Spanish immigrants at an estate called Talambo, in the coast valley of Jequetepeque, which might easily have been arranged by arbitration. But the success at Callao aroused the enthusiasm of the people and excited strong patriotic feelings. Colonel Don José Balta was elected President of Peru on August 2nd, 1868, the present Constitution having been proclaimed on August 31st, 1867. The Senate is composed of Deputies of the Provinces, with a property qualification, and the House of Representatives of members nominated by electoral colleges of provinces and districts, one member for every 20,000 inhabitants. The district colleges choose deputies to the provincial colleges, who elect the representatives to Congress. There are 44 senators and 110 representatives. Executive power is in the hands of a President and Vice-President, elected for four years, with a Cabinet of five Ministers. . . . The government of Colonel Balta entered upon a career of wild extravagance, and pushed forward the execution of railways and other public works with feverish haste, bringing ruin upon the country. . . . It is sad that a wretched military outbreak, in which the President was killed on July 26th, 1872, should have given it a tragic termination. . . . On August 2nd, 1872, Don Manuel Pardo became Constitutional President of Peru. He was the first civilian that had been elected. . . . He came to the helm at a period of great financial difficulty, and he undertook a thankless but patriotic task. . . . He was the best President that Peru has ever known. When his term of office came to an end, he was peacefully succeeded, on August 2nd, 1876, by General Don Mariano Ignacio Prado."—C. R. Markham, *Peru, ch.* 8.

A. D. 1879-1884.—The disastrous war with Chile. See CHILE: A. D. 1833–1884.

A. D. 1886-1894.—Slow recovery.—Since the close of the war with Chile, Peru has been slowly recovering from its destructive effects. General Caceres became President in 1886, and was succeeded in 1890 by General Remigio Morales Bermudez, whose term expires in 1894.

PERUGIA, Early history of. See PERUSIA.

Under the domination of the Baglioni. See BAGLIONI.

PERUS, The Two.—Upper Peru and Lower Peru of the older Spanish viceroyalty are represented, at the present time, the former by the Republic of Bolivia, the latter by the Republic of Peru.

PERUSIA, The war of.—In the second year of the triumvirate of Octavius, Antony and Lepidus, Antony being in the east, his wife Fulvia and his brother fomented a revolt in Italy against Octavius, which forced the latter for a time to quit Rome. But his coolness, with the energy and ability of his friend Agrippa, overcame the conspiracy. The army of the insurgents was blockaded in Perusia (modern Perugia) and sustained a siege of several months, so obstinate that the whole affair came to be called the war of Perusia. The siege was distinguished by a peculiar horror; for the slaves of the city were deliberately starved to death, being denied food and also denied escape, lest the besiegers should learn of the scarcity within the walls.—C. Merivale, *Hist. of Rome, ch.* 27.

PERUVIAN BARK, Introduction of. See MEDICAL SCIENCE: 17TH CENTURY.

PERUVIAN QUIPU. See QUIPU.

PES, The. See FOOT, THE ROMAN.

PESHWA OF THE MAHRATTAS, The. See INDIA: A. D. 1662–1748; 1798–1805; and 1816–1819.

PESO DE ORO. See SPANISH COINS.

PESTALOZZI, and educational reform. See EDUCATION, MODERN: REFORMS, &C.: A. D. 1798–1827.

PESTH: A. D. 1241.—Destruction by the Mongols. See MONGOLS: A. D. 1229–1294.

A. D. 1872.—Union with Buda. See BUDA-PESTH.

PESTILENCE. See PLAGUE.

PETALISM.—A vote of banishment which the ancient Syracusans brought into practice for a time, in imitatian of the Ostracism of the Athenians,—(see OSTRACISM). The name of the citizen to be banished was written, at Syracuse, on olive-leaves, instead of on shells, as at Athens. Hence the name, petalism.—Diodorus, *Historical Library, bk.* 11, *ch.* 26.

PETER, Latin Emperor at Constantinople (Romania), A. D. 1217–1219.....Peter I. (called The Great), Czar of Russia, 1689–1725..... Peter I., King of Aragon and Navarre, 1094–1104.....Peter I., King of Hungary, 1038–1046. ....Peter II., Czar of Russia, 1727–1730..... Peter II., King of Aragon, 1196–1213.....Peter

II., King of Sicily, 1337–1342.....Peter III., Czar of Russia, 1762.....Peter III., King of Aragon, 1276–1285; King of Sicily, 1283–1285. ....Peter IV., King of Aragon, 1336–1387..... Peter the Hermit's Crusade. See CRUSADES: A. D. 1094–1095; and 1096–1099.....**Peter.** See, also, PEDRO.

PETERBOROUGH, Earl of, and the siege of Barcelona. See SPAIN: A. D. 1705.

PETERLOO, Massacre of. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1816–1820.

PETER'S PENCE.—King Offa, of the old English kingdom of Mercia, procured, by a liberal tribute to Rome, a new archbishopric for Lichfield, thus dividing the province of Canterbury. "This payment . . . is probably the origin of the Rom-feoh, or Peter's pence, a tax of a penny on every hearth, which was collected [in England] and sent to Rome from the beginning of the tenth century, and was a subject of frequent legislation. But the archiepiscopate of Lichfield scarcely survived its founder."—W. Stubbs, *Const. Hist. of Eng., ch.* 8, *sect.* 86 (*v.* 1).

PETERSBURG, Siege and evacuation of. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1864 (JUNE: VIRGINIA), (JULY: VIRGINIA), (AUGUST: VIRGINIA); 1865 (MARCH—APRIL: VIRGINIA).

PETERSHAM, Rout of Shays' rebels at. See MASSACHUSETTS: A. D. 1786–1787.

PETERVARDEIN, Battle of (1716). See HUNGARY: A. D. 1699–1718.

PETILIA, Battle at. See SPARTACUS, RISING OF.

PETIT SERJEANTY. See FEUDAL TENURES.

PETITION OF RIGHT, The. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1625–1628; and 1628.

PETITS MAÎTRES, Les. See FRANCE: A. D. 1650–1651.

PETRA, Arabia.—The rock-city of the Nabatheans. See NABATHEANS.

PETRA, Illyricum: Cæsar's blockade of Pompeius. See ROME: B. C. 48.

PETRA, Lazica. See LAZICA.

PETROBRUSIANS. — HENRICIANS.—"The heretic who, for above twenty years, attempted a restoration of a simple religion in Southern France, the well-known Pierre de Bruys, a native of Gap or Embrun, . . . warred against images and all other visible emblems of worship; he questioned the expediency of infant baptism, the soundness of the doctrine of transubstantiation, and opposed prayers for the dead; but he professed poverty for himself, and would have equally enforced it upon all the ministers of the altar. He protested against the payment of tithes; and it was, most probably, owing to this last, the most heinous of all offences, that he was, towards 1130, burnt with slow fire by a populace maddened by the priests, at St. Gilles, on the Rhone. . . . His followers rallied . . . and changed their name of Petrobrusians into that of Henricians, when the mantle of their first master rested on the shoulders of Henry, supposed by Mosheim [Eccles. Hist., v. 2] to have been an Italian Eremite monk."—L. Mariotti (A. Gallenga), *Frà Dolcino and his Times, ch.* 1.

PETROCORII, The.—A Gallic tribe established in the ancient Périgord, the modern French department of the Dordogne.—Napoleon III., *Hist. of Cæsar, bk.* 3, *ch.* 2, *foot-note.*

PETRONILLA, Queen of Aragon, A. D. 1137–1163.

PETRONIUS MAXIMUS, Roman Emperor (Western), A. D. 455.

PEUCINI, The. — "The Peucini derived their name from the little island Peuce (Piczino) at the mouth of the Danube. Pliny (iv. 14) speaks of them as a German people bordering on the Daci. They would thus stretch through Moldavia from the Carpathian Mountains to the Black Sea. Under the name Bastarnæ they are mentioned by Livy (xl. 57, 58) as a powerful people, who helped Philip, king of Macedonia, in his wars with the Romans. Plutarch ('Life of Paullus Æmilius,' ch. ix.) says they were the same as the Galatæ, who dwelt round the Ister (Danube). If so, they were Gauls, which Livy also implies."— Church and Brodribb, *Geog. Notes to The Germany of Tacitus.*

PEUKETIANS, The. See ŒNOTRIANS.

PEUTINGERIAN TABLE, The.—This is the name given to the only copy which has survived of a Roman official road-chart. "Tables of this kind were not maps in the proper sense of the term, but were rather diagrams drawn purposely out of proportion, on which the public roads were projected in a panoramic view. The latitude and longitude and the positions of rivers and mountains were disregarded so far as they might interfere with the display of the provinces, the outlines being flattened out to suit the shape of a roll of parchment; but the distances between the stations were inserted in numerals, so that an extract from the record might be used as a supplement to the table of mileage in the road-book. The copy now remaining derives its name from Conrad Peutinger of Augsburg, in whose library it was found on his death in 1547. It is supposed to have been brought to Europe from a monastery in the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem, and to have been a copy taken by some thirteenth century scribe from an original assigned to the beginning of the fourth century or the end of the third."— C. Elton, *Origins of English Hist., ch.* 11 *and plate* 7.

ALSO IN: W. M. Ramsay, *Hist. Geog. of Asia Minor, pt.* 1, *ch.* 6.

PEVENSEY.— The landing-place of William the Conquerer, September 28, A. D. 1066, when he came to win the crown of England. See, also, ANDERIDA.

PFALZ.—PFALZGRAF.— In German, the term signifying Palatine and PALATINE COUNT, which see.

PHACUSEH. See JEWS: THE ROUTE OF THE EXODUS.

PHÆACIANS, The.—"We are wholly at a loss to explain the reasons that led the Greeks in early times . . . to treat the Phæacians [of Homer's Odyssey] as a historical people, and to identify the Homeric Scheria with the island of Corcyra [modern Corfu]. . . . We must . . . be content to banish the kindly and hospitable Phæacians, as well as the barbarous Cyclopes and Læstrygones, to that outer zone of the Homeric world, in which everything was still shrouded in a veil of marvel and mystery."— E. H. Bunbury, *Hist. of Ancient Geog., ch.* 3, *sect.* 3 (*v.* 1).

PHALANGITES, The.—The soldiers of the Macedonian phalanx.

PHALANX, The Macedonian. — "The main body, the phalanx — or quadruple phalanx, as it was sometimes called, to mark that it was formed of four divisions, each bearing

the same name—presented a mass of 18,000 men, which was distributed, at least by Alexander, into six brigades of 3,000 each, formidable in its aspect, and, on ground suited to its operations, irresistible in its attacks. The phalangite soldier wore the usual defensive armour of the Greek heavy infantry, helmet, breast-plate, and greaves; and almost the whole front of his person was covered with the long shield called the aspis. His weapons were a sword, long enough to enable a man in the second rank to reach an enemy who had come to close quarters with the comrade who stood before him, and the celebrated spear, known by the Macedonian name sarissa, four and twenty feet long. The sarissa, when couched, projected eighteen feet in front of the soldier, and the space between the ranks was such that those of the second rank were fifteen, those of the third twelve, those of the fourth nine, those of the fifth six, and those of the sixth three feet in advance of the first line; so that the man at the head of the file was guarded on each side by the points of six spears. The ordinary depth of the phalanx was of sixteen ranks. The men who stood too far behind to use their sarissas, and who therefore kept them raised until they advanced to fill a vacant place, still added to the pressure of the mass. As the efficacy of the phalanx depended on its compactness, and this again on the uniformity of its movements, the greatest care was taken to select the best soldiers for the foremost and hindmost ranks—the frames, as it were, of the engine. The bulk and core of the phalanx consisted of Macedonians; but it was composed in part of foreign troops."—C. Thirlwall, *Hist. of Greece, ch.* 48.

PHALARIS, Brazen bull of.—Epistles of.—Phalaris is said to have been a rich man who made himself tyrant of the Greek city of Agrigentum in Sicily, about 570 B. C., and who distinguished himself above all others of his kind by his cruelties. He seems to have been especially infamous in early times on account of his brazen bull. "This piece of mechanism was hollow, and sufficiently capacious to contain one or more victims enclosed within it, to perish in tortures when the metal was heated: the cries of these suffering prisoners passed for the roarings of the animal. The artist was named Perillus, and is said to have been himself the first person burnt in it by order of the despot."—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece, pt.* 2, *ch.* 43.—At a later time Phalaris was represented as having been a man of culture and letters, and certain Epistles were ascribed to him which most scholars now regard as forgeries. The famous treatise of Bentley is thought to have settled the question.

PHALERUM. See Piræus.

PHANARIOTS, The.—"The reduction of Constantinople, in 1453, was mainly achieved by the extraordinary exploit of Mahomet II. in transporting his galleys from the Bosphorus to the interior of the harbour, by dragging them over land from Dolma Bactche, and again launching them opposite to the quarter denominated the Phanar, from a lantern suspended over the gate which there communicates with the city. The inhabitants of this district, either from terror or treachery, are said to have subsequently thrown open a passage to the conqueror; and Mahomet, as a remuneration, assigned them for their residence this portion of Constantinople, which has since continued to be occupied by the Patriarch and the most distinguished families of the Greeks. It is only, however, within the last century and a half that the Phanariots have attained any distinction beyond that of merchants and bankers, or that their name, from merely designating their residence, has been used to indicate their diplomatic employments."—Sir J. E. Tennent, *Hist. of Modern Greece, ch.* 12 (*v.* 2).

Also in: E. A. Freeman, *The Ottoman Power in Europe, ch.* 4.—J. Samuelson, *Roumania, Past and Present, ch.* 13, *sect.* 3–7.

PHARAOH, The title.—The title Pharaoh which was given to the kings of ancient Egypt, "appears on the monuments as piraa, 'great house,' the palace in which the king lived being used to denote the king himself, just as in our own time the 'porte' or gate of the palace has become synonymous with the Turkish Sultan."—A. H. Sayce, *Fresh Light from the Ancient Monuments, ch.* 2.

PHARAOHITES. See Gypsies.

PHARISEES, The. See Chasidim; and Sadducees.

PHARSALIA, Battle of. See Rome: B. C. 48.

PHELPS' AND GORHAM'S PURCHASE. See New York: A. D. 1786–1799.

PHERÆ.—A town in ancient Thessaly which acquired an evil fame in Greek history, during the fourth century, B. C., by the power and the cruelty of the tyrants who ruled it and who extended their sway for a time over the greater part of Thessaly. Jason and Alexander were the most notorious of the brood.

PHILADELPHIA, Asia Minor.—The city of Philadelphia, founded by Attalus Philadelphus of Pergamum, in eastern Lydia, not far from Sardes, was one in which Christianity flourished at an early day, and which prospered for several centuries, notwithstanding repeated calamities of earthquake. It was the last community of Greeks in Asia Minor which retained its independence of the Turks. It stood out for two generations in the midst of the Seljouk Turks, after all around it had succumbed. The brave city was finally taken by the Ottoman sultan, Bayezid, or Bajazet, about 1390. The Turks then gave it the name Alashehr.—G. Finlay, *Hist. of the Byzantine and Greek Empires, bk.* 4, *ch.* 2, *sect.* 4 (*v.* 2).

PHILADELPHIA, Penn.: A. D. 1641.—The first settlement, by New Haven colonists. See New Jersey: A. D. 1640–1655.

A. D. 1682-1685.—Penn's founding of the city. See Pennsylvania: A. D. 1682–1685.

A. D. 1686-1692.—Bradford's Press. See Printing and the Press: A. D. 1535–1709.

A. D. 1701.—Chartered as a city. See Pennsylvania: A. D. 1701–1718.

A. D. 1719-1729.—The first newspapers.—Franklin's advent. See Printing: A. D. 1704–1729.

A. D. 1765.—Patriotic self-denials.—Non-importation agreements. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1764–1767.

A. D. 1774.—The First Continental Congress. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1774 (September), and (September—October).

A. D. 1775.—Reception of the news of Lexington and Concord. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1775 (April—June).

A. D. 1775.—The Second Continental Congress. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1775 (MAY—AUGUST).

A. D. 1777.—The British army in the city.—Removal of Congress to York. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1777 (JANUARY—DECEMBER).

A. D. 1777-1778.—The gay winter with the British in the city.—The Battle of the Kegs.—The Mischianza.—"The year 1778 found the British at Philadelphia in snug quarters, unembarrassed by the cares of the field, and, except for occasional detachments, free from other military duties than the necessary details of garrison life. The trifling affairs that occurred during the remainder of the season served rather as a zest to the pleasures which engaged them than as a serious occupation. . . . No sooner were they settled in their winter-quarters than the English set on foot scenes of gayety that were long remembered, and often with regret, by the younger part of the local gentry. . . . Of all the band, no one seems to have created such a pleasing impression or to have been so long admiringly remembered as André. His name in our own days lingered on the lips of every aged woman whose youth had seen her a belle in the royal lines. . . . The military feats about Philadelphia, in the earlier part of 1778, were neither numerous or important. Howe aimed at little more than keeping a passage clear for the country-people, within certain bounds, to come in with marketing. The incident known as the Battle of the Kegs was celebrated by Hopkinson in a very amusing song that, wedded to the air of Maggy Lander, was long the favorite of the American military vocalists; but it hardly seems to have been noticed at Philadelphia until the whig version came in. The local newspapers say that, in January, 1778, a barrel floating down the Delaware being taken up by some boys exploded in their hands, and killed or maimed one of them. A few days after, some of the transports fired a few guns at several other kegs that appeared on the tide; but no particular notice of the occurrence was taken. These torpedoes were sent down in the hope that they would damage the shipping." When Howe was displaced from the command and recalled, his officers, among whom he was very popular, resolved "to commemorate their esteem for him by an entertainment not less novel than splendid. This was the famous Mischianza [or Meschianza] of the 18th of May, 1778; the various nature of which is expressed by its name, while its conception is evidently taken from Lord Derby's fête champêtre at The Oaks, June 9th, 1774, on occasion of Lord Stanley's marriage to the Duke of Hamilton's daughter. . . . The regatta, or aquatic procession, in the Mischianza was suggested by a like pageant on the Thames, June 23rd, 1775. . . . A mock tournament—perhaps the first in America—was a part of the play."—W. Sargent, *Life of Major John André, ch.* 9.

ALSO IN: J. T. Scharf and T. Westcott, *Hist. of Philadelphia, ch.* 17 (*v.* 1).—A. H. Wharton, *Through Colonial Doorways, ch.* 2.

A. D. 1778.—Evacuation by the British. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1778 (JUNE).

A. D. 1780-1784.—Founding of the Pennsylvania Bank and the Bank of North America. See MONEY AND BANKING: A. D. 1780–1784.

A. D. 1787.—The sitting of the Federal Constitutional Convention. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1787.

A. D. 1876.—The Centennial Exhibition. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1876.

PHILADELPHIA, Tenn., Battle at. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1863 (OCTOBER—DECEMBER: TENNESSEE).

PHILADELPHIA LIBRARY COMPANY. See LIBRARIES, MODERN: UNITED STATES OF AM.

PHILIP, Roman Emperor, A. D. 244–249. ....Philip, King of Macedon, The ascendancy in Greece of. See GREECE: B. C. 359–358, and 357–336. ....**Philip, King of the Pokanokets, and his war with the English.** See NEW ENGLAND: A. D. 1674–1675, to 1676–1678. ....**Philip, King of Sweden, 1112–1118. ....Philip (called The Bold), Duke of Burgundy, 1363–1404. .... Philip (called The Good), Duke of Burgundy, 1418–1467. ....Philip I. King of France, 1060–1108. ....Philip II. (called Augustus), King of France, 1180–1223. ....Philip II., King of the Two Sicilies, 1554–1598; Duke of Burgundy, 1555–1598; King of Spain, 1556–1598; King of Portugal, 1580–1598. ....Philip III. (called The Bold), King of France, 1270–1285. ....Philip III., King of Spain, Portugal and the Two Sicilies, and Duke of Burgundy, 1598–1621. .... Philip IV. (called The Fair), King of France, 1285–1314. ....Philip IV., King of Spain, 1621–1665; King of Portugal, 1621–1640. ....Philip V., King of France and Navarre, 1316–1322. ....Philip V., King of Spain (first of the Spanish-Bourbon line), 1700–1746. ....Philip VI., King of France (the first king of the House of Valois), 1328–1350.**

PHILIPHAUGH, Battle of (1645). See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1644–1645.

PHILIPPI.—Founded by Philip of Macedonia, in 356 B. C., in the district of Pangaeus.

PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.—The group of islands numbers more than 400. It was discovered by Magellan in 1521 and occupied a few years later by Spain. There are about 7,000,000 inhabitants, mostly Malayan and Chinese.

PHILIPPI, Battles of (B. C. 42). See ROME: B. C. 44–42.

PHILIPPI, West Va., Battle of. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1861 (JUNE—JULY: WEST VIRGINIA).

PHILIPPICS OF DEMOSTHENES, The. See GREECE: B. C. 357–336, and 351–348.

PHILIPPICUS, Roman Emperor (Eastern), A. D. 711–713.

PHILIPPOPOLIS, Capture of, by the Goths. See GOTHS: A. D. 244–251.

PHILIPSBURG: A. D. 1644.—Taken by the French. See GERMANY: A. D. 1643–1644.

A. D. 1648.—Right of garrisoning secured to France. See GERMANY: A. D. 1648.

A. D. 1676.—Taken from France by the Imperialists. See NETHERLANDS (HOLLAND): A. D. 1674–1678.

A. D. 1679.—Given up by France. See NIMEGUEN, PEACE OF.

A. D. 1734.—Siege and reduction by the French. See FRANCE: A. D. 1733–1735.

PHILISTINES, The.—"One small nation alone, of all which dwelt on the land claimed by

Israel, permanently refused to amalgamate itself with the circumcised peoples, — namely the uncircumcised Philistines. They occupied the lots which ought to have been conquered by Dan and Simeon, and had five principal cities, Gaza, Askelon, Ashdod, Gath and Ekron, of which the three first are on the sea-coast. Ashdod and Gaza were places of great strength, capable of long resisting the efforts of Egyptian and Greek warfare. The Philistines cannot have been a populous nation, but they were far more advanced in the arts of peace and war than the Hebrews. Their position commanded the land-traffic between Egypt and Canaan, and gave them access to the sea; hence perhaps their wealth and comparatively advanced civilization. Some learned men give credit to an account in Sanchoniathon, that they came from Crete." They gave their name to Palestine. — F. W. Newman, *Hist. of the Hebrew Monarchy, ch.* 2.— "Where the Philistines came from, and what they originally were, is not clear. That they moved up the coast from Egypt is certain; that they came from Kaphtor is also certain. But it by no means follows, as some argue, that Kaphtor and Egypt are the same region. . . . It appears more safe to identify Kaphtor with" Crete. "But to have traced the Philistines to Crete is not to have cleared up their origin, for early Crete was full of tribes from both east and west. . . . Take them as a whole, and the Philistines appear a Semitic people."—George Adam Smith, *Historical Geog. of the Holy Land, ch.* 9.

Also in: Dean Stanley, *Lect's on the Hist. of the Jewish Church, lect.* 16.— H. Ewald, *Hist. of Israel, bk.* 2, *sect.* 3.—See, also, Jews: The Conquest of Canaan, and after.

PHILOCRATES, The Peace of. See Greece: B. C. 357-336.

PHLIUS, Siege of.—Phlius, the chief city of the small mountain state of Phliasia, in the northeastern corner of Peloponnesus, adjoining Argos and Arcadia, made an heroic effort, B. C. 380, to maintain its liberties against Sparta. Under a valiant leader, Delphion, it endured a siege which lasted more than an entire year. When forced to surrender, in the end, it was treated with terrible severity by the Spartan king, Agesilaus.—E. Curtius, *Hist. of Greece, bk.* 5, *ch.* 5.

PHOCÆANS, OR PHOKÆANS, The.— "The citizens of Phocæa had been the last on the coast-line of Ionia [see Asia Minor: The Greek Colonies] to settle down to a condition of tranquillity. They had no building-ground but a rocky peninsula, where they found so little space over which to spread at their ease that this very circumstance made them a thorough people of sailors. In accordance with their local situation they had turned to the waters of the Pontus, established settlements on the Dardanelles and the Black Sea, and taken part in the trade with Egypt. Here however they were unable to hold their own by the side of the Milesians, . . . and the Phocæans accordingly saw themselves obliged to look westward and to follow the direction of Chalcidian navigation. . . . It was thus that the Ionian Phocæans came into the western sea. Being forced from the first to accustom themselves to long and distant voyages, instead of the easy summer trips of the other maritime cities, they became notably bold and heroic sailors. They began where the rest left off; they made voyages of discovery into regions avoided by others; they remained at sea even when the skies already showed signs of approaching winter and the observation of the stars became difficult. They built their ships long and slim, in order to increase their agility; their merchant vessels were at the same time men-of-war. . . . They entered those parts of the Adriatic which most abound in rocks, and circumnavigated the islands of the Tyrrhenian sea in spite of the Carthaginian guard-ships; they sought out the bays of Campania and the mouths of the Tiber and Arnus; they proceeded farther, past the Alpine ranges, along the coast as far as the mouth of the Rhodanus, and finally reached Iberia, with whose rich treasures of precious metals they had first become acquainted on the coast of Italy. . . . During the period when Ionia began to be hard pressed by the Lydians, the Phocæans, who had hitherto contented themselves with small commercial settlements, in their turn proceeded to the foundation of cities in Gaul and Iberia. The mouth of the Rhodanus [the Rhone] was of especial importance to them for the purposes of land and sea trade. . . . Massalia [modern Marseilles], from the forty-fifth Olympiad [B. C. 600] became a fixed seat of Hellenic culture in the land of the Celts, despite the hostility of the piratical tribes of Liguria and the Punic fleet. Large fisheries were established on the shore; and the stony soil in the immediate vicinity of the city itself was converted into vine and olive plantations. The roads leading inland were made level, which brought the products of the country to the mouth of the Rhone; and in the Celtic towns were set up mercantile establishments, which collected at Massalia the loads of British tin, of inestimable value for the manufacture of copper, while wine and oil, as well as works of art, particularly copper utensils, were supplied to the interior. A totally new horizon opened for Hellenic inquiry."—E. Curtius, *Hist. of Greece, bk.* 2, *ch.* 3.—See, also, Asia Minor: B. C. 724-539.

PHOCAS, Roman Emperor (Eastern), A. D. 602-610.

PHOCIANS, The. See Phokians.

PHOCION, Execution of. See Greece: B. C. 321-312.

PHOCIS: B. C. 357-346.—Seizure of Delphi.—The Ten Years Sacred War with Thebes.—Intervention of Philip of Macedon.—Heavy punishment by his hand. See Greece: B. C. 357-336.

PHŒNICIANS: Origin and early history.—Commerce.—Colonies.— "The traditions of the Phœnicians collected at Tyre itself by Herodotus . . . ; those of the inhabitants of Southern Arabia preserved by Strabo; and, finally, those still current in Babylonia during the first centuries of the Christian era, when the Syro-Chaldee original of the book of 'Nabathæan Agriculture' was revised — all agree in stating that the Canaanites at first lived near the Cushites, their brethren in race, on the banks of the Erythræan Sea, or Persian Gulf, on that portion of the coast of Bahrein designated El Katif on our modern maps of Arabia. Pliny speaks of a land of Canaan in this neighbourhood, in his time. . . . According to Trogus Pompeius, the Canaanites were driven from their first settlements by earthquakes, and then journeyed to-

wards Southern Syria. The traditions preserved in 'Nabathæan Agriculture' state, on the contrary, that they were violently expelled, in consequence of a quarrel with the Cushite monarchs of Babylon of the dynasty of Nimrod; and this is also the account given by the Arabian historians. . . . The entry of the Canaanites into Palestine, and their settlement in the entire country situated between the sea and the valley of Jordan, must . . . be placed between the period when the twelfth dynasty governed Egypt and that when the Elamite king, Chedorlaomer, reigned as suzerain over all the Tigro-Euphrates basin. This brings us approximately between 2400 and 2300 B. C. . . . The Sidonians formed the first settlement, and always remained at the head of the Phœnician nation, which, at all periods of its history, even when joined by other peoples of the same race, called itself both 'Canaanite' and 'Sidonian.' . . . The Greek name, Phœnicians, of unknown origin, must not be applied to the whole of the nations of the race of Canaan who settled in Southern Syria; it belongs to the Canaanites of the sea coast only, who were always widely separated from the others. Phœnicia, in both classical history and geography, is merely that very narrow tract of land, hemmed in by mountains and sea, extending from Aradus on the north to the town of Acco on the south."—F. Lenormant, *Manual of Ancient Hist. of the East, bk.* 6, *ch.* 1.—"Renan sums up the evidence when he says: 'The greater number of modern critics admit it as demonstrated, that the primitive abode of the Phœnicians must be placed on the Lower Euphrates, in the centre of the great commercial and maritime establishments of the Persian Gulf, conformably to the unanimous witness of antiquity.' The date, the causes, and the circumstances of the migration are involved in equal obscurity. The motive for it assigned by Justin is absurd, since no nation ever undertook a long and difficult migration on account of an earthquake. If we may resort to conjecture we should be inclined to suggest that the spirit of adventure gave the first impulse, and that afterwards the unexampled facilities for trade, which the Mediterranean coast was found to possess, attracted a continuous flow of immigrants from the sea of the Rising to that of the Setting Sun."—G. Rawlinson, *The Story of Phœnicia, ch.* 2.—The same, *Hist. of Phœnicia, ch.* 3.—"The campaigns which the Pharaohs undertook against Syria and the land of the Euphrates after the expulsion of the Shepherds could not leave these cities [Sidon and others] unmoved. If the Zemar of the inscriptions of Tuthmosis III. is Zemar (Simyra) near Aradus, and Arathutu is Aradus itself, the territories of these cities were laid waste by this king in his sixth campaign (about the year 1580 B. C.); if Arkatu is Arka, south of Aradus, this place must have been destroyed in his fifteenth campaign (about the year 1570 B. C.). Sethos I. (1440–1400 B. C.) subdued the land of Limanon (i. e. the region of Lebanon), and caused cedars to be felled there. One of his inscriptions mentions Zor, i. e. Tyre, among the cities conquered by him. The son and successor of Sethos I., Ramses II., also forced his way in the first decades of the fourteenth century as far as the coasts of the Phenicians. At the mouth of the Nahr el Kelb, between Sidon and Berytus, the rocks on the coast display the memorial which he caused to be set up in the second and third year of his reign in honour of the successes obtained in this region. In the fifth year of his reign Ramses, with the king of the Cheta, defeats the king of Arathu in the neighbourhood of Kadeshu on the Orontes, and Ramses III., about the year 1310 B. C., mentions beside the Cheta who attack Egypt the people of Arathu, by which name in the one case as in the other, may be meant the warriors of Aradus. If Arathu, like Arathutu, is Aradus, it follows, from the position which Ramses II. and III. give to the princes of Arathu, that beside the power to which the kingdom of the Hittites had risen about the middle of the fifteenth century B. C., and which it maintained to the end of the fourteenth, the Phenician cities had assumed an independent position. The successes of the Pharaohs in Syria come to an end in the first decades of the fourteenth century. Egypt makes peace and enters into a contract of marriage with the royal house of the Cheta. . . . The overthrow of the kingdom of the Hittites, which succumbed to the attack of the Amorites soon after the year 1300 B. C., must have had a reaction on the cities of the Phenicians. Expelled Hittites must have been driven to the coast-land, or have fled thither, and in the middle of the thirteenth century the successes gained by the Hebrews who broke in from the East, over the Amorites, the settlement of the Hebrews on the mountains of the Amorites [see JEWS: CONQUEST OF CANAAN], must again have thrown the vanquished, i. e. the fugitives of this nation, towards the coast. With this retirement of the older strata of the population of Canaan to the coast is connected the movement which from this period emanates from the coasts of the Phenicians, and is directed towards the islands of the Mediterranean and the Ægean. It is true that on this subject only the most scanty statements and traces, only the most legendary traditions have come down to us, so that we can ascertain these advances only in the most wavering outlines. One hundred miles to the west off the coast of Phenicia lies the island of Cyprus. . . . The western writers state that before the time of the Trojan war Belus had conquered and subjugated the island of Cyprus, and that Citium belonged to Belus. The victorious Belus is the Baal of the Phenicians. The date of the Trojan war is of no importance for the settlement of the Phenicians in Cyprus, for this statement is found in Virgil only. More important is the fact that the settlers brought the Babylonian cuneiform writing to Cyprus. . . . The settlement of the Sidonians in Cyprus must therefore have taken place before the time in which the alphabetic writing, i. e. the writing specially known as Phenician, was in use in Syria, and hence at the latest before 1100 B. C. . . . In the beginning of the tenth century B. C. the cities of Cyprus stood under the supremacy of the king of Tyre. The island was of extraordinary fertility. The forests furnished wood for shipbuilding; the mountains concealed rich veins of the metal which has obtained the name of copper from this island. Hence it was a very valuable acquisition, an essential strengthening of the power of Sidon in the older, and Tyre in the later period. . . . As early as the fifteenth century B. C., we may regard the Phenician cities as the central points of a trade branching east and

west, which must have been augmented by the fact that they conveyed not only products of the Syrian land to the Euphrates and the Nile, but could also carry the goods which they obtained in exchange in Egypt to Babylonia, and what they obtained beyond the Euphrates to Egypt. At the same time the fabrics of Babylon and Egypt roused them to emulation, and called forth an industry among the Phenicians which we see producing woven stuffs, vessels of clay and metal, ornaments and weapons, and becoming pre-eminent in the colouring of stuffs with the liquor of the purple-fish which are found on the Phenician coasts. This industry required above all things metals, of which Babylonia and Egypt were no less in need, and when the purple-fish of their own coasts were no longer sufficient for their extensive dyeing, colouring-matter had to be obtained. Large quantities of these fish produced a proportionately small amount of the dye. Copper-ore was found in Cyprus, gold in the island of Thasos, and purple-fish on the coasts of Hellas. When the fall of the kingdom of the Hittites and the overthrow of the Amorite princes in the south of Canaan augmented the numbers of the population on the coast, these cities were no longer content to obtain those possessions of the islands by merely landing and making exchanges with the inhabitants. Intercourse with semi-barbarous tribes must be protected by the sword. Good harbours were needed. . . . Thus arose protecting forts on the distant islands and coasts, which received the ships of the native land. . . . In order to obtain the raw material necessary for their industry no less than to carry off the surplus of population, the Phenicians were brought to colonise Cyprus, Rhodes, Crete, Thera, Melos, Oliarus, Samothrace, Imbros, Lemnos and Thasos. In the bays of Laconia and Argos, in the straits of Eubœa, purple-fish were found in extraordinary quantities. . . . We may conclude that the Phenicians must have set foot on Cyprus about the year 1250 B. C., and on the islands and coasts of Hellas about the year 1200 B. C. Thucydides observes that in ancient times the Phenicians had occupied the promontories of Sicily and the small islands lying around Sicily, in order to carry on trade with the Sicels. Diodorus Siculus tells us that when the Phenicians extended their trade to the western ocean they settled in the island of Melite (Malta), owing to its situation in the middle of the sea and excellent harbours, in order to have a refuge for their ships. . . . On Sardinia also, as Diodorus tells us, the Phenicians planted many colonies. The mountains of Sardinia contained iron, silver, and lead. . . . The legend of the Greeks makes Heracles, i. e. Baal Melkarth, lord of the whole West. As a fact, the colonies of the Phenicians went beyond Sardinia in this direction. Their first colonies on the north coast of Africa appear to have been planted where the shore runs out nearest Sicily; Hippo was apparently regarded as the oldest colony. In the legends of the coins mentioned above Hippo is named beside Tyre and Citium as a daughter of Sidon. . . . Ityke (atak, settlement, Utica), on the mouth of the Bagradas (Medsherda), takes the next place after this Hippo, if indeed it was not founded before it. Aristotle tells us that the Phenicians stated that Ityke was built 287 years before Carthage, and Pliny maintains that Ityke was founded 1,178 years before his time. As Carthage was founded in the year 846 B. C. [see CARTHAGE] Ityke, according to Aristotle's statement, was built in the year 1133 B. C. With this the statement of Pliny agrees. He wrote in the years 52–77 A. D., and therefore he places the foundation of Ityke in the year 1126 or 1100 B. C. About the same time, i. e. about the year 1100 B. C., the Phenicians had already reached much further to the west. . . . When their undertakings succeeded according to their desire and they had collected great treasures, they resolved to traverse the sea beyond the pillars of Heracles, which is called Oceanus. First of all, on their passage through these pillars, they founded upon a peninsula of Europe a city which they called Gadeira. . . . This foundation of Gades, which on the coins is called Gadir and Agadir, i. e. wall, fortification, the modern Cadiz, and without doubt the most ancient city in Europe which has preserved its name, is said to have taken place in the year 1100 B. C. If Ityke was founded before 1100 B. C. or about that time, we have no reason to doubt the founding of Gades soon after that date. Hence the ships of the Phenicians would have reached the ocean about the time when Tiglath Pilesar I. left the Tigris with his army, trod the north of Syria, and looked on the Mediterranean."—M. Duncker, *The History of Antiquity*, *bk.* 3, *ch.* 3 (*v.* 3).—"The typical Phœnician colony was only a trading station, inhabited by dealers, who had not ceased to be counted as citizens of the parent State. . . . In Phœnicia itself the chief object of public interest was the maintenance and extension of foreign trade. The wealth of the country depended on the profits of the merchants, and it was therefore the interest of the Government to encourage and protect the adventures of the citizens. Unlike the treasures or curiosities imported by the fleets of royal adventurers, Phœnician imports were not intended to be consumed within the country, but to be exchanged for the most part for other commodities. The products of all lands were brought to market there, and the market people, after supplying all their own wants in kind, still had commodities to sell at a profit to the rest of the world. The Government did not seek to retain a monopoly of this profit; on the contrary, private enterprise seems to have been more untrammelled than at any time before the present century. But individuals and the State were agreed in desiring to retain a monopoly of foreign traffic as against the rest of the world, hence the invention of 'Phœnician lies' about the dangers of the sea, and the real dangers which 'Tyrian seas' came to possess for navigators of any other nation. . . . Phœnician traders were everywhere first in the field, and it was easy for them to persuade their barbarous customers that foreigners of any other stock were dangerous and should be treated as enemies. They themselves relied more on stratagem than on open warfare to keep the seas, which they considered their own, free from other navigators. . . . Silver and gold, wool and purple, couches inlaid with ivory, Babylonish garments and carpets, unguents of all sorts, female slaves and musicians, are indicated by the comic poets as forming part of the typical cargo of a Phœnician merchantman, the value of which in many cases would reach a far higher figure than a small ship-owner or captain could command.

PHŒNICIANS.

As a consequence, a good deal of banking or money-lending business was done by the wealthy members of the great Corporation of Merchants and Ship-owners. The Phœnicians had an evil reputation with the other nations of the Mediterranean for sharp practices, and the custom of lending money at interest was considered, of course wrongly, a Phœnician invention, though it is possible that they led the way in the general substitution of loans at interest for the more primitive use of antichretic pledges. . . . To the Greeks the name Phœnician seems to have called up the same sort of association as those which still cling to the name of Jew in circles which make no boast of tolerance; and it is probable enough that the first, like the second, great race of wandering traders was less scrupulous in its dealings with aliens than compatriots. . . . So far as the Punic race may be supposed to have merited its evil reputation, one is tempted to account for the fact by the character of its principal staples. All the products of all the countries of the world circulated in Phœnician merchantmen, but the two most considerable, and most profitable articles of trade in which they dealt were human beings and the precious metals. The Phœnicians were the slave-dealers and the money-changers of the Old World. And it is evident that a branch of trade, which necessarily follows the methods of piracy, is less favourable to the growth of the social virtues than the cultivation of the ground, the domestication of animals, or the arts and manufactures by which the products of nature are applied to new and varied uses. Compared with the trade in slaves, that in metals — gold, silver, copper and tin — must seem innocent and meritorious; yet the experience of ages seems to show that, somehow or other, mining is not a moralizing industry. . . . Sidon was famous in Homer's time for copper or bronze, and Tyre in Solomon's for bronze (the 'brass' of the Authorized Version); and the Phœnicians retailed the work of all other metallurgists as well as their own, as they retailed the manufactures of Egypt and Babylonia, and the gums and spices of Arabia. . . . Two things are certain with regard to the continental commerce of Europe before the written history of its northern countries begins. Tin and amber were conveyed by more than one route from Cornwall and the North Sea to Mediterranean ports. In the latter case the traders proceeded up the Rhine and the Aar, along the Jura to the Rhone, and thence down to Marseilles; and also across the Alps, by a track forking off, perhaps at Grenoble, into the valley of the Po, and so to the Adriatic. . . . Apart from the Phœnician sea trade, Cornish tin was conveyed partly by water to Armorica and to Marseilles through the west of France; but also to the east of England (partly overland by the route known later as the Pilgrims' Way), and from the east of Kent, possibly to the seat of the amber trade, as well as to a route through the east of France, starting from the short Dover crossing."—E. J. Simcox, *Primitive Civilizations, v.* 1, *pp.* 397–402.—"The epigraphic texts left us by the Phœnicians are too short and dry to give us any of those vivid glimpses into the past that the historian loves. When we wish to make the men of Tyre and Sidon live again, when we try to see them as they moved in those seven or eight centuries during which they were supreme in the Mediterranean, we have to turn to the Greeks, to Herodotus and Homer, for the details of our picture; it is in their pages that we are told how these eastern traders made themselves indispensable to the half-savage races of Europe. . . . The Phœnicians carried on their trade in a leisurely way. It consisted for the most part in exchanging their manufactured wares for the natural produce of the countries they visited; it was in conformity with the spirit of the time, and, although it inspired distrust, it was regular enough in its methods. Stories told by both Homer and Herodotus show them to us as abductors of women and children, but in the then state of the world even deeds like those described would soon be forgotten, and after a time the faithless traders would be readmitted for the sake of the wares they brought. . . . Seeing how great their services were to the civilization of Greece and Rome, and how admirable were those virtues of industry, activity, and splendid courage that they brought to their work, how is it that the classic writers speak of the Phœnicians with so little sympathy? and why does the modern historian, in spite of his breadth and freedom from bias, find it difficult to treat them even with justice? It is because, in spite of their long relations with them, the peoples of Greece and Italy never learnt to really know the Phœnicians or to understand their language, and, to answer the second question, because our modern historians are hardly better informed. Between Greece and Rome on the one hand and Phœnicia and Carthage on the other, there was a barrier which was never beaten down. They traded and fought, but they never concluded a lasting and cordial peace; they made no effort to comprehend each other's nature, but retained their mutual, ignorant antipathy to the very end. . . . That full justice has never been done to the Phœnicians is partly their own fault. They were moved neither by the passion for truth nor by that for beauty; they cared only for gain, and thanks to the condition of the world at the time they entered upon the scene, they could satisfy that lust to the full. In the barter trade they carried on for so many centuries the advantage must always have been for the more civilized, and the Phœnicians used and abused that advantage. Tyre and Sidon acquired prodigious wealth; the minds of their people were exclusively occupied with the useful; they were thinking always of the immediate profit to themselves in every transaction; and to such a people the world readily denies justice, to say nothing of indulgence. . . . No doubt it may be said that it was quite without their goodwill that the Phœnicians helped other nations to shake off barbarism and to supply themselves with the material of civilized life. That, of course, is true, but it does not diminish the importance of the results obtained through their means. Phœnicia appropriated for herself all the inventions and recipes of the old eastern civilizations and by more than one happy discovery, and especially by the invention of the alphabet, she added to the value of the treasure thus accumulated. Whether she meant it or not, she did, as a fact, devote her energies to the dissemination of all this precious knowledge from the very day on which she entered into relations with those tribes on the Grecian islands and on the continent of Europe which were as yet strangers to political life.

. . . At the time of their greatest expansion, the true Phœnicians numbered, at the very most, a few hundreds of thousands. It was with such scanty numbers that they contrived to be present everywhere, to construct ports of refuge for their ships, factories for their merchants and warehouses for their goods. These 'English of antiquity,' as they have been so well called, upheld their power by means very similar to those employed by England, who has succeeded for two centuries in holding together her vast colonial empire by a handful of soldiers and a huge fleet of ships. The great difference lies in the fact that Tyre made no attempt to subjugate and govern the nations she traded with."—G. Perrot and C. Chipiez, *Hist. of Art in Phœnicia, v. 2, ch. 6.*—The ascendancy among Phœnician cities passed at some early day from Sidon to Tyre, and the decline of the former has been ascribed to an attack from the Philistines of Ascalon, which occurred about 1250 or 1200 B. C. But the explanation seems questionable.—G. Rawlinson, *Hist. of Phœnicia, ch. 14.*—See TYRE.

Coinage and Money. See MONEY AND BANKING: PHŒNICIA.

B. C. 850-538.—Subjection to Assyria and Babylonia.—About 850 B. C. "the military expeditions of the Assyrians began to reach Southern Syria, and Phœnician independence seems to have been lost. We cannot be sure that the submission was continuous; but from the middle of the ninth till past the middle of the eighth century there occur in the contemporary monuments of Assyria plain indications of Phœnician subjection, while there is no evidence of resistance or revolt. . . . About B. C. 743 the passive submission of Phœnicia to the Assyrian yoke began to be exchanged for an impatience of it, and frequent efforts were made, from this date till Nineveh fell, to re-establish Phœnician independence. These efforts for the most part failed; but it is not improbable that finally, amid the troubles under which the Assyrian empire succumbed, success crowned the nation's patriotic exertions, and autonomy was recovered. . . . Scarcely, however, had Assyria fallen when a new enemy appeared upon the scene. Nechoh of Egypt, about B. C. 608, conquered the whole tract between his own borders and the Euphrates. Phœnicia submitted or was reduced, and remained for three years an Egyptian dependency. Nebuchadnezzar, in B. C. 605, after his defeat of Nechoh at Carchemish, added Phœnicia to Babylon; and, though Tyre revolted from him eight years later, B. C. 598, and resisted for thirteen years all his attempts to reduce her, yet at length she was compelled to submit, and the Babylonian yoke was firmly fixed on the entire Phœnician people. It is not quite certain that they did not shake it off upon the death of the great Babylonian king; but, on the whole, probability is in favour of their having remained subject till the conquest of Babylon by Cyrus, B. C. 538."—G. Rawlinson, *Manual of Ancient Hist., bk. 1, pt. 1, sect. 6.*—"It appears to have been only a few years after Nebuchadnezzar's triumphant campaign against Neco that renewed troubles broke out in Syria. Phœnicia revolted under the leadership of Tyre; and about the same time Jehoiakim, the Jewish king, having obtained a promise of aid from the Egyptians, renounced his allegiance. Upon this, in his seventh year (B. C. 598), Nebuchadnezzar proceeded once more into Palestine at the head of a vast army, composed partly of his allies, the Medes, partly of his own subjects. He first invested Tyre; but finding that city too strong to be taken by assault, he left a portion of his army to continue the siege, while he himself pressed forward against Jerusalem. . . . The siege of Tyre was still being pressed at the date of the second investment of Jerusalem. . . . Tyre, if it fell at the end of its thirteen years' siege, must have been taken in the very year which followed the capture of Jerusalem, B. C. 585. . . . It has been questioned whether the real Tyre, the island city, actually fell on this occasion (Heeren, As. Nat. vol. ii. p. 11, E. T.; Kenrick, Phœnicia, p. 390), chiefly because Ezekiel says, about B. C. 570, that Nebuchadnezzar had 'received no wages for the service that he served against it.' (Ezek. xxix. 18.) But this passage may be understood to mean that he had had no sufficient wages. Berosus expressly stated that Nebuchadnezzar reduced all Phœnicia."—The same, *Five Great Monarchies: Babylonia, ch. 8, and footnote.*

Later commerce.—"The commerce of Phœnicia appears to have reached its greatest height about the time of the rise of the Chaldæan power at Babylon. Its monopoly may have been more complete in earlier times, but the range of its traffic was more confined. Nebuchadnezzar was impelled to attempt its conquest by a double motive—to possess himself of its riches and to become master of its harbours and its navy. The prophet Ezekiel (ch. 27), foretelling his siege of Tyre, has drawn a picture of its commerce, which is the most valuable document for its commercial history that has come down to us. . . . Directly or indirectly, the commerce of Tyre, in the beginning of the sixth century before Christ, thus embraced the whole known world. By means of the Arabian and the Persian gulfs it communicated with India and the coast of Africa towards the equator. On the north its vessels found their way along the Euxine to the frozen borders of Scythia. Beyond the Straits of Gibraltar, its ships, or those of its colony of Gades, visited the British isles for tin, if they did not penetrate into the Baltic to bring back amber. Ezekiel says nothing of the voyages of the Tyrians in the Atlantic ocean, which lay beyond the limits of Jewish geography; but it is probable that they had several centuries before passed the limits of the Desert on the western coast of Africa, and by the discovery of one of the Canaries had given rise to the Greek fable of the Islands of the Blessed."—J. Kenrick, *Phœnicia, ch. 6.*

ALSO IN: A. H. L. Heeren, *Hist. Researches, v. 1.*—J. Yeats, *Growth and Vicissitudes of Commerce, ch. 3.*—G. Rawlinson, *Hist. of Phœnicia, ch. 9, and 14, sect. 2.*—R. Bosworth Smith, *Carthage and the Carthaginians, ch. 1.*

B. C. 332, and after.—Final history. See TYRE.

PHŒNIX CLUBS. See IRELAND: A. D. 1858-1867.

PHŒNIX PARK MURDERS, The. See IRELAND: A. D. 1882.

PHOKIANS, The.—"The Phokians [in ancient Greece] were bounded on the north by the little territories called Doris and Dryopis, which separated them from the Malians,—on the north-

east, east and south-west by the different branches of Lokrians,—and on the south-east by the Bœotians. They touched the Eubœan sea . . . at Daphnus, the point where it approaches nearest to their chief town, Elateia; their territory also comprised most part of the lofty and bleak range of Parnassus, as far as its southerly termination, where a lower portion of it, called Kirphis, projects into the Corinthian Gulf, between the two bays of Antikyra and Krissa; the latter, with its once fertile plain, was in proximity to the sacred rock of the Delphian Apollo. Both Delphi and Krissa originally belonged to the Phokian race. But the sanctity of the temple, together with Lacedæmonian aid, enabled the Delphians to set up for themselves, disavowing their connexion with the Phokian brotherhood. Territorially speaking, the most valuable part of Phokis consisted in the valley of the river Kephisus. . . . It was on the projecting mountain ledges and rocks on each side of this river that the numerous little Phokian towns were situated. Twenty-two of them were destroyed and broken up into villages by the Amphiktyonic order, after the second Sacred War."—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece, pt.* 2, *ch.* 3.—See Sacred Wars.

PHORMIO, and the sea victories of. See Greece: B. C. 429–427.

PHRATRIÆ. See Phylæ; also, Athens: B. C. 510–507.

PHRYGIAN CAP OF LIBERTY, The. See Liberty Cap.

PHRYGIAN SIBYL. See Sibyls.

PHRYGIANS.—MYSIANS.—"When the Assyrians in the thirteenth century [B. C.] advanced past the springs of the Euphrates into the western peninsula [of Asia Minor], they found, on the central table-land, a mighty body of native population—the Phrygians. The remains of their language tend to show them to have been the central link between the Greeks and the elder Aryans. They called their Zeus Bagalus ('baga' in ancient Persian signifying God; 'bhaga,' in Sanscrit, fortune), or Sabazius, from a verb common to Indian and Greek, and signifying 'to adore.' They possessed the vowels of the Greeks, and in the terminations of words changed the 'm' into 'n.' Kept off from the sea, they, it is true, lagged behind the coast tribes in civilization, and were regarded by these as men slow of understanding and only suited for inferior duties in human society. Yet they too had a great and independent post of their own, which is mirrored in the native myths of their kings. The home of these myths is especially in the northern regions of Phrygia, on the banks of the springs which feed the Sangarius, flowing in mighty curves through Bithynia into Pontus. Here traditions survived of the ancient kings of the land, of Gordius and Midas."—E. Curtius, *Hist. of Greece, v.* 1, *bk.* 1, *ch.* 3.—"As far as any positive opinion can be formed respecting nations of whom we know so little, it would appear that the Mysians and Phrygians are a sort of connecting link between Lydians and Karians on one side, and Thracians (European as well as Asiatic) on the other—a remote ethnical affinity pervading the whole. Ancient migrations are spoken of in both directions across the Hellespont and the Thracian Bosphorus. It was the opinion of some that Phrygians, Mysians and Thracians had immigrated into Asia from Europe. . . . On the other hand, Herodotus speaks of a vast body of Teukrians and Mysians who, before the Trojan war, had crossed the strait from Asia into Europe. . . . The Phrygians also are supposed by some to have originally occupied an European soil on the borders of Macedonia, . . . while the Mysians are said to have come from the north-eastern portions of European Thrace south of the Danube, known under the Roman empire by the name of Mœsia. But with respect to the Mysians there was also another story, according to which they were described as colonists emanating from the Lydians. . . . And this last opinion was supported by the character of the Mysian language, half Lydian and half Phrygian."—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece, pt.* 2, *ch.* 16.—The Mysians occupied the north-western corner of Asia Minor, including the region of the Troad. "In the works of the great Greek writers which have come down to us, notably, in the histories of Herodotus and Thucydides, the Phrygians figure but little. To the Greeks generally they were known but as the race whence most of their slaves were drawn, as a people branded with the qualities of slaves, idleness, cowardice, effeminacy. . . . From the Phrygians came those orgiastic forms of religious cult which were connected with the worship of Dionysus and of the Mother of the Gods, orgies which led alike to sensual excess and to hideous self-mutilations, to semi-religious frenzy and bestial immoralities, against which the strong good-sense of the better Greeks set itself at all periods, though it could not deprive them of their attractions for the lowest of the people. And yet it was to this race sunk in corruption, except when roused by frenzy, that the warlike Trojan stock belonged. Hector and Aeneas were Phrygians; and the most manly race of the ancient world, the Romans, were proud of their supposed descent from shepherds of Phrygia."—P. Gardner, *New Chapters in Greek History, ch.* 2.

PHUT. See Libyans.

PHYLÆ.—PHRATRIÆ.—GENTES.—"In all Greek states, without exception, the people was divided into tribes or Phylæ, and those again into the smaller subdivisions of Phratriæ and gentes, and the distribution so made was employed to a greater or less extent for the common organisation of the State."—G. F. Schömann, *Antiquities of Greece: The State, pt.* 2, *ch.* 4.—The four Attic tribes were called, during the later period of that division, the Geleontes, Hopletes, Ægikoreis, and Argadeis. "It is affirmed, and with some etymological plausibility, that the denominations of these four tribes must originally have had reference to the occupations of those who bore them,—the Hopletes being the warriour-class, the Ægikoreis goatherds, the Argadeis artisans, and the Geleontes (Teleontes or Gedeontes) cultivators. Hence some authors have ascribed to the ancient inhabitants of Attica an actual primitive distribution into hereditary professions or castes, similar to that which prevailed in India and Egypt. If we should even grant that such a division into castes might originally have prevailed, it must have grown obsolete long before the time of Solon; but there seem no sufficient grounds for believing that it ever did prevail. . . . The four tribes, and the four names (allowing for some variations of reading), are therefore historically verified. But neither the time of their introduction, nor

their primitive import, are ascertainable matters. . . . These four tribes may be looked at either as religious and social aggregates, in which capacity each of them comprised three Phratries and ninety Gentes; or as political aggregates, in which point of view each included three Trittyes and twelve Naukraries. Each Phratry contained thirty Gentes; each Trittys comprised four Naukraries: the total numbers were thus 360 Gentes and 48 Naukraries. Moreover, each gens is said to have contained thirty heads of families, of whom therefore there would be a total of 10,800. . . . That every Phratry contained an equal number of Gentes, and every Gens an equal number of families, is a supposition hardly admissible without better evidence than we possess. But apart from this questionable precision of numerical scale, the Phratries and Gentes themselves were real, ancient and durable associations among the Athenian people, highly important to be understood. The basis of the whole was the house, hearth or family,— a number of which, greater or less, composed the Gens, or Genos. This Gens was therefore a clan, sept, or enlarged, and partly factitious, brotherhood. . . . All these phratric and gentile associations, the larger as well as the smaller, were founded upon the same principles and tendencies of the Grecian mind — a coalescence of the idea of worship with that of ancestry, or of communion in certain special religious rites with communion of blood, real or supposed. The god, or hero, to whom the assembled members offered their sacrifices, was conceived as the primitive ancestor, to whom they owed their origin. . . . The revolution of Kleisthenes in 509 B. C. abolished the old tribes for civil purposes, and created ten new tribes,— leaving the Phratries and Gentes unaltered, but introducing the local distribution according to demes or cantons, as the foundation of his new political tribes. A certain number of demes belonged to each of the ten Kleisthenean tribes (the demes in the same tribes were not usually contiguous, so that the tribe was not coincident with a definite circumscription), and the deme, in which every individual was then registered, continued to be that in which his descendants were also registered. . . . The different Gentes were very unequal in dignity, arising chiefly from the religious ceremonies of which each possessed the hereditary and exclusive administration, and which, being in some cases considered as of pre-eminent sanctity in reference to the whole city, were therefore nationalized. Thus the Eumolpidæ and Kerykes, who supplied the Hierophant and superintended the mysteries of the Eleusinian Demeter — and the Butadæ, who furnished the priestess of Athene Polias as well as the priest of Poseidon Erechtheus in the acropolis — seem to have been reverenced above all the other Gentes. When the name Butadæ was selected in the Kleisthenean arrangement as the name of a deme, the holy Gens so called adopted the distinctive denomination of Eteobutadæ, or 'The true Butadæ.'"—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece, pt.* 2, *ch.* 10.

Also in: Fustel de Coulanges, *The Ancient City, bk.* 3, *ch.* 1.

PHYLARCH. See Taxiarch.

PHYLE. See Athens: B. C. 404–403.

PHYSICIANS, First English College of. See Medical Science, 16th Century.

PIACENZA. See Placentia.

PIAGNONI, The. See Florence: A. D. 1490–1498.

PIANKISHAWS, The. See American Aborigines: Algonquian Family, and Sacs, &c.

PIASTS, OR PIASSES, The. See Poland: Beginnings, &c.

PIAVE, Battle on the. See Germany: A. D. 1809 (January—June).

PI-BESETH. See Bubastis.

PICARDS, The Religious Sect of the.— "The reforming movement of Bohemia [15th century] had drawn thither persons from other countries whose opinions were obnoxious to the authorities of the church. Among these, the most remarkable were known by the name of Picards,— apparently a form of the word 'beghards' [see Beguines], which . . . was then widely applied to sectaries. These Picards appear to have come from the Low Countries."— J. C. Robertson, *Hist. of the Christian Church, v.* 8, *p.* 24.—See, also, Paulicians.

PICARDY.— PICARDS.— "Whimsical enough is the origin of the name of Picards, and from thence of Picardie, which does not date earlier than A. D. 1200. It was an academical joke, an epithet first applied to the quarrelsome humour of those students in the university of Paris who came from the frontier of France and Flanders."—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, ch.* 58, *foot-note* 1.

PICENIANS, The. See Sabines.

PICHEGRU, Campaign and political intrigues of. See France; A. D. 1794 (March—July); 1794–1795 (October—May); 1795 (June—December); 1797 (September); and 1804–1805.

PICHINCHA, Battle of (1822). See Colombian States: A. D. 1819–1830.

PICKAWILLANY. See Ohio (Valley): A. D. 1748–1754.

PICTAVI. See Poitiers: Original Names.

PICTONES, The.— "The Pictones [of ancient Gaul], whose name is represented by Poitou, and the Santones (Saintonge) occupied the coast between the lower Loire and the great aestuary of the Garonne."— G. Long, *Decline of the Roman Republic, v.* 4, *ch.* 6.

PICTS AND SCOTS. See Scotland: The Picts and Scots.

PICTURE-WRITING. See Aztec and Maya Picture-Writing; also Hieroglyphics.

PIE-POWDER COURT, The.— "There was one special court [in London, during the Middle Ages], which met to decide disputes arising on market-days, or among travellers and men of business, and which reminds us of the old English tendency to decide quickly and definitely, without entering into any long written or verbal consideration of the question at issue; and this was known as the Pie-powder Court, a corruption of the old French words, 'pieds poudres,' the Latin 'pedes pulverizati,' in which the complainant and the accused were supposed not to have shaken the dust from off their feet."— R. Pauli, *Pictures of Old England, ch.* 12.

PIECES OF EIGHT. See Spanish Coins.

PIEDMONT: Primitive inhabitants. See Ligurians.

History. See Savoy and Piedmont.

PIEDMONT, Va., Battle of. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1864 (May—June: Virginia) The Campaigning in the Shenandoah.

PIEGANS. See American Aborigines: Blackfeet.

PIERCE, Franklin: Presidential election and administration. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1852, to 1857.

PIGNEROL: A. D. 1630-1631.—Siege, capture and purchase by the French. See Italy: A. D. 1627–1631.

A. D. 1648.—Secured to France in the Peace of Westphalia. See Germany: A. D. 1648.

A. D. 1659.—Ceded to France. See France: A. D. 1659–1661.

A. D. 1697.—Ceded to the Duke of Savoy. See Savoy: A. D. 1580–1713.

PIGNEROL, Treaty of. See Waldenses: A. D. 1655.

PIKE'S PEAK MINING REGION. See Colorado: A. D. 1806–1876.

PILATE, Pontius. See Jews: B. C. 40—A. D. 44; and A. D. 26.

PILGRIMAGE OF GRACE, The. See England: A. D. 1535–1539.

PILGRIMS.—PILGRIM FATHERS.—In American history, the familiar designation of the little company of English colonists who sailed for the New World in the Mayflower, A. D. 1620, seeking religious freedom, and who landed at Plymouth Rock. See Independents or Separatists, and Massachusetts: A. D. 1620.

PILLOW, Fort: A. D. 1862.—Evacuated by the Confederates. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1862 (June: On the Mississippi).

A. D. 1864.—Capture and Massacre. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1864 (April: Tennessee).

PILNITZ, The Declaration of. See France: A. D. 1791 (July—September).

PILOT KNOB, Attack on. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1864 (March—October: Arkansas—Missouri).

PILSEN, Capture by Count Ernest of Mansfeld (1618). See Germany: A. D. 1618–1620.

PILUM, The.—The Roman spear was called the pilum. "It was, according to [Polybius], a spear having a very large iron head or blade, and this was carried by a socket to receive the shaft. . . . By the soldiers of the legions, to whom the use of the pilum was restricted, this weapon was both hurled from the hand as a javelin, and grasped firmly, as well for the charge as to resist and beat down hostile attacks."—P. Lacombe, *Arms and Armour, ch.* 4.

PIMAN FAMILY, The. See American Aborigines: Piman Family.

PIMENTEIRAS, The. See American Aborigines: Guck or Coco Group.

PINDARIS, OR PINDHARIES, The. See India: A. D. 1816–1819.

PINE TREE MONEY.—Between 1652 and 1684 the colony of Massachusetts coined silver shillings and smaller coins, which bore on their faces the rude figure of a pine tree, and are called "pine tree money." See Money and Banking: 17th Century.

PINEROLO. See Pignerol.

PINKIE, Battle of (1547). See Scotland: A. D. 1544–1548.

PIPE ROLLS. See Exchequer.

PIPPIN, OR PEPIN, of Heristal, Austrasian Mayor of the Palace, and Duke of the Franks, A. D. 687–714.....Pippin, or Pepin, the Short, Duke and Prince of the Franks, 741–752; King, 752–768.

PIQUETS AND ZINGLINS. See Hayti: A. D. 1804–1880.

PIRÆUS, The.—This was the important harbor of Athens, constructed and fortified during and after the Persian wars; a work which the Athenians owed to the genius and energy of Themistocles. The name was sometimes applied to the whole peninsula in which the Piræus is situated, and which contained two other harbors—Munychia and Zea. Phalerum, which had previously been the harbor of Athens, lay to the east. The walls built by Themistocles "were carried round the whole of the peninsula in a circumference of seven miles, following the bend of its rocky rim, and including the three harbour-bays. At the mouths of each of the harbours a pair of towers rose opposite to one another at so short a distance that it was possible to connect them by means of chains: these were the locks of the Piræus. The walls, about 16 feet thick, were built without mortar, of rectangular blocks throughout, and were raised to a height of 30 feet by Themistocles, who is said to have originally intended to give them double that height."—E. Curtius, *Hist. of Greece, bk.* 3, *ch.* 2.

Also in: W. M. Leake, *Topography of Athens, sect.* 10.—See, also, Athens: B. C. 489–480.

PIRATES OF CILICIA, The. See Cilicia, Pirates of.

PIRMASENS, Battle of (1793). See France: A. D. 1793 (July—December) Progress of the War.

PIRNA, Saxon Surrender at. See Germany: A. D. 1756.

PIRU, OR CHONTAQUIROS, The. See American Aborigines: Andesians.

PISA, Greece. See Elis; and Olympic Games.

PISA, Italy: Origin of the city.—Early growth of its commerce and naval power.—Conquest of Sardinia.—Strabo and others have given Pisa a Grecian origin. "Situated near the sea upon the triangle formed in past ages, by the confluence of the two rivers, the Arno and the Serchio; she was highly adapted to commerce and navigation; particularly in times when these were carried on with small vessels. We consequently find that she was rich and mercantile in early times, and frequented by all the barbarous nations. . . . Down to the end of the fifteenth century, almost all the navigation of the nations of Europe, as well as those of Asia and Africa, which kept a correspondence and commerce with the former, was limited to the Mediterranean, Adriatic, Archipelago, and Euxine seas; and the first three Italian republics, Pisa, Genoa, and Venice, were for a long time mistresses of it. Pisa, as far back as the year 925, was the principal city of Tuscany, according to Luitprand. In the beginning of the eleventh century, that is, in the year 1004, we find in the Pisan annals, that the latter waged war with the Lucchese and beat them; this is the first enterprise of one Italian city against another, which proves that she already acted for herself, and was in great part, if not wholly, liberated from the dominion

of the Duke of Tuscany. In the Pisan annals, and in other authors, we meet with a series of enterprises, many of which are obscurely related, or perhaps exaggerated. Thus we find that in the year 1005, in an expedition of the Pisans against the maritime city of Reggio, Pisa being left unprovided with defenders, Musetto, king, or head, of the Saracens, who occupied Sardinia, seized the opportunity of making an invasion; and having sacked the city, departed, or was driven out of it. . . . It was very natural for the Pisans and Genoese, who must have been in continual fear of the piracies and invasions of the barbarians as long as they occupied Sardinia, to think seriously of exterminating them from that country: the pope himself sent the Bishop of Ostia in haste to the Pisans as legate, to encourage them to the enterprise: who, joining with the Genoese, conquered Sardinia [1017] by driving out the Saracens; and the pope, by the right he thought he possessed over all the kingdoms of the earth, invested the Pisans with the dominion; not however without exciting the jealousy of the Genoese, who, as they were less powerful in those times, were obliged to yield to force. The mutual necessity of defence from the common enemy kept them united; the barbarians having disembarked in the year 1020 in Sardinia under the same leader, they were again repulsed, and all their treasure which remained a booty of the conquerors, was conceded to the Genoese as an indemnity for the expense."—L. Pignotti, *Hist. of Tuscany, v.* 1, *ch.* 7.

A. D. 1063-1293.—Architectural development.—Disastrous war with Genoa.—The great defeat at Meloria.—Count Ugolino and his fate.—War with Florence and Lucca.—"The republic of Pisa was one of the first to make known to the world the riches and power which a small state might acquire by the aid of commerce and liberty. Pisa had astonished the shores of the Mediterranean by the number of vessels and galleys that sailed under her flag, by the succor she had given the crusaders, by the fear she had inspired at Constantinople, and by the conquest of Sardinia and the Balearic Isles. Pisa was the first to introduce into Tuscany the arts that ennoble wealth: her dome, her baptistery, her leaning tower, and her Campo Santo, which the traveller's eye embraces at one glance, but does not weary of beholding, had been successively built from the year 1063 to the end of the 12th century. These chefs-d'œuvre had animated the genius of the Pisans; the great architects of the 13th century were, for the most part, pupils of Nicolas di Pisa. But the moment was come in which the ruin of this glorious republic was at hand; a deep-rooted jealousy, to be dated from the conquest of Sardinia, had frequently, during the last two centuries, armed against each other the republics of Genoa and Pisa: a new war between them broke out in 1282. It is difficult to comprehend how two simple cities could put to sea such prodigious fleets as those of Pisa and Genoa. In 1282, Ginicel Sismondi commanded 30 Pisan galleys, of which he lost the half in a tempest, on the 9th of September; the following year, Rosso Sismondi commanded 64; in 1284, Guido Jacia commanded 24, and was vanquished. The Pisans had recourse the same year to a Venetian admiral, Alberto Morosini, to whom they intrusted 103 galleys: but whatever efforts they made, the Genoese constantly opposed a superior fleet. This year [1284], however, all the male population of the two republics seemed assembled on their vessels; they met on the 6th of August, 1284, once more before the Isle of Meloria, rendered famous 43 years before by the victory of the Pisans over the same enemies [when the Ghibelline friendship of Pisa for the Emperor Frederick II. induced her to intercept and attack, on the 3d of May, 1241, a Genoese fleet which conveyed many prelates to a great council called by Pope Gregory IX. with hostile intentions towards the Emperor, and which the latter desired to prevent]. Valor was still the same, but fortune had changed sides; and a terrible disaster effaced the memory of an ancient victory. While the two fleets, almost equal in number, were engaged, a reinforcement of 30 Genoese galleys, driven impetuously by the wind, struck the Pisan fleet in flank: 7 of their vessels were instantly sunk, 28 taken. 5,000 citizens perished in the battle, and 11,000 who were taken prisoners to Genoa preferred death in captivity rather than their republic should ransom them, by giving up Sardinia to the Genoese. This prodigious loss ruined the maritime power of Pisa; the same nautical knowledge, the same spirit of enterprise, were not transmitted to the next generation. All the fishermen of the coast quitted the Pisan galleys for those of Genoa. The vessels diminished in number, with the means of manning them; and Pisa could no longer pretend to be more than the third maritime power in Italy. While the republic was thus exhausted by this great reverse of fortune, it was attacked by the league of the Tuscan Guelphs; and a powerful citizen, to whom it had intrusted itself, betrayed his country to enslave it. Ugolino was count of the Gherardesca, a mountainous country situated along the coast, between Leghorn and Piombino: he was of Ghibeline origin, but had married his sister to Giovan di Gallura, chief of the Guelphs of Pisa and of Sardinia. From that time he artfully opposed the Guelphs to the Ghibelines." The Pisans, thinking him to be the person best able to reconcile Pisa with the Guelph league "named Ugolino captain-general for ten years: and the new commander did, indeed, obtain peace with the Guelph league; but not till he had caused all the fortresses of the Pisan territory to be opened by his creatures to the Lucchese and Florentines. . . . From that time he sought only to strengthen his own despotism." In July, 1288, there was a rising of the Pisans against him; his palace was stormed and burned; and he, his two sons and two grandsons, were dragged out of the flames, to be locked in a tower and starved to death—as told in the verse of Dante. "The victory over count Ugolino, achieved by the most ardent of the Ghibelines, redoubled the enthusiasm and audacity of that party; and soon determined them to renew the war with the Guelphs of Tuscany. . . . Guido de Montefeltro was named captain. He had acquired a high reputation in defending Forli against the French forces of Charles of Anjou; and the republic had not to repent of its choice. He recovered by force of arms all the fortresses which Ugolino had given up to the Lucchese and Florentines. The Pisan militia, whom Montefeltro armed with cross-bows, which he had trained them to use with precision, became the terror of Tuscany. The Guelphs of Florence

and Lucca were glad to make peace in 1293."—J. C. L. de Sismondi, *Hist. of the Italian Republics, ch.* 5.—In 1290, when Pisa was in her greatest distress, Genoa suddenly joined again in the attack on her ancient rival. She sent an expedition under Conrad d'Oria which entered the harbor of Pisa, pulled down its towers, its bridge and its forts, and carried away the chain which locked the harbor entrance. The latter trophy was only restored to Pisa in recent years.—J. T. Bent, *Genoa, ch.* 4.

Also in: H. E. Napier, *Florentine Hist., bk.* 1, *ch.* 12 (*v.* 1).

A. D. 1100-1111.—Participation in the first Crusades. See Crusades: A. D. 1104–1111.

A. D. 1135-1137.—Destruction of Amalfi. See Amalfi.

13th Century.—Commercial rivalry with Venice and Genoa at Constantinople. See Constantinople: A. D. 1261–1453.

A. D. 1311-1313.—Welcome to the Emperor Henry VII.—Aid to his war against Florence. See Italy: A. D. 1310–1313.

A. D. 1313-1328.—Military successes under Uguccione della Faggiuola.—His tyranny and its overthrow.—Subjection to Castruccio Castracani and the deliverance. See Italy: A. D. 1313–1330.

A. D. 1341.—Defeat of the Florentines before Lucca.—Acquisition of that city. See Florence: A. D. 1341–1343.

A. D. 1353-1364.—Dealings with the Free Companies.—War with Florence. See Italy: A. D. 1343–1393.

A. D. 1399-1406.—Betrayal to Visconti of Milan.—Sale to the Florentines.—Conquest by them and subsequent decline. See Italy: A. D. 1402–1406.

A. D. 1409.—The General Council of the Church. See Papacy: A. D. 1377–1417.

A. D. 1494-1509.—Delivered by the French.—The faithlessness of Charles VIII.—Thirteen years of struggle against Florence.—Final surrender.—"The Florentine conquest was the beginning of 90 years of slavery for Pisa—a terrible slavery, heavy with exaggerated imports, bitter with the tolerated plunder of private Florentines, humiliating with continual espionage. . . . Pisa was the Ireland of Florence, captive and yet unvanquished. . . . At last a favourable chance was offered to the Pisans. . . . In the autumn of 1494, the armies of Charles VIII. poured into Italy [see Italy: A. D. 1494–1496]. It had been the custom of the Florentines, in times of war and danger, to call the heads of every Pisan household into Florence, as hostages for the good behaviour of their families and fellow citizens. But in the autumn of 1494, Piero de' Medici who forgot everything, who had forgotten to garrison his frontier, forgot to call the Pisan hostages to Florence, although the French were steadily advancing on Tuscany, and the Pisans eager to rebel. . . . The French army and the hope of liberty entered the unhappy city hand in hand [November 8, 1494]. . . . That night the Florentines in Pisa—men in office, judges, merchants, and soldiers of the garrison—were driven at the sword's point out of the rebellious city. . . . Twenty-four hours after the entry of the French, Pisa was a free republic, governed by a Gonfalonier, six Priors, and a Balia of Ten, with a new militia of its own, and, for the first time in eight and eighty years, a Pisan garrison in the ancient citadel." All this was done with the assent of the King of France and the promise of his protection. But when he passed on to Florence, and was faced there by the resolute Capponi, he signed a treaty in which he promised to give back Pisa to Florence when he returned from Naples. He returned from Naples the next summer (1495), hard pressed and retreating from his recent triumphs, and halted with his army at Pisa. There the tears and distress of the friendly Pisans moved even his soldiers to cry out in protestation against the surrender of the city to its former bondage. Charles compromised by a new treaty with the Florentines, again agreeing to deliver Pisa to them, but stipulating that they should place their old rivals on equal terms with themselves, in commerce and in civil rights. But Entragues, the French governor whom Charles had left in command at Pisa, with a small garrison, refused to carry out the treaty. He assisted the Pisans in expelling a force with which the Duke of Milan attempted to secure the city, and then, on the 1st of January, 1496, he delivered the citadel which he held into the hands of the Pisan signory. "During thirteen years from this date the shifting fortunes, the greeds and jealousies of the great Italian cities, fostered an artificial liberty in Pisa. Thrown like a ball from Milan to Venice, Venice to Maximilian, Max again to Venice, and thence to Cæsar Borgia, the unhappy Republic described the whole circle of desperate hope, agonized courage, misery, poverty, cunning, and betrayal."—A. M. F. Robinson, *The End of the Middle Ages: The French at Pisa.*—In 1509 the Pisans, reduced to the last extremity by the obstinate siege which the Florentines had maintained, and sold by the French and Spaniards, who took pay from Florence (see Venice: A. D. 1508–1509) for abandoning their cause, opened their gates to the Florentine army.—H. E. Napier, *Florentine History, bk.* 2, *ch.* 8 (*v.* 4).

Also in: T. A. Trollope, *Hist. of the Commonwealth of Florence, bk.* 8, *ch.* 6 *and bk.* 9, *ch.* 1–10.

A. D. 1512.—The attempted convocation of a Council by Louis XII. of France. See Italy: A. D. 1510–1513.

PISISTRATIDÆ, The. See Athens: B. C. 560–510.

PISTICS. See Gnostics.

PIT RIVER INDIANS, The. See American Aborigines: Modocs, &c.

PITHECUSA.—The ancient name of the island of Ischia.

PITHOM, the store city. See Jews: The Route of the Exodus.

PITT, William (Lord Chatham).—The administration of. See England: A. D. 1757–1760; 1760–1763; and 1765–1768.....**The American Revolution.** See United States of Am.: A. D. 1775 (January—March).

PITT, William (the Younger). The Administration of. See England: A. D. 1783–1787, to 1801–1806.

PITTI PALACE, The building of the. See Florence: A. D. 1458–1469.

PITTSBURG LANDING, OR SHILOH, Battle of. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1862 (February—April: Tennessee).

PITTSBURGH: A. D. 1754.—Fort Duquesne built by the French. See OHIO (VALLEY): A. D. 1754.

A. D. 1758.—Fort Duquesne abandoned by the French, occupied by the English, and named in honor of Pitt. See CANADA: A. D. 1758.

A. D. 1763.—Siege of Fort Pitt by the Indians.—Bouquet's relieving expedition. See PONTIAC'S WAR.

A. D. 1794.—The Whiskey Insurrection. See PENNSYLVANIA: A. D. 1794.

PIUS II., Pope, A. D. 1458–1464.....Pius III., Pope, 1503, September to October.....Pius IV., Pope, 1559–1565.....Pius V., Pope, 1566–1572.....Pius VI., Pope, 1775–1799.....Pius VII., Pope, 1800–1823.....Pius VIII., Pope, 1829–1830.....Pius IX., Pope, 1846–1878.

PIUTES, PAH UTES, &c. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: SHOSHONEAN FAMILY.

PIZARRO, Francisco: Discovery and conquest of Peru. See AMERICA: A. D. 1524–1528; and PERU: A. D. 1528–1531, and 1531–1533.

PLACARDS OF CHARLES V., The. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1521–1555.

PLACENTIA (modern Piacenza): The Roman colony.—Its capture by the Gauls. See ROME: B. C. 295–191.

B. C. 49.—Mutiny of Cæsar's Legions. See ROME: B. C. 49.

A. D. 270.—Defeat of the Alemanni. See ALEMANNI: A. D. 270.

14th Century.—Under the tyranny of the Visconti. See MILAN: A. D. 1277–1447.

A. D. 1513.—Conquest by Pope Julius II. See ITALY: A. D. 1510–1513.

A. D. 1515.—Restored to the duchy of Milan, and with it to the king of France. See FRANCE: A. D. 1515–1518.

A. D. 1521.—Retaken by the Pope. See FRANCE: A. D. 1520–1523.

A. D. 1545-1592.—Union with Parma in the duchy created for the House of Farnese. See PARMA: A. D. 1545–1592.

A. D. 1725.—Reversion of the duchy pledged to the Infant of Spain. See SPAIN: A. D. 1713–1725.

A. D. 1735.—Restored to Austria. See FRANCE: A. D. 1733–1735.

A. D. 1746.—Given up by the Spaniards. See ITALY: A. D. 1746–1747.

A. D. 1805.—The duchy declared a dependency of France. See FRANCE: A. D. 1804–1805.

A. D. 1814.—The duchy conferred on Marie Louise, the ex-empress of Napoleon. See FRANCE: A. D. 1814 (MARCH—APRIL).

PLACILLA, Battle of (1891). See CHILE: A. D. 1885–1891.

PLACITUM.—PLAID. See PARLIAMENT OF PARIS.

PLAGUE.—PESTILENCE.—EPIDEMICS: B. C. 466-463.—At Rome. See ROME: B. C. 466–463.

B. C. 431-429.—At Athens. See ATHENS: B. C. 430–429.

B. C. 405-375.—Among the Carthaginians.—"Within the space of less than thirty years [from B. C. 405] we read of four distinct epidemic distempers, each of frightful severity, as having afflicted Carthage and her armies in Sicily, without touching either Syracuse or the Sicilian Greeks. Such epidemics were the most irresistible of all enemies to the Carthaginians. . . . Upon what physical conditions the frequent repetition of such a calamity depended, together with the remarkable fact that it was confined to Carthage and her armies — we know partially in respect to the third of the four cases [when it was attributable in some degree to the situation of the Carthaginian camp on low, marshy ground, at a season when hot days alternated with chill nights] but not at all in regard to the others."—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece, pt. 2, ch. 83.*

A. D. 78-266.—Plague after the destruction of Herculaneum and Pompeii.—Plagues of Orosius, Antoninus, and Cyprian.—"On the cessation of the eruption of Vesuvius, which began on the 23d of August, A. D. 78, and which buried Herculaneum, Stabiæ and Pompeii in ashes, there arose . . . a destructive plague, which for many days in succession slew 10,000 men daily." The plague of Orosius (so called because Orosius, who wrote in the 5th century, described it most fully) began in the year A. D. 125. It was attributed to immense masses of grasshoppers which were swept by the winds, that year, from Africa into the Mediterranean Sea, and which were cast back by the waves to putrefy in heaps on the shore. "'In Numidia, where at that time Micipsa was king, 800,000 men perished, while in the region which lies most contiguous to the sea-shore of Carthage and Utica, more than 200,000 are said to have been cut down. In the city of Utica itself, 30,000 soldiers, who had been ordered here for the defence of all Africa, were destroyed.' . . . The plague of Antoninus (A. D. 164–180) visited the whole Roman Empire, from its most eastern to its extreme western boundaries, beginning at the former, and spreading thence by means of the troops who returned from putting down a rebellion in Syria. In the year 166 it broke out for the first time in Rome, and returned again in the year 168. . . . The plague depopulated entire cities and districts, so that forests sprung up in places before inhabited. . . . In its last year it appears to have raged again with especial fury, so that in Rome . . . 2,000 men often died in a single day. With regard to the character of this plague, it has been considered sometimes smallpox, sometimes petechial typhus, and again the bubo-plague. The third so-called plague, that of Cyprian, raged about A. D. 251–266. . . . For a long time 500 died a day in Rome. . . . After its disappearance Italy was almost deserted. . . . It has been assumed that this plague should be considered either a true bubo-plague, or smallpox."—J. H. Baas, *Outlines of the History of Medicine, pp.* 189–190.—"Niebuhr has expressed the opinion that 'the ancient world never recovered from the blow inflicted upon it by the plague which visited it in the reign of M. Aurelius.'"—C. Merivale, *Hist. of the Romans, ch.* 68, *footnote.*

ALSO IN: P. B. Watson, *Marcus Aurelius Antoninus, ch.* 4.

A. D. 542-594.—During the reign of Justinian.—"The fatal disease which depopulated the earth in the time of Justinian and his successors first appeared in the neighbourhood of Pelusium, between the Serbonian bog and the eastern chan-

PLAGUE.

nel of the Nile. From thence, tracing as it were a double path, it spread to the east, over Syria, Persia, and the Indies, and penetrated to the west, along the coast of Africa, and over the continent of Europe. In the spring of the second year, Constantinople, during three or four months, was visited by the pestilence; and Procopius, who observed its progress and symptoms with the eyes of a physician, has emulated the skill and diligence of Thucydides in the description of the plague of Athens. . . . The fever was often accompanied with lethargy or delirium; the bodies of the sick were covered with black pustules or carbuncles, the symptoms of immediate death; and in the constitutions too feeble to produce an eruption, the vomiting of blood was followed by a mortification of the bowels. . . . Youth was the most perilous season; and the female sex was less susceptible than the male. . . . It was not till the end of a calamitous period of fifty-two years [A. D. 542–594] that mankind recovered their health, or the air resumed its pure and salubrious quality. . . . During three months, five and at length ten thousand persons died each day at Constantinople; . . . many cities of the east were left vacant; . . . in several districts of Italy the harvest and the vintage withered on the ground. The triple scourge of war, pestilence, and famine, afflicted the subjects of Justinian; and his reign is disgraced by a visible decrease of the human species, which has never been repaired in some of the fairest countries of the globe."—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, ch.* 43.

Also in: T. Hodgkin, *Italy and Her Invaders, bk.* 5, *ch.* 17.—J. B. Bury, *Hist. of the Later Roman Empire, bk.* 4, *ch.* 6 (*v.* 1).

6-13th Centuries.—Spread of Small-pox.—"Nothing is known of the origin of small-pox; but it appears to have come originally from the East, and to have been known in China and Hindostan from time immemorial. . . . 'It seems to have reached Constantinople by way of Egypt about the year 569.' From Constantinople it spread gradually over the whole of Europe, reaching England about the middle of the 13th century."—R. Rollo, *Epidemics, Plagues, and Fevers, p.* 271.

A. D. 744-748.—The world-wide pestilence.—"One great calamity in the age of Constantine [the Byzantine emperor Constantine V., called Copronymus], appears to have travelled over the whole habitable world; this was the great pestilence, which made its appearance in the Byzantine empire as early as 745. It had previously carried off a considerable portion of the population of Syria, and the Caliph Yezid III. perished of the disease in 744. From Syria it visited Egypt and Africa, from whence it passed into Sicily. After making great ravages in Sicily and Calabria, it spread to Greece; and at last, in the year 747, it broke out with terrible violence in Constantinople, then probably the most populous city in the universe. It was supposed to have been introduced, and dispersed through Christian countries, by the Venetian and Greek ships employed in carrying on a contraband trade in slaves with the Mohammedan nations, and it spread wherever commerce extended. . . . This plague threatened to exterminate the Hellenic race." After it had disappeared, at the end of a year, "the capital required an immense influx of new inhabitants. To fill up the void caused by the scourge, Constantine induced many Greek families from the continent and the islands to emigrate to Constantinople."—G. Finlay, *Hist. of the Byzantine Empire, from* 716 *to* 1057, *bk.* 1, *ch.* 1, *sect.* 3.

A. D. 1348-1351.—The Black Death. See Black Death; also, England: A. D. 1348–1349.

A. D. 1360-1363.—The Children's Plague.—"The peace of Brétigni [England and France, A. D. 1360], like the capture of Calais, was followed by a pestilence that turned the national rejoicings into mourning. But the 'Children's Plague,' as it was called, from the fact that it was most deadly to the young, was fortunately not a return of the Black Death, and did not approach it in its effects. It numbered, however, three prelates and the Duke of Lancaster among its victims, and caused such anxiety in London that the courts of law were adjourned from May to October. France felt the scourge more severely. It ravaged the country for three years, and was especially fatal at Paris and at Avignon. In Ireland, where the pestilence lingered on into the next year, and proved very deadly, it was mistaken for scrofula, a circumstance which probably shows that it attacked the glands and the throat."—C. H. Pearson, *Eng. Hist. in the 14th Century, ch.* 7.

A. D. 1374.—The Dancing Mania.—"The effects of the Black Death had not yet subsided, and the graves of millions of its victims were scarcely closed, when a strange delusion arose in Germany. . . . It was a convulsion which in the most extraordinary manner infuriated the human frame, and excited the astonishment of contemporaries for more than two centuries, since which time it has never reappeared. It was called the dance of St. John or of St. Vitus, on account of the Bacchantic leaps by which it was characterized, and which gave to those affected, whilst performing their wild dance, and screaming and foaming with fury, all the appearance of persons possessed. It did not remain confined to particular localities, but was propagated by the sight of the sufferers, like a demoniacal epidemic, over the whole of Germany and the neighbouring countries to the north-west, which were already prepared for its reception by the prevailing opinions of the times. So early as the year 1374, assemblages of men and women were seen at Aix-la-Chapelle who had come out of Germany, and who, united by one common delusion, exhibited to the public both in the streets and in the churches the following strange spectacle. They formed circles hand in hand, and appearing to have lost all control over their senses, continued dancing, regardless of the by-standers, for hours together in wild delirium, until at length they fell to the ground in a state of exhaustion. They then complained of extreme oppression, and groaned as if in the agonies of death, until they were swathed in cloths, bound tightly round their waists, upon which they again recovered, and remained free from complaint until the next attack. This practice of swathing was resorted to on account of the tympany which followed these spasmodic ravings, but the by-standers frequently relieved patients in a less artificial manner, by thumping and trampling upon the parts affected. While dancing they neither saw nor heard, being insensible to external impressions through the

senses, but were haunted by visions, their fancies conjuring up spirits whose names they shrieked out; and some of them afterwards asserted that they felt as if they had been immersed in a stream of blood, which obliged them to leap so high. . . . Where the disease was completely developed, the attack commenced with epileptic convulsions. Those affected fell to the ground senseless, panting and labouring for breath. They foamed at the mouth, and suddenly springing up began their dance amidst strange contortions. Yet the malady doubtless made its appearance very variously, and was modified by temporary or local circumstances. . . . It was but a few months ere this demoniacal disease had spread from Aix-la-Chapelle, where it appeared in July, over the neighbouring Netherlands. In Liege, Utrecht, Tongres, and many other towns of Belgium, the dancers appeared with garlands in their hair, and their waists girt with cloths, that they might, as soon as the paroxysm was over, receive immediate relief on the attack of the tympany. This bandage was, by the insertion of a stick, easily twisted tight: many, however, obtained more relief from kicks and blows, which they found numbers of persons ready to administer. . . . A few months after this dancing malady had made its appearance at Aix-la-Chapelle, it broke out at Cologne, where the number of those possessed amounted to more than five hundred, and about the same time at Metz, the streets of which place are said to have been filled with eleven hundred dancers. Peasants left their ploughs, mechanics their workshops, housewives their domestic duties, to join the wild revels, and this rich commercial city became the scene of the most ruinous disorder. . . . The dancing mania of the year 1374 was, in fact, no new disease, but a phenomenon well known in the middle ages, of which many wondrous stories were traditionally current among the people."—J. F. C. Hecker, *Epidemics of the Middle Ages: The Dancing Mania, ch.* 1.

A. D. 1485-1593.—The Sweating Sickness in England.—Plague, Small-pox and Grippe in Europe.—"For centuries no infection had visited England, which in fearful rapidity and malignancy could be compared with the 'sudor Anglicus,' as it was at first called, from the notion that its attacks were confined to Englishmen. People sitting at dinner, in the full enjoyment of health and spirits, were seized with it and died before the next morning. An open window, accidental contact in the streets, children playing before the door, a beggar knocking at the rich man's gate, might disseminate the infection, and a whole family would be decimated in a few hours without hope or remedy. Houses and villages were deserted. . . . Dr. Caius, a physician who had studied the disease under its various aspects, gives the following account of its appearance: 'In the year of our Lord God 1485, shortly after the 7th day of August, at which time King Henry VII. arrived at Milford in Wales out of France, and in the first year of his reign, there chanced a disease among the people lasting the rest of that month and all September, which for the sudden sharpness and unwont cruelness passed the pestilence. For this commonly giveth in four, often seven, sometime nine, sometime eleven and sometime fourteen days, respite to whom it vexeth. But that immediately killed some in opening their windows, some in playing with children in their street doors, some in one hour, many in two, it destroyed. . . . This disease, because it most did stand in sweating from the beginning until the ending, was called here The Sweating Sickness; and because it first began in England, it was named in other countries The English Sweat.' From the same authority we learn that it appeared in 1506, again in 1517 from July to the middle of December, then in 1528. It commenced with a fever, followed by strong internal struggles of nature, causing sweat. . . . It was attended with sharp pains in the back, shoulders and extremities, and then attacked the liver. . . . It never entered Scotland. In Calais, Antwerp and Brabant it generally singled out English residents and visitors. . . . In consequence of the peculiarity of the disease in thus singling out Englishmen, and those of a richer diet and more sanguine temperament, various speculations were set afloat as to its origin and its best mode of cure. Erasmus attributed it to bad houses and bad ventilation, to the clay floors, the unchanged and festering rushes with which the rooms were strewn, and the putrid offal, bones and filth which reeked and rotted together in the unswept and unwashed dining-halls and chambers."—J. S. Brewer, *Reign of Henry VIII., v.* 1, *ch.* 8. —See, also, Sweating Sickness. —"In the middle of the 16th century the English sweating sickness disappeared from the list of epidemic diseases. On the other hand, the plague, during the whole 16th century, prevailed more generally, and in places more fatally, than ever before. . . . In 1500–1507 it raged in Germany, Italy, and Holland, in 1528 in Upper Italy, 1534 in Southern France, 1562–1568 pretty generally throughout Europe. . . . The disease prevailed again in 1591. It is characteristic of the improvement in the art of observation of this century that the plague was declared contagious and portable, and accordingly measures of isolation and disinfection were put in force against it, though without proving in any degree effectual. With a view to disinfection, horn, gunpowder, arsenic with sulphur or straw moistened with wine, etc., were burned in the streets. . . . Small-pox (first observed or described in Germany in 1493) and measles, whose specific nature was still unknown to the physicians of the West, likewise appeared in the 16th century. . . . The Grippe (influenza), for the first time recognizable with certainty as such, showed itself in the year 1510, and spread over all Europe. A second epidemic, beginning in 1557, was less widely extended. On the other hand, in 1580 and 1593 it became again pandemic, while in 1591 Germany alone was visited."—J. H. Baas, *Outlines of the History of Medicine, pp.* 438–439.

Also in: J. F. Hecker, *Epidemics of the Middle Ages.*

A. D. 1665.—In London. See London: A. D. 1665.

18th Century.—The more serious epidemics.—"The bubo-plague, 'the disease of barbarism' and especially of declining nations, in the 18th century still often reached the north of Europe, though it maintained its chief focus and headquarters in the south-west [south-east?]. Thus from 1703 forward, as the result of the Russo-Swedish war, it spread from Turkey to Sweden, Denmark, Poland and Prussia, so that in 1709, the coldest year of the 18th century, more than

300,000 human beings died in East Prussia in spite of the intense cold, and in Dantzic alone more than 30,000. Obliquing to the west, the plague reached Styria and Bohemia, and was carried by a ship to Regensburg in 1714, but by means of strict quarantine regulations was prevented from spreading to the rest of Germany. A hurricane swept the disease, as it were, out of all Europe. Yet six years later it appeared anew with devastating force in southern France" and was recurrent at intervals, in different parts of the continent, throughout the century. "Epidemics of typhus fever . . . showed themselves at the beginning of the century in small numbers, but disappeared before the plague. . . . The first description of typhoid fever — under the designation of 'Schleimfieber' (morbus mucosus) — appeared in the 18th century. . . . Malaria in the last century still gave rise to great epidemics. Of course all the conditions of life favored its prevalence. . . . La Grippe (influenza) appeared as a pandemic throughout almost all Europe in the years 1709, 1729, 1732, 1742, and 1788; in almost all America in 1732, 1737, 1751, 1772, 1781, and 1798; throughout the eastern hemisphere in 1781, and in the entire western hemisphere in 1761 and 1789; throughout Europe and America in 1767. It prevailed as an epidemic in France in the years 1737, 1775, and 1779; in England in 1758 and 1775, and in Germany in 1800. . . . Diphtheria, which in the 17th century had showed itself almost exclusively in Spain and Italy, was observed during the 18th in all parts of the world. . . . Small-pox had attained general diffusion. . . . Scarlet fever, first observed in the 17th century, had already gained wide diffusion. . . . Yellow fever, first recognized in the 16th century, and mentioned occasionally in the 17th, appeared with great frequency in the 18th century, but was mostly confined, as at a later period, to America."—J. H. Baas, *Outlines of the History of Medicine, pp.* 727–730.

19th Century.—The visitations of Asiatic Cholera.— Cholera "has its origin in Asia, where its ravages are as great as those of yellow fever in America. It is endemic or permanent in the Ganges delta, whence it generally spreads every year over India. It was not known in Europe until the beginning of the century; but since that time we have had six successive visitations. . . . In 1817 there was a violent outbreak of cholera at Jessore, India. Thence it spread to the Malay Islands, and to Bourbon (1819); to China and Persia (1821); to Russia in Europe, and especially to St. Petersburg and Moscow (1830). In the following year it overran Poland, Germany, and England [thence in 1832 to Ireland and America], and first appeared in Paris on January 6, 1832. . . . In 1849, the cholera pursued the same route. Coming overland from India through Russia, it appeared in Paris on March 17, and lasted until October. In 1853, cholera, again coming by this route, was less fatal in Paris, although it lasted for a longer time — from November, 1853, to December, 1854. The three last epidemics, 1865, 1873, and 1884, . . . came by the Mediterranean Sea."—E. L. Trouessart, *Microbes, Ferments and Moulds, ch.* 5, *sect.* 8.— A seventh visitation of cholera in Europe occurred in 1892. Its route on this occasion was from the Punjab, through Afghanistan and Persia into Russia and across the Mediterranean to Southern France. Late in the summer the epidemic appeared in various parts of Austria and Germany and was frightfully virulent in the city of Hamburg. In England it was confined by excellent regulations to narrow limits. Crossing the Atlantic late in August, it was arrested at the harbor of New York, by half-barbarous but effectual measures of quarantine, and gained no footing in America.—*Appleton's Annual Cyclopædia*, 1892.

Also in: C. Macnamara, *History of Asiatic Cholera.*—A. Stillé, *Cholera, pp.* 15–31.

PLAID.—PLACITUM. See Parliament of Paris.

PLAIN OR MARAIS, The Party of the. See France: A. D. 1792 (September—November).

PLAINS OF ABRAHAM. See Abraham, Plains of.

PLAN OF CAMPAIGN, The. See Ireland: A. D. 1886.

PLANTAGENETS, The. See England: A. D. 1154–1189; and Anjou; Creation of the county.

PLASSEY, Battle of. See India: A. D. 1757.

PLATÆA.—Platæa, one of the cities of the Bœotian federation in ancient Greece, under the headship of Thebes, was ill-used by the latter and claimed and received the protection of Athens. This provoked the deep-seated and enduring enmity of Thebes and Bœotia in general towards Athens, while the alliance of the Athenians and Platæans was lasting and faithful.—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece, pt.* 2, *ch.* 31.

B. C. 490.—Help to Athens at Marathon. See Greece: B. C. 490.

B. C. 479.—Decisive overthrow of the Persians. See Greece: B. C. 479.

B. C. 431.—Surprise of.—The first act in the Peloponnesian War (B. C. 431) was the surprising of the city of Platæa, the one ally of Athens in Bœotia, by a small force from her near neighbor and deadly enemy, Thebes. The Thebans were admitted by treachery at night and thought themselves in possession of the town. But the Platæans rallied before daybreak and turned the tables upon the foe. Not one of the Thebans escaped. See Greece: B. C. 432–431.

B. C. 429-427.—Siege, capture, and destruction by the Peloponnesians. See Greece: B. C. 429–427.

B. C. 335.—Restoration by Alexander. See Greece: B. C. 336–335.

PLATE RIVER, Discovery of the. See Paraguay: A. D. 1515–1557.

PLATE RIVER, Provinces of the. See Argentine Republic: A. D. 1806–1820.

PLATO, and the Schools of Athens. See Academy; also Education, Ancient: Greek.

PLATTSBURG, Battle of. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1814 (September).

PLAUTIO-PAPIRIAN LAW, The. See Rome: B. C. 90–88.

PLEASANT HILL, Battle of. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1864 (March—May: Louisiana).

PLEBEIANS, OR PLEBS, Roman.—"We are now prepared to understand the origin of a

distinct body of people which grew up alongside of the patricians of the Roman state during the latter part of the regal period and after its close. These were the plebeians (plebs, 'the crowd,' cf. 'pleo,' to fill) who dwelt in the Roman territory both within and without the walls of the city. They did not belong to the old clans which formed the three original tribes, nor did they have any real or pretended kinship with them, nor, for that matter, with one another, except within the ordinary limits of nature. They were, at the outset, simply an ill-assorted mass of residents, entirely outside of the orderly arrangement which we have described. There were three sources of this multitude: I. When the city grew strong enough, it began to extend its boundaries, and first at the expense of the cantons nearest it, between the Tiber and the Anio. When Rome conquered a canton, she destroyed the walls of its citadel. Its inhabitants were sometimes permitted to occupy their villages as before, and sometimes were removed to Rome. In either case, Rome was henceforth to be their place of meeting and refuge, and they themselves, instead of being reduced to the condition of slaves, were attached to the state as non-citizens. II. The relation of guest-friendship so called, in ancient times, could be entered into between individuals with their families and descendants, and also between individuals and a state, or between two states. Provision for such guest-friendship was undoubtedly made in the treaties which bound together Rome on the one side and the various independent cities of its neighborhood on the other. . . . The commercial advantages of Rome's situation attracted to it, in the course of time, a great many men from the Latin cities in the vicinity, who remained permanently settled there without acquiring Roman citizenship. III. A third constituent element of the 'plebs' was formed by the clients ('the listeners,' 'cluere') [see CLIENTES]. . . . In the beginning of the long struggle between the patricians and plebeians, the clients are represented as having sided with the former. . . . Afterward, when the lapse of time had weakened their sense of dependence on their patrons, they became, as a body, identified with the plebeians." —A. Tighe, *Development of the Roman Constitution, ch.* 3.—Originally having no political rights, the Roman plebeians were forced to content themselves with the privilege they enjoyed of engaging in trade at Rome and acquiring property of their own. But as in time they grew to outnumber the patricians, while they rivalled the latter in wealth, they struggled with success for a share in the government and for other rights of citizenship. In the end, political power passed over to them entirely, and the Roman constitution became almost purely democratic, before it perished in anarchy and revolution, giving way to imperialism.—H. G. Liddell, *Hist. of Rome, ch.* 7, 8, 10, 35.

ALSO IN: B. G. Niebuhr, *Lect's on Hist. of Rome, bk.* 4, *ch.* 2.

Secessions of the Plebs. See SECESSIONS OF THE ROMAN PLEBS.

PLEBISCITA.—Resolutions passed by the Roman plebeians in their Comitia Tributa, or Assembly of the Tribes, were called "plebiscita." See ROME: B. C. 472–471.—In modern France the term "plebiscite" has been applied to a general vote of the people, taken upon some single question, like that of the establishment of the Second Empire. See FRANCE: A. D. 1851–1852; also, REFERENDUM.

PLESWITZ, Armistice of. See GERMANY: A. D. 1813 (MAY—AUGUST).

PLEVNA, Siege and capture of. See TURKS: A. D. 1877–1878.

PLOW PATENT, The. See MAINE: A. D. 1629–1631; and 1643–1677.

PLOWDEN'S COUNTY PALATINE. See NEW ALBION.

PLUVIÔSE, The month. See FRANCE: A. D. 1793 (OCTOBER) THE NEW REPUBLICAN CALENDAR.

PLYMOUTH, Mass.: A. D. 1605.—Visited by Champlain, and the harbor named Port St. Louis. See CANADA: A. D. 1603–1605.

A. D. 1620.—Landing of the Pilgrims.—Founding of the Colony. See MASSACHUSETTS: A. D. 1620, and after.

PLYMOUTH, N. C.: A. D. 1864.—Capture and recapture. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1864 (APRIL—MAY: NORTH CAROLINA), and (OCTOBER: NORTH CAROLINA).

PLYMOUTH COMPANY: Formation. See VIRGINIA: A. D. 1606–1607; and MAINE: A. D. 1607–1608.

A. D. 1615.—Unsuccessful undertakings with Captain John Smith. See AMERICA: A. D. 1614–1615.

A. D. 1620.—Merged in the Council for New England. See NEW ENGLAND: A. D. 1620–1623.

PLYMOUTH ROCK. See MASSACHUSETTS: A. D. 1620.

PNYX, The.—"The place of meeting [of the general assemblies of the people in ancient Athens] in earlier times is stated to have been in the market; in the historical period the people met there only to vote on proposals of ostracism, at other times assembling in the so-called Pnyx. As regards the position of this latter, a point which quite recently has become a matter of considerable dispute, the indications given by the ancient authorities appear to settle this much at any rate with certainty, that it was in the neighbourhood of the market, and that of the streets running out of the market one led only into the Pnyx."—G. F. Schömann, *Antiq. of Greece: The State, pt.* 3, *ch.* 3.—"The Pnyx was an artificial platform on the north-eastern side of one of the rocky heights which encircled Athens on the west, and along the crest of which is still traced the ancient enclosure of the Asty. In shape this platform differed only from a circular sector of about 155 degrees, inasmuch as the radii forming the angle were about 200 feet in length, while the distance from the angle to the middle of the curve was about 240 feet. On this latter side, or towards the Agora, the platform was bounded by a wall of support, which is about sixteen feet high in the middle or highest part, and is composed of large blocks, of various sizes, and for the most part quadrangular. In the opposite direction the platform was bounded by a vertical excavation in the rock, which, in the parts best preserved, is from twelve to fifteen feet high. The foot of this wall in-

clines towards the angle of the sector, thereby showing that originally the entire platform sloped towards this point as a centre, such being obviously the construction most adapted to an assembly which stood or sat to hear an orator placed in the angle. At this angle rose the celebrated [bema], or pulpit, often called the rock. . . . It was a quadrangular projection of the rock, eleven feet broad, rising from a graduated basis. The summit is broken; its present height is about twenty feet. On the right and left of the orator there was an access to the summit of the bema by a flight of steps, and from behind by two or three steps from an inclosure, in which are several chambers cut in the rock, which served doubtless for purposes connected with that of the Pnyx itself. . . . The area of the platform was capable of containing between seven and eight thousand persons, allowing a square yard to each."—W. M. Leake, *Topography of Athens, app.* 11. See, also, AGORA.

POCAHONTAS. See VIRGINIA: A. D. 1607–1610; and 1609–1616.

POCKET BOROUGHS. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1830.

PODESTAS.—"About the end of the 12th century a new and singular species of magistracy was introduced into the Lombard cities. During the tyranny of Frederic I. [Frederick Barbarossa] he had appointed officers of his own, called podestas, instead of the elective consuls. It is remarkable that this memorial of despotic power should not have excited insuperable alarm and disgust in the free republics. But, on the contrary, they almost universally, after the peace of Constance, revived an office which had been abrogated when they first rose in rebellion against Frederic. From experience, as we must presume, of the partiality which their domestic factions carried into the administration of justice, it became a general practice to elect, by the name of podesta, a citizen of some neighbouring state as their general, their criminal judge, and preserver of the peace. . . . The podesta was sometimes chosen in a general assembly, sometimes by a select number of citizens. His office was annual, though prolonged in peculiar emergencies. He was invariably a man of noble family, even in those cities which excluded their own nobility from any share in the government. He received a fixed salary, and was compelled to remain in the city after the expiration of his office for the purpose of answering such charges as might be adduced against his conduct. He could neither marry a native of the city, nor have any relation resident within the district, nor even, so great was their jealousy, eat or drink in the house of any citizen. The authority of these foreign magistrates was not by any means alike in all cities. In some he seems to have superseded the consuls, and commanded the armies in war. In others, as Milan and Florence, his authority was merely judicial."—H. Hallam, *The Middle Ages, ch.* 3, *pt.* 1 (*v.* 1).

ALSO IN: E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, ch.* 69.

PODIEBRAD, George, King of Bohemia, A. D. 1458–1471.

POINT PLEASANT, Battle of. See OHIO (VALLEY): A. D. 1774.

POISSY, The Colloquy at. See FRANCE: A. D. 1560–1563.

POITIERS: Original names.—Limonum, a town of the Gauls, acquired later the name of Pictavi, which has become in modern times Poitiers.

A. D. 1569.—Siege by the Huguenots. See FRANCE: A. D. 1563–1570.

POITIERS, Battle of.—A battle was fought September 19, 1356, near the city of Poitiers, in France, by the English, under the "Black Prince," the famous son of Edward III., with the French commanded personally by their king, John II. The advantage in numbers was on the side of the French, but the position of the English was in their favor, inasmuch as it gave little opportunity to the cavalry of the French, which was their strongest arm. The English archers won the day, as in so many other battles of that age. The French were sorely beaten and their king was taken prisoner.—Froissart, *Chronicles, (tr. by Johnes), bk.* 1, *ch.* 157–166.—See FRANCE: A. D. 1337–1360.

POITIERS, Edict of. See FRANCE: A. D. 1577–1578.

POITOU: Origin of the name. See PICTONES.

The rise of the Counts. See TOULOUSE: 10–11TH CENTURIES.

The Counts become Dukes of Aquitaine or Guienne. See AQUITAINE: A. D. 884–1151.

POKANOKETS, OR WAMPANOAGS, The. See RHODE ISLAND: A. D. 1636; AMERICAN ABORIGINES: ALGONQUIAN FAMILY; NEW ENGLAND: A. D. 1674–1675, 1675, 1676–1678.

POLA, Naval battle of (1379). See VENICE: A. D. 1378–1379.

POLAND.

The Name.—"The word Pole is not older than the tenth century, and seems to have been originally applied, not so much to the people as to the region they inhabited; 'polska' in the Slavonic tongue signifying a level field or plain."—S. A. Dunham, *Hist. of Poland, introd.*

The ancestors of the race. See LYGIANS.

Beginnings of national existence.—"The Poles were a nation whose name does not occur in history before the middle of the tenth century; and we owe to Christianity the first intimations that we have regarding this people. Mieczislaus [or Miceslaus] I., the first duke or prince of the Poles of whom we possess any authentic accounts, embraced Christianity (966) at the solicitation of his spouse, Dambrowka, sister of Boleslaus II., duke of Bohemia. Shortly after, the first bishopric in Poland, that of Posen, was founded by Otho the Great. Christianity did not, however, tame the ferocious habits of the Poles, who remained for a long time without the least progress in mental cultivation. Their government, as wretched as that of Bohemia, subjected the great body of the nation to the most debasing servitude.

The ancient sovereigns of Poland were hereditary. They ruled most despotically, and with a rod of iron; and, although they acknowledged themselves vassals and tributaries of the German emperors, they repeatedly broke out into open rebellion, asserted their absolute independence, and waged a successful war against their masters. Boleslaus, son of Mieczislaus I., took advantage of the troubles which rose in Germany on the death of Otho III., to possess himself of the Marches of Lusatia and Budissin, or Bautzen, which the Emperor Henry II. afterwards granted him as fiefs. This same prince, in despite of the Germans, on the death of Henry II. (1025), assumed the royal dignity. Mieczislaus II., son of Boleslaus, after having cruelly ravaged the country situate between the Oder, the Elbe, and the Saal, was compelled to abdicate the throne, and also to restore th se provinces which his father had wrested from the Empire. The male descendants of Mieczislaus I. reigned in Poland until the death of Casimir the Great (1370). This dynasty of kings is known by the name of the Piasts, or Piasses, so called from one Piast, alleged to have been its founder."—W. Koch, *Hist. of Revolutions in Europe, ch.* 4.

Also in: S. A. Dunham, *Hist. of Poland, ch.* 1-2.

A. D. 1096.—The refuge of the Jews. See Jews: 11–17th Centuries.

A. D. 1240-1241.—Mongol invasion. See Mongols: A. D. 1229–1294.

13-14th Centuries.—Growing power and increasing dominion.—Encroachments on Russia. See Russia: A. D. 1237–1480.

A. D. 1333-1572.—The union with Lithuania and the reign of the Jagellon dynasty.—Conquest of Prussia and its grant to Grandmaster Albert.—Casimir III., or Casimir the Great, the last Polish king of the Piast line, ascended the throne in 1333. "Polish historians celebrate the good deeds of this king for the internal prosperity of Poland—his introduction of a legal code, his just administration, his encouragement of learning, and his munificence in founding churches, schools, and hospitals. The great external question of his reign was that of the relations of Poland to the two contiguous powers of Lithuania and the Teutonic Knights of Prussia and the Baltic provinces. On the one hand, Poland, as a Christian country, had stronger ties of connexion with the Teutonic Knights than with Lithuania. On the other hand, ties of race and tradition connected Poland with Lithuania; and the ambitious policy of the Teutonic Knights, who aimed at the extension of their rule at the expense of Poland and Lithuania, and also jealously shut out both countries from the Baltic coast, and so from the advantages of commerce, tended to increase the sympathy between the Poles and the Lithuanians. A happy solution was at length given to this question. Casimir, dying in 1370, left no issue . . . . and the Crown of Poland passed to his nephew Louis of Anjou, at that time also King of Hungary [see Hungary: A. D. 1301–1442]. Louis, occupied with the affairs of Hungary, neglected those of Poland, and left it exposed to the attacks of the Lithuanians. He became excessively unpopular among the Poles; and, after his death in 1384, they proclaimed Hedvige [his daughter] Queen of Poland. In 1386, a marriage was arranged between this princess and Jagellon, Duke of Lithuania—Jagellon agreeing to be baptized, and to establish Christianity among his hitherto heathen subjects. Thus Poland and Lithuania were united; and a new dynasty of Polish kings was founded, called the dynasty of the Jagellons. The rule of this dynasty, under seven successive kings (1386–1572) constitutes the flourishing epoch of Polish history, to which at the present day the Poles look fondly back when they would exalt the glory and greatness of their country. . . . The effect of the union of Poland and Lithuania was at once felt in Europe. The first Jagellon, who on his baptism took the name of Uladislav II., and whom one fancies as still a sort of rough half-heathen by the side of the beautiful Polish Hedvige, spent his whole reign (1386–1434) in consolidating the union and turning it to account. He defended Lithuania against the Tartar hordes then moving westward before the impulse of the conquering Tamerlane. But his chief activity was against the Teutonic Knights. . . . He engaged in a series of wars against the knights, which ended in a great victory gained over them at Tannenburg in 1410. By this victory the power of the knights was broken for the time, and their territories placed at the mercy of the Poles. During the reign of Uladislav III., the second of the Jagellons (1434–1444), the knights remained submissive, and that monarch was able to turn his arms, in conjunction with the Hungarians, against a more formidable enemy—the Turks—then beginning their invasions of Europe. Uladislav III. having been slain in battle against the Turks at Varna, the Teutonic Knights availed themselves of the confusion which followed, to try to recover their power. By this time, however, their Prussian subjects were tired of their rule; Dantzic, Elbing, Thorn, and other towns, as well as the landed proprietors and the clergy of various districts, formed a league against them; and, on the accession of Casimir IV., the third of the Jagellons, to the Polish throne (1447), all Western Prussia revolted from the knights and placed itself under his protection. A terrific war ensued, which was brought to a close in 1466 by the peace of Thorn. By this notable treaty, the independent sovereignty of the Teutonic order in the countries they had held for two centuries was extinguished—the whole of Western Prussia, with the city of Marienburg, and other districts, being annexed to the Polish crown, with guarantees for the preservation of their own forms of administration; and the knights being allowed to retain certain districts of Eastern Prussia, only as vassals of Poland. Thus Poland was once more in possession of that necessity of its existence as a great European state—a seaboard on the Baltic. Exulting in an acquisition for which they had so long struggled, the Poles are said to have danced with joy as they looked on the blue waves and could call them their own. Casimir IV., the hero of this important passage in Polish history, died in 1492; and, though during the reigns of his successors—John Albertus (1492–1501), and Alexander (1501–1506)—the Polish territories suffered some diminution in the direction of Russia, the fruits of the treaty of Thorn were enjoyed in peace. In the reign of the sixth of the Jagellonidæ, however—Sigismund I. (1506–1547)—the Teutonic Knights made an attempt to throw

off their allegiance to Poland. The attempt was made in singular circumstances, and led to a singular conclusion. The grand-master of the Teutonic order at this time was Albert of Brandenburg . . . , a descendant [in the Anspach branch] of that astute Hohenzollern family which in 1411 had possessed itself of the Marquisate of Brandenburg. Albert, carrying out a scheme entertained by the preceding grand-master, refused homage for the Prussian territories of his order to the Polish king Sigismund, and even prepared to win back what the order had lost by the treaty of Thorn. Sigismund, who was uncle to Albert, defeated his schemes, and proved the superiority of the Polish armies over the forces of the once great but now effete order. Albert found it his best policy to submit, and this he did in no ordinary fashion. The Reformation was then in the first flush of its progress over the Continent, and the Teutonic Order of Knights, long a practical anachronism in Europe, was losing even the slight support it still had in surrounding public opinion, as the new doctrines changed men's ideas. What was more, the grand-master himself imbibed Protestant opinions and was a disciple of Luther and Melancthon. He resolved to bring down the fabric of the order about his ears and construct for himself a secular principality out of its ruins. Many of the knights shared or were gained over to his views; so he married a princess, and they took themselves wives — all becoming Protestants together, with the exception of a few tough old knights who transferred their chapter to Mergentheim in Würtemberg, where it remained, a curious relic, till the time of Napoleon. The secularization was formally completed at Cracow in April, 1525. There, in a square before the royal palace, on a throne emblazoned with the arms of Poland and Lithuania — a white eagle for the one, and a mounted knight for the other — the Polish king Sigismund received . . . the banner of the order, the knights standing by and agreeing to the surrender. In return, Sigismund embraced the late grand-master as Duke of Prussia, granting to him and the knights the former possessions of the order, as secular vassals of the Polish crown. The remainder of Sigismund's reign was worthy of this beginning; and at no time was Poland more flourishing than when his son, Sigismund II., the seventh of the Jagellonidæ, succeeded him on the throne. During the wise reign of this prince (1547–1572), whose tolerant policy in the matter of the great religious controversy then agitating Europe is not his least title to credit, Poland lost nothing of her prosperity or her greatness; and one of its last transactions was the consummation of the union between the two nations of Poland and Lithuania by their formal incorporation into one kingdom at the Diet of Lublin (July 1, 1569). But, alas for Poland, this seventh of the Jagellonidæ was also the last, and, on his death in 1572, Poland entered on that career of misery and decline, with the reminiscences of which her name is now associated."—*Poland: her Hist. and Prospects* (*Westminster Rev., January*, 1855).

Also in: H. Tuttle, *Hist. of Prussia, to Frederick the Great, ch.* 4.—S. A. Dunham, *Hist. of Poland, bk.* 1, *ch.* 3.

A. D. 1439.—Election of Ladislaus III. to the throne of Hungary. See Hungary: A. D. 1301–1442.

A. D. 1471-1479.—War with Matthias of Hungary. See Hungary: A. D. 1471–1487.

A. D. 1505-1588.—Enslavement of the peasantry. See Slavery, Mediæval: Poland.

A. D. 1573.—Election of Henry of Valois to the throne.—The Pacta Conventa.—On the election of Henry of Valois, Duke of Anjou, to the Polish throne (see France: A. D. 1573–1576), he was required to subscribe to a series of articles, known as the Pacta Conventa (and sometimes called the Articles of Henry), which were intended to be the basis of all future covenants between the Poles and their elective sovereigns. The chief articles of the Pacta Conventa were the following: "1. That the king should not in the remotest degree attempt to influence the senate in the choice of a successor; but should leave inviolable to the Polish nobles the right of electing one at his decease. 2. That he should not assume the title of 'master' and 'heir' of the monarchy, as borne by all preceding kings. 3. That he should observe the treaty of peace made with the dissidents. 4. That he should not declare war, or dispatch the nobles on any expedition, without the previous sanction of the diet. 5. That he should not impose taxes or contributions of any description. 6. That he should not have any authority to appoint ambassadors to foreign courts. 7. That in case of different opinions prevailing among the senators, he should espouse such only as were in accordance with the laws, and clearly advantageous to the nation. 8. That he should be furnished with a permanent council, the members of which (16 in number; viz. 4 bishops, 4 palatines, and 8 castellans) should be changed every half year, and should be selected by the ordinary diets. 9. That a general diet should be convoked every two years, or oftener, if required. 10. That the duration of each diet should not exceed six weeks. 11. That no dignities or benefices should be conferred on other than natives. 12. That the king should neither marry nor divorce a wife without the permission of the diet. The violation of any one of these articles, even in spirit, was to be considered by the Poles as absolving them from their oaths of allegiance, and as empowering them to elect another ruler."—S. A. Dunham, *Hist. of Poland, bk.* 2, *ch.* 1.

A. D. 1574-1590.—Disgraceful abandonment of the throne by Henry of Valois.—Election of Stephen Batory.—His successful wars with Russia, and his death.—Election of Sigismund III., of Sweden.—The worthless French prince, Henry of Valois, whom the Poles had chosen to be their king, and whom they crowned at Cracow, on the 21st of February, 1574, "soon sighed for the banks of the Seine: amidst the ferocious people whose authority he was constrained to recognize, and who despised him for his imbecility, he had no hope of enjoyment. To escape their factions, their mutinies, their studied insults, he shut himself up within his palace, and, with the few countrymen whom he had been permitted to retain near his person, he abandoned himself to idleness and dissipation. . . . By the death of his brother [Charles IX. king of France], who died on the 30th of May, 1574, he was become heir to the crown of the Valois. His first object was to conceal the letters which announced that event, and to flee before the Poles could have any suspicion of his intention. The intelligence, however, transpired

through another channel. His senators advised him to convoke a diet, and, in conformity with the laws, to solicit permission of a short absence while he settled the affairs of his new heritage. Such permission would willingly have been granted him, more willingly still had he proposed an eternal separation; but he feared the ambition of his brother the duke of Alençon, who secretly aspired to the throne; and he resolved to depart without it. He concealed his extraordinary purpose with great art," and achieved a most contemptible success in carrying it out,—stealing away from his kingdom like a thief, on the night of the 18th of June. "Some letters found on a table in his apartment attempted to account for his precipitate departure by the urgency of the troubles in his hereditary kingdom; yet he did not reach Lyons till the following year. In a diet assembled at Warsaw, it was resolved that if the king did not return by the 12th of May, 1575, the throne should be declared vacant. Deputies were sent to acquaint him with the decree. . . . After the expiration of the term, the interregnum was proclaimed in the diet of Stenzyca, and a day appointed for a new election. After the deposition of Henry [now become Henry III. of France], no less than five foreign and two native princes were proposed as candidates for the crown. The latter, however, refused to divide the suffrages of the republic, wisely preferring the privilege of electing kings to the honour of being elected themselves. The primate, many of the bishops, and several palatines, declared in favour of an Austrian prince; but the greater portion of the diet (assembled on the plains opposite to Warsaw) were for the princess Anne, sister of Sigismund Augustus, whose hand they resolved to confer on Stephen Batory, duke of Transylvania. Accordingly, Stephen was proclaimed king by Zamoyski, starost of Beltz, whose name was soon to prove famous in the annals of Poland. On the other hand, Uchanski the primate nominated the emperor Maximilian, who was proclaimed by the marshal of the crown: this party, however, being too feeble to contend with the great body of the equestrian order, despatched messengers to hasten the arrival of the emperor; but Zamoyski acted with still greater celerity. While his rival was busied about certain conditions, which the party of the primate forced on Maximilian, Batory arrived in Poland, married the princess, subscribed to every thing required from him, and was solemnly crowned. A civil war appeared inevitable, but the death of Maximilian happily averted the disaster. . . . But though Poland and Lithuania thus acknowledged the new king, Prussia, which had espoused the interests of the Austrian, was less tractable. The country, however, was speedily reduced to submission, with the exception of Dantzic, which not only refused to own him, but insisted on its recognition by the diet as a free and independent republic. . . . Had the Dantzickers sought no other glory than that of defending their city, had they resolutely kept within their entrenchments, they might have beheld the power of their king shattered against the bulwarks below them; but the principles which moved them pushed them on to temerity. . . . Their rashness cost them dear; the loss of 8,000 men compelled them again to seek the shelter of their walls, and annihilated their hope of ultimate success. Fortunately they had to deal with a monarch of extraordinary moderation. . . . Their submission [1577] disarmed his resentment, and left him at liberty to march against other enemies. During this struggle of Stephen with his rebellious subjects, the Muscovites had laid waste Livonia. To punish their audacity, and wrest from their grasp the conquests they had made during the reign of his immediate predecessors, was now his object. . . . Success every where accompanied him. Polotsk, Sakol, Turowla, and many other places, submitted to his arms. The investiture of the duchy (Polotsk, which the Muscovites had reduced in the time of Sigismund I.) he conferred on Gottard duke of Courland. On the approach of winter he returned, to obtain more liberal supplies for the ensuing campaign. Nothing can more strongly exhibit the different characters of the Poles and Lithuanians than the reception he met from each. At Wilna his splendid successes procured him the most enthusiastic welcome; at Warsaw they caused him to be received with sullen discontent. The Polish nobles were less alive to the glory of their country than to the preservation of their monstrous privileges, which, they apprehended, might be endangered under so vigilant and able a ruler. With the aid, however, of Zamoyski and some other leading barons, he again wrung a few supplies from that most jealous of bodies, a diet. . . . Stephen now directed his course towards the province of Novogorod: neither the innumerable marshes, nor the vast forests of these steppes, which had been untrodden by soldier's foot since the days of Witold, could stop his progress; he triumphed over every obstacle, and, with amazing rapidity, reduced the chief fortified towns between Livonia and that ancient mistress of the North. But his troops were thinned by fatigue, and even victory; reinforcements were peremptorily necessary; and though in an enfeebled state of health, he again returned to collect them. . . . The succeeding campaign promised to be equally glorious, when the tsar, by adroitly insinuating his inclination to unite the Greek with the Latin church, prevailed on the pope to interpose for peace. To the wishes of the papal see the king was ever ready to pay the utmost deference. The conditions were advantageous to the republic. If she surrendered her recent conquests — which she could not possibly have retained — she obtained an acknowledgment of her rights of sovereignty over Livonia; and Polotsk, with several surrounding fortresses, was annexed to Lithuania." Stephen Batory died in 1586, having vainly advised the diet to make the crown hereditary, and avert the ruin of the nation. The interregnum which ensued afforded opportunity for a fierce private war between the factions of the Zborowskis and the Zamoyskis. Then followed a disputed election of king, one party proclaiming the archduke Maximilian of Austria, the other Sigismund, prince royal of Sweden — a scion of the Jagellonic family — and both sides resorting to arms. Maximilian was defeated and taken prisoner, and only regained his freedom by relinquishing his claims to the Polish crown.—S. A. Dunham, *Hist. of Poland, bk.* 2, *ch.* 1.

A. D. 1578-1652.—Anarchy organized by the Nobles.—The extraordinary Constitution imposed by them on the country.—The Liberum

Veto and its effects.—"On the death of the last Jagellon, 1573, at a time when Bohemia and Hungary were deprived of the power of electing their kings, when Sweden renounced this right in favour of its monarchs, Poland renewed its privilege in its most comprehensive form. At a time when European monarchs gradually deprived the great feudal barons of all share in the administration of the law, . . . the Polish nobles destroyed the last vestiges of the royal prerogative. . . . In the year 1578 the kings lost the right of bestowing the patent of nobility, which was made over to the diet. The kings had no share in the legislation, as the laws were made in every interregnum. As soon as the throne became vacant by the death of a king, and before the diet appointed a successor, the nobles of the provinces assembled to examine into the administration of the late king and his senate. Any law that was not approved of could be repealed and new arrangements proposed, which became law if the votes of the diet were unanimous. This unanimity was most easily obtained when a law threatened the individual or when the royal prerogative was to be decreased. . . . The king had no share in the administration, and even the most urgent circumstances did not justify his acting without the co-operation of the senate [which consisted of 17 archbishops and bishops, 33 palatines or woiwodes—'war-leaders'—who were governors of provinces or palatinates, and 85 castellans, who were originally commanders in the royal cities and fortresses, but who had become, like the woiwodes, quite independent of the king]. The senate deprived the king of the power of making peace or war. . . . If there was a hostile invasion, war became a matter of course, but it was carried on, on their own account, by the palatines most nearly concerned, and often without the assistance of the king. . . . Bribery, intrigue and party spirit were the only means of influence that could be employed by a king, who was excluded from the administration, who was without domains, without private property or settled revenue, who was surrounded by officers he could not depose and by judges who could be deposed, and who was, in short, without real power of any sort. The senate itself was deprived of its power, and the representatives of the nobles seized upon the highest authority. . . . They alone held the public offices and the highest ecclesiastical benefices. They filled the seats of the judges exclusively, and enjoyed perfect immunity from taxes, duties, &c. . . . Another great evil from which the republic suffered was the abuse of the liberum veto, which, dangerous as it was in itself, had become law in 1652." This gave the power of veto to every single voice in the assemblies of the nobles, or in the meetings of the deputies who represented them. Nothing could be adopted without entire unanimity; and yet deputies to the diet were allowed no discretion. "They received definite instructions as to the demands they were to bring forward and the concessions they were to make. . . . One step only was wanting before unanimity of votes became an impossibility, and anarchy was completely organized. This step was taken when individual palatines enjoined their deputies to oppose every discussion at the diet, till their own proposals had been heard and acceded to. Before long, several deputies received the same instructions, and thus the diet was in fact dissolved before it was opened. Other deputies refused to consent to any proposals, if those of their own province were not accepted; so that the veto of one deputy in a single transaction could bring about the dissolution of the entire diet, and the exercise of the royal authority was thus suspended for two years [since the diet could only be held every other year, to last no longer than a fortnight, and to sit during daylight, only]. . . . No law could be passed, nothing could be resolved upon. The army received no pay. Provinces were desolated by enemies, and none came to their aid. Justice was delayed, the coinage was debased; in short, Poland ceased for the next two years to exist as a state. Every time that a rupture occurred in the diet it was looked on as a national calamity. The curse of posterity was invoked on that deputy who had occasioned it, and on his family. In order to save themselves from popular fury, these deputies were accustomed to hand in their protest in writing, and then to wander about, unknown and without rest, cursed by the nation." —Count Moltke, *Poland: an Historical Sketch, ch.* 3.—"It was not till 1652 . . . that this principle of equality, or the free consent of every individual Pole of the privileged class to every act done in the name of the nation, reached its last logical excess. In that year, the king John Casimir having embroiled himself with Sweden, a deputy in the Diet was bold enough to use the right which by theory belonged to him, and by his single veto, not only arrest the preparations for a war with Sweden, but also quash all the proceedings of the Diet. Such was the first case of the exercise of that liberum veto of which we hear so much in subsequent Polish history, and which is certainly the greatest curiosity, in the shape of a political institution, with which the records of any nation present us. From that time every Pole walked over the earth a conscious incarnation of a power such as no mortal man out of Poland possessed—that of putting a spoke into the whole legislative machinery of his country, and bringing it to a dead lock by his own single obstinacy; and, though the exercise of the power was a different thing from its possession, yet every now and then a man was found with nerve enough to put it in practice. . . . There were, of course, various remedies for this among an inventive people. One, and the most obvious and most frequent, was to knock the vetoist down and throttle him; another, in cases where he had a party at his back, was to bring soldiers round the Diet and coerce it into unanimity. There was also the device of what were called confederations; that is, associations of the nobles independent of the Diet, adopting decrees with the sanction of the king, and imposing them by force on the country. These confederations acquired a kind of legal existence in the intervals between the Diets."—*Poland: her History and Prospects* (*Westminster Rev., Jan.*, 1855).

A. D. 1586-1629.—Election of Sigismund of Sweden to the throne.—His succession to the Swedish crown and his deposition.—His claims and the consequent war. See SCANDINAVIAN STATES (SWEDEN): A. D. 1523–1604; and 1611–1629.

A. D. 1590-1648.—Reigns of Sigismund III. and Ladislaus IV.—Wars with the Muscovites, the Turks and the Swedes.—Domestic

discord in the kingdom.—"The new king, who was elected out of respect for the memory of the house of Jaguello (being the son of the sister of Sigismond Augustus), was not the kind of monarch Poland at that time required. . . . He was too indolent to take the reins of government into his own hands, but placed them in those of the Jesuits and his German favourites. Not only did he thereby lose the affections of his people, but he also lost the crown of Sweden, to which, at his father's death, he was the rightful heir. This throne was wrested from him by his uncle Charles, the brother of the late king [see Scandinavian States (Sweden): A. D. 1523–1604]. This usurpation by Charles was the cause of a war between Sweden and Poland, which, although conducted with great skill by the illustrious generals Zamoyski and Chodkiewicz, terminated disastrously for Poland, for, after this war, a part of Livonia remained in the hands of the Swedes." During the troubled state of affairs at Moscow which followed the death, in 1584, of Ivan the Terrible, Sigismond interfered and sent an army which took possession of the Russian capital and remained in occupation of it for some time (see Russia: A. D. 1533–1682). "As a consequence . . . the Muscovites offered the throne of the Czar to Ladislas, the eldest son of the King of Poland, on condition that he would change his religion and become a member of 'the Orthodox Church.' Sigismond III., who was a zealous Catholic, and under the influence of the Jesuits, wishing rather to convert the Muscovites to the Catholic Church, would not permit Ladislas to change his faith — refused the throne of the Czar for his son. . . . By the peace concluded at Moscow, 1619, the fortress of Smolenski and a considerable part of Muscovy remained in the hands of the Poles. . . . Sigismond III., whose reign was so disastrous to Poland, kept up intimate relations with the house of Austria. The Emperor invited him to take part with him . . . in what is historically termed 'the Thirty Years' War.' Sigismond complied with this request, and sent the Emperor of Austria some of his Cossack regiments. . . . Whilst the Emperor was on the one hand engaged in 'the Thirty Years' War,' he was on the other embroiled with Turkey. The Sultan, in revenge for the aid which the Poles had afforded the Austrians, entered Moldavia with a considerable force. Sigismond III. sent his able general Zolkiewski against the Turks, but as the Polish army was much smaller than that of the Turks, it was defeated on the battlefield of Cecora [1621], in Moldavia, [its] general killed, and many of his soldiers taken prisoners. After this unfortunate campaign . . . the Sultan Osman, at the head of 300,000 Mussulmans, confident in the number and valour of his army, marched towards the frontier of Poland with the intention of subjugating the entire kingdom. At this alarming news a Diet was convoked in all haste, at which it was determined that there should be a 'levée en masse,' in order to drive away the terrible Mussulman scourge. But before this levée en masse could be organized, the Hetman Chodkiewicz, who had succeeded Zolkiewski as commander-in-chief, crossed the river Dniester with 35,000 soldiers and 30,000 Cossacks, camped under the walls of the fortress of Chocim [or Kotzim, or Khotzim, or Choczim] and there awaited the enemy, to whom, on his appearance, he gave battle [Sept. 28, 1622], and, notwithstanding the disproportion of the two armies, the Turks were utterly routed. The Moslems left on the battlefield, besides the dead, guns, tents, and provisions. . . . After this brilliant victory a peace was concluded with Turkey; and I think I am justified in saying that, by this victory, the whole of Western Europe was saved from Mussulman invasion. . . . The successful Polish general unhappily did not long survive his brilliant victory. . . . While these events were taking place in the southern provinces, Gustavus Adolphus, who had succeeded to the throne of Sweden, marched into the northern province of Livonia, where there were no Polish troops to resist him (all having been sent against the Turks), and took possession of this Polish province [see Scandinavian States (Sweden): A. D. 1611–1629]. Gustavus Adolphus, however, proposed to restore it to Poland on condition that Sigismond III. would renounce all claim to the crown of Sweden, to which the Polish sovereign was the rightful heir. But in this matter, as in all previous ones, the Polish king acted with the same obstinacy, and the same disregard for the interests of the kingdom. He would not accept the terms offered by Gustavus Adolphus, and by his refusal Poland lost the entire province of Livonia with the exception of the city of Dynabourg." Sigismond III. died in 1632, and his eldest son, Ladislas IV., "was immediately elected King of Poland, a proceeding which spared the kingdom all the miseries attendant on an interregnum. In 1633, after the successful campaign against the Muscovites, in which the important fortified city of Smolensk, as well as other territory, was taken, a treaty advantageous to Poland was concluded. Soon afterwards, through the intervention of England and France, another treaty was made between Poland and Sweden by which the King of Sweden restored to Poland a part of Prussia which had been annexed by Sweden. Thus the reign of Ladislas IV. commenced auspiciously with regard to external matters. . . . Unhappily the bitter quarrels of the nobles were incessant; their only unanimity consisted in trying to foil the good intentions of their kings." Ladislas IV. died in 1648, and was succeeded by his brother, John Casimir, who had entered the Order of the Jesuits some years before, and had been made a cardinal by the Pope, but who was now absolved from his vows and permitted to marry.—K. Wolski, *Poland, lect.* 11–12.

A. D. 1610-1612.—Intervention in Russia.—Occupation of and expulsion from Moscow. See Russia: A. D. 1533–1682.

A. D. 1648-1654.—The great revolt of the Cossacks.—Their allegiance transferred to the Russian Czar.—Since 1320, the Cossacks of the Ukraine had acknowledged allegiance, first, to the Grand Duke of Lithuania, and afterwards to the king of Poland on the two crowns becoming united in the Jagellon family [see Cossacks]. They had long been treated by the Poles with harshness and insolence, and in the time of the hetman Bogdan Khmelnitski, who had personally suffered grievous wrongs at the hands of the Poles, they were ripe for revolt (1648). "His standard was joined by hordes of Tatars from Bessarabia and the struggle partook to a large extent of the nature of a holy war, as the Cossacks and Malo-Russians generally were of the

Greek faith, and their violence was directed against the Roman Catholics and Jews. It would be useless to encumber our pages with the details of the brutal massacres inflicted by the infuriated peasants in this jacquerie; unfortunately their atrocities had been provoked by the cruelties of their masters. Bogdan succeeded in taking Lemberg, and became master of all the palatinate, with the exception of Zamosc, a fortress into which the Polish authorities retreated. On the election of John Casimir as king of Poland, he at once opened negotiations with the successful Cossack, and matters were about to be arranged peacefully. Khmelnitski accepted the 'bulava' of a hetman which was offered him by the king. The Cossacks demanded the restoration of their ancient privileges, the removal of the detested Union — as the attempt to amalgamate the Greek and Latin Churches was called — the banishment of the Jesuits from the Ukraine, and the expulsion of the Jews, with other conditions. They were rejected, however, as impossible, and Prince Wisniowiecki, taking advantage of the security into which the Cossacks were lulled, fell upon them treacherously and defeated them with great slaughter. All compromise now seemed hopeless, but the desertion of his Tatar allies made Bogdan again listen to terms at Zborow. The peace, however, was of short duration, and on the 28th of June, 1651, at the battle of Beresteczko in Galicia, the hosts of Bogdan were defeated with great slaughter. After this engagement Bogdan saw that he had no chance of withstanding the Poles by his own resources, and accordingly sent an embassy to Moscow in 1652, offering to transfer himself and his confederates to the allegiance of the Tsar. The negotiations were protracted for some time, and were concluded at Pereiaslavl, when Bogdan and seventeen Malo-Russian regiments took the oath to Buturlin, the Tsar's commissioner. Quite recently a monument has been erected to the Cossack chief at Kiev, but he seems, to say the least, to have been a man of doubtful honesty. Since this time the Cossacks have formed an integral part of the Russian Empire."—W. R. Morfill, *The Story of Russia, ch.* 6.

Also in: Count H. Krasinski, *The Cossacks of the Ukraine, ch.* 1.

A. D. 1652.—First exercise of the Liberum Veto. See above: A. D. 1578–1652.

A. D. 1656-1657.—Rapid and ephemeral conquest by Charles X. of Sweden.—Loss of the Feudal overlordship of Prussia. See Scandinavian States (Sweden): A. D. 1644–1697; and Brandenburg: A. D. 1640–1688.

A. D. 1668-1696.—Abdication of John Casimir.—War with the Turks.—Election and reign of John Sobieski.—"In 1668, John Casimir, whose disposition had always been that of a monk rather than that of a king, resigned his throne, and retired to France, where he died as Abbé de St. Germain in 1672. He left the kingdom shorn of a considerable part of its ancient dominions; for, besides that portion of it which had been annexed to Muscovy, Poland sustained another loss in this reign by the erection of the Polish dependency of Brandenburg [Prussia] into an independent state — the germ of the present Prussian kingdom. For two years after the abdication of John Casimir, the country was in a state of turmoil and confusion, caused partly by the recent calamities, and partly by intrigues regarding the succession; but in 1670, a powerful faction of the inferior nobles secured the election of Michael Wisniowiecki, an amiable but silly young man. His election gave rise to great dissatisfaction among the Polish grandees; and it is probable that a civil war would have broken out, had not the Poles been called upon to use all their energies against their old enemies the Turks. Crossing the south-eastern frontier of Poland with an immense army, these formidable foes swept all before them. Polish valour, even when commanded by the greatest of Polish geniuses, was unable to check their progress; and in 1672 a dishonourable treaty was concluded, by which Poland ceded to Turkey a section of her territories, and engaged to pay to the sultan an annual tribute of 22,000 ducats. No sooner was this ignominious treaty concluded, than the Polish nobles became ashamed of it; and it was resolved to break the peace, and challenge Turkey once more to a decisive death-grapple. Luckily, at this moment Wisniowiecki died; and on the 20th of April 1674, the Polish diet elected, as his successor, John Sobieski — a name illustrious in the history of Poland. . . . He was of a noble family, his father being castellan of Cracow, and the proprietor of princely estates; and his mother being descended from Zalkiewski, one of the most celebrated generals that Poland had produced. . . . In the year 1660, he was one of the commanders of the Polish army sent to repel the Russians, who were ravaging the eastern provinces of the kingdom. A great victory which he gained at Slobadyssa over the Muscovite general Sheremetoff, established his military reputation, and from that time the name of Sobieski was known over all Eastern Europe. His fame increased during the six years which followed, till he outshone all his contemporaries. He was created by his sovereign, John Casimir, first the Grand-marshal, and afterwards the Grand-hetman of the kingdom; the first being the highest civil, and the second the highest military, dignity in Poland, and the two having never before been held in conjunction by the same individual. These dignities, having once been conferred on Sobieski, could not be revoked; for, by the Polish constitution, the king, though he had the power to confer honours, was not permitted to resume them. . . . When John Casimir abdicated the throne, Sobieski, retaining his office of Grand-hetman under his successor, the feeble Wisniowiecki, was commander-in-chief of the Polish forces against the Turks. In the campaigns of 1671 and 1672, his successes against this powerful enemy were almost miraculous. But all his exertions were insufficient, in the existing condition of the republic, to deliver it from the terror of the impetuous Mussulmans. In 1672, as we have already informed our readers, a disgraceful truce was concluded between the Polish diet and the sultan. . . . When . . . Sobieski, as Grand-hetman, advised the immediate rupture of the dishonourable treaty with the Turks, [the] approval was unanimous and enthusiastic. Raising an army of 30,000 men, not without difficulty, Sobieski marched against the Turks. He laid siege to the fortress of Kotzim, garrisoned by a strong Turkish force, and hitherto deemed impregnable. The fortress was taken; the provinces of Moldavia and Walachia yielded; the Turks hastily retreated across the Danube; and 'Europe thanked God for the most

signal success which, for three centuries, Christendom had gained over the Infidel.' While the Poles were preparing to follow up their victory, intelligence reached the camp that Wisniowiecki was dead. He had died of a surfeit of apples sent him from Danzig. The army returned home, to be present at the assembling of the diet for the election of the new sovereign. The diet had already met when Sobieski, and those of the Polish nobles who had been with him, reached Warsaw. The electors were divided respecting the claims of two candidates, both foreigners — Charles of Lorraine, who was supported by Austria; and Philip of Neuburg, who was supported by Louis XIV. of France. Many of the Polish nobility had become so corrupt, that foreign gold and foreign influence ruled the diet. In this case, the Austrian candidate seemed to be most favourably received; but, as the diet was engaged in the discussion, Sobieski entered, and taking his place in the diet, proposed the Prince of Condé. A stormy discussion ensued, in the midst of which the cry of 'Let a Pole rule over Poland,' was raised by one of the nobles, who further proposed that John Sobieski should be elected. The proposition went with the humour of the assembly, and Sobieski, under the title of John III., was proclaimed king of Poland (1674). Sobieski accepted the proffered honour, and immediately set about improving the national affairs, founding an institution for the education of Polish nobles, and increasing the army. . . . After several battles of lesser moment with his Turkish foes, Sobieski prepared for a grand effort; but before he could mature his plans, the Pasha of Damascus appeared with an army of 300,000 men on the Polish frontier, and threatened the national subjugation. With the small force he could immediately collect, amounting to not more than 10,000 soldiers, Sobieski opposed this enormous force, taking up his position in two small villages on the banks of the Dniester, where he withstood a bombardment of 20 days. Food and ammunition had failed, but still the Poles held out. Gathering the balls and shells which the enemy threw within their entrenchments, they thrust them into their own cannons and mortars, and dashed them back against the faces of the Turks, who surrounded them on all sides at the distance of a musket-shot. The besiegers were surprised, and slackened their fire. At length, early in the morning of the 14th of October 1676, they saw the Poles issue slowly out of their entrenchments in order of battle, and apparently confident of victory. A superstitious fear came over them at such a strange sight. No ordinary mortal, they thought, could dare such a thing; and the Tartars cried out that it was useless to fight against the wizard king. The pasha himself was superior to the fears of his men; but knowing that succours were approaching from Poland, he offered an honourable peace, which was accepted, and Sobieski returned home in triumph. Seven years of peace followed. These were spent by Sobieski in performing his ordinary duties as king of Poland — duties which the constant jealousies and discords of the nobles rendered by no means easy. . . . It was almost a relief to the hero when, in 1683, a threatened invasion of Christendom by the Turks called him again to the field. . . . After completely clearing Austria of the Turks [see HUNGARY: A. D. 1668–1683], Sobieski returned to Poland, again to be harassed with political and domestic annoyances. . . . Clogged and confined by an absurd system of government, to which the nobles tenaciously clung, his genius was prevented from employing itself with effect upon great national objects. He died suddenly on Corpus Christi Day, in the year 1696; and 'with him,' says the historian, 'the glory of Poland descended to the tomb.' On the death of Sobieski, the crown of Poland was disposed of to the highest bidder. The competitors were James Sobieski, the son of John; the Prince of Conti; the Elector of Bavaria; and Frederick Augustus, Elector of Saxony. The last was the successful candidate, having bought over one half of the Polish nobility, and terrified the other half by the approach of his Saxon troops. He had just succeeded to the electorate of Saxony, and was already celebrated as one of the strongest and most handsome men in Europe. Augustus entertained a great ambition to be a conqueror, and the particular province which he wished to annex to Poland was Livonia, on the Baltic — a province which had originally belonged to the Teutonic Knights, for which the Swedes, Poles, and Russians had long contended; but which had now, for nearly a century, been in the possession of Sweden."—*Hist. of Poland* (*Chambers's Miscellany, no.* 29 (*v.* 4).

ALSO IN: A. T. Palmer, *Life of John Sobieski.*

A. D. 1683.—Sobieski's deliverance of Vienna from the Turks. See HUNGARY: A. D 1668–1683.

A. D. 1684-1696.—War of the Holy League against the Turks. See TURKS: A. D. 1684–1696.

A. D. 1696-1698.—Disputed Election of a King.—The crown gained by Augustus of Saxony.—On the death of Sobieski, Louis XIV., of France, put forward the Prince of Conti as a candidate for the vacant Polish throne. "The Emperor, the Pope, the Jesuits and Russia united in supporting the Elector Augustus of Saxony. The Elector had just abjured, in view of the throne of Poland, and the Pope found it quite natural to recompense the hereditary chief of the Lutheran party for having reëntered the Roman Church. The Jesuits, who were only too powerful in Poland, feared the Jansenist relations of Conti. As to the young Czar Peter, he wished to have Poland remain his ally, his instrument against the Turk and the Swede, and feared lest the French spirit should come to reorganize that country. He had chosen his candidate wisely: the Saxon king was to begin the ruin of Poland! The financial distress of France did not permit the necessary sacrifices, in an affair wherein money was to play an important part, to be made in time. The Elector of Saxony, on the contrary, exhausted his States to purchase partisans and soldiers. The Prince de Conti had, nevertheless, the majority, and was proclaimed King at Warsaw, June 27, 1697; but the minority proclaimed and called the Elector, who hastened with Saxon troops, and was consecrated King of Poland at Cracow (September 15). Conti, retarded by an English fleet that had obstructed his passage, did not arrive by sea till September 26 at Dantzic, which refused to receive him. The Prince took with him neither troops nor money. The Elector had had, on the contrary, all the time necessary to organize his resources. The Russians were threatening

Lithuania. Conti, abandoned by a great part of his adherents, abandoned the undertaking, and returned to France in the month of November. . . . In the following year Augustus of Saxony was recognized as King of Poland by all Europe, even by France."—H. Martin, *Hist. of France: Age of Louis XIV., v.* 2, *ch.* 4.

A. D. 1699.—The Peace of Carlowitz with the Sultan. See HUNGARY: A. D. 1683–1699.

A. D. 1700.—Aggressive league with Russia and Denmark against Charles XII. of Sweden. See SCANDINAVIAN STATES (SWEDEN): A. D. 1697–1700.

A. D. 1701-1707. — Subjugation by Charles XII. of Sweden. — Deposition of Augustus from the throne.—Election of Stanislaus Leczinski. See SCANDINAVIAN STATES (SWEDEN): A. D. 1701–1707.

A. D. 1709. — Restoration of Augustus to the throne. — Expulsion of Stanislaus Leczinski. See SCANDINAVIAN STATES (SWEDEN): A. D. 1707–1718.

A. D. 1720.—Peace with Sweden.—Recognition of Augustus.—Stanislaus allowed to call himself king. See SCANDINAVIAN STATES (SWEDEN): A. D. 1719–1721.

A. D. 1732-1733.—The election to the throne a European question.—France against Russia, Austria and Prussia.—Triumph of the three powers.—The crown renewed to the House of Saxony.— "It became clear that before long a struggle would take place for the Crown of Poland, in which the powers of Europe must interest themselves very closely. Two parties will compete for that uneasy throne: on the one side will stand the northern powers, supporting the claims of the House of Saxony, which was endeavouring to make the Crown hereditary and to restrict it to the Saxon line; on the other side we shall find France alone, desiring to retain the old elective system, and to place on the throne some prince, who, much beholden to her, should cherish French influences, and form a centre of resistance against the dominance of the northern powers. England stands neutral: the other powers are indifferent or exhausted. With a view to the coming difficulty, Russia, Austria, and Prussia, made a secret agreement in 1732, by which they bound themselves to resist all French influences in Poland. With this pact begins that system of nursing and interferences with which the three powers pushed the 'sick man of the North' to its ruin; it is the first stage towards the Partition-treaties. Early in 1733 Augustus II of Poland died: the Poles dreading these powerful neighbours, and drawn, as ever, by a subtle sympathy towards France, at once took steps to resist dictation, declared that they would elect none but a native prince, sent envoys to demand French help, and summoned Stanislaus Leczinski to Warsaw. Leczinski had been the protégé of Charles XII, who had set him on the Polish throne in 1704; with the fall of the great Swede the little Pole also fell (1712); after some vicissitudes he quietly settled at Weissenburg, whence his daughter Marie went to ascend the throne of France as spouse of Louis XV (1725). Now in 1733 the national party in Poland re-elected him their king, by a vast majority of votes: there was, however, an Austro-Russian faction among the nobles, and these, supported by strong armies of Germans and Russians, nominated Augustus III of Saxony to the throne: he had promised the Empress Anne to cede Courland to Russia, and Charles VI he had won over by acknowledging the Pragmatic Sanction. War thus became inevitable: the French majority had no strength with which to maintain their candidate against the forces of Russia and Austria; and France, instead of affording Stanislaus effective support at Warsaw, declared war against Austria. The luckless King was obliged to escape from Warsaw, and took refuge in Danzig, expecting French help: all that came was a single ship and 1,500 men, who, landing at the mouth of the Vistula, tried in vain to break the Russian lines. Their aid thus proving vain, Danzig capitulated, and Stanislaus, a broken refugee, found his way, with many adventures, back to France; Poland submitted to Augustus III."—G. W. Kitchin, *Hist. of France, bk.* 6, *ch.* 2 (*v.* 3).

A. D. 1763-1773.—The First Partition and the events which led to it.—The respective shares of Russia, Austria and Prussia.— "In 1762, Catherine II. ascended the throne of Russia. Everybody knows what ambition filled the mind of this woman; how she longed to bring two quarters of the globe under her rule, or under her influence; and how, above all, she was bent on playing a great part in the affairs of Western Europe. Poland lay between Europe and her empire; she was bound, therefore, to get a firm footing in Poland. . . . On the death of Augustus III., therefore, she would permit no foreign prince to mount the throne of Poland, but selected a native Polish nobleman, from the numerous class of Russian hirelings, and cast her eye upon a nephew of the Czartoriskys, Stanislaus Poniatowsky, a former lover of her own. Above all things she desired to perpetuate the chronic anarchy of Poland, so as to ensure the weakness of that kingdom. . . . A further desire in Catherine's mind arose from her own peculiar position in Russia at that time. She had deposed her Imperial Consort, deprived her son of the succession, and ascended the throne without the shadow of a title. During the first years of her reign, therefore, her situation was extremely critical." She desired to render herself popular, and "she could find nothing more in accordance with the disposition of the Russians . . . than the protection of the Greek Catholics in Poland. Incredible as it may seem, the frantic fanaticism of the Polish rulers had begun, in the preceding twenty or thirty years, to limit and partially to destroy, by harsh enactments, the ancient rights of the Nonconformists. . . . In the year 1763 a complaint was addressed to Catherine by Konisky, the Greek Bishop of Mohilev, that 150 parishes of his diocese had been forcibly Romanised by the Polish authorities. The Empress resolved to recover for the dissenters in Poland at least some of their ancient rights, and thus secure their eternal devotion to herself, and inspire the Russian people with grateful enthusiasm. At this time, however, King Augustus III. was attacked by his last illness. A new king must soon be elected at Warsaw, upon which occasion all the European Powers would make their voices heard. Catherine, therefore, in the spring of 1763, first sounded the Cabinets of Vienna and Berlin, in order, if possible, to gain common ground and their support for her diplomatic action. The

reception which her overtures met with at the two courts was such as to influence the next ten years of the history of Poland and Europe. . . . At Vienna, ever since Peter III. had renounced the Austrian alliance, a very unfavourable feeling towards Russia prevailed. . . . The result was that Austria came to no definite resolution, but returned a sullen and evasive reply. It was far otherwise with Frederick II. of Prussia. That energetic and clear-sighted statesman had his faults, but indecision had never been one of them. He agreed with Catherine in desiring that Poland should remain weak. On the other hand, he failed not to perceive that an excessive growth of Russia, and an abiding Russian occupation of Poland, might seriously threaten him. Nevertheless, he did not waver a moment. . . . He needed a powerful ally. . . . Russia alone was left, and he unhesitatingly seized her offered hand. . . . It was proposed to him that six articles should be signed, with certain secret provisions, by which were secured the election of a native for the throne of Poland, the maintenance of the Liberum Veto (i. e., of the anarchy of the nobles), and the support of the Nonconformists; while it was determined to prevent in Sweden all constitutional reforms. Frederick, who was called upon to protect the West Prussian Lutherans, just as the aid of Catherine had been sought by the Greek Bishop of Mohilev, made no objection. After the death of King Augustus III. of Poland, in October, 1763, Frederick signed the above treaty, April 11th, 1764. This understanding between the two Northern Powers caused no small degree of excitement at Vienna. It was immediately feared that Prussia and Russia would at once seize on Polish provinces. . . . This anxiety, however, was altogether premature. No one at St. Petersburg wished for a partition of Poland, but for increased influence over the entire Polish realm. Frederick II., for his part, did not aim at any territorial extension, but would abandon Poland for the time to Russia, that he might secure peace for his country by a Russian alliance. . . . Meanwhile, matters in Poland proceeded according to the wishes of Catherine. Her path was opened to her by the Poles themselves. It was at the call of the Czartoriskys [a wealthy and powerful Polish family], that a Russian army corps of 10,000 men entered the country, occupied Warsaw, and put down the opposing party. It was under the same protection that Stanislaus Poniatowsky was unanimously elected King, on September 1st, 1764. But the Czartoriskys were too clever. They intended, after having become masters of Poland by the help of Russia, to reform the constitution, to establish a regular administration, to strengthen the Crown, and finally to bow the Russians out of the kingdom." The Czartoriskys were soon at issue with the Russian envoy, who commanded the support of all their political opponents, together with that of all the religious Nonconformists, both in the Greek Church and among the Protestants. The King, too, went over to the latter, bought by a Russian subsidy. But this Russian confederation was speedily broken up, when the question of granting civil equality to the Nonconformists came up for settlement. The Russians carried the measure through by force and the act embodying it was signed March 5, 1768. "It was just here that the conflagration arose which first brought fearful evils upon the country itself, and then threatened all Europe with incalculable dangers. At Bar, in Podolia, two courageous men, Pulawski and Krasinski, who were deeply revolted at the concession of civil rights to heretics, set on foot a new Confederation to wage a holy war for the unity and purity of the Church. . . . The Roman Catholic population of every district joined the Confederation. . . . A terrible war began in the southern provinces. . . . The war on both sides was carried on with savage cruelty; prisoners were tortured to death; neither person nor property was spared. Other complications soon arose. . . . When . . . the Russians, in eager pursuit of a defeated band of Confederates, crossed the Turkish frontier, and the little town of Balta was burnt during an obstinate fight, . . . the Sultan, in an unexpected access of fury, declared war against Russia in October, 1768, because, as he stated in his manifesto, he could no longer endure the wrong done to Poland [see TURKS: A. D. 1768–1774]. Thus, by a sudden turn of affairs, this Polish question had become a European question of the first importance; and no one felt the change more deeply than King Frederick II. He knew Catherine well enough to be sure that she would not end the war now begun with Turkey, without some material gain to herself. It was equally plain that Austria would never leave to Russia territorial conquests of any great extent in Turkey. . . . The slightest occurrence might divide all Europe into two hostile camps; and Germany would, as usual, from her central position, have to suffer the worst evils of a general war. Frederick II. was thrown into the greatest anxiety by this danger, and he meditated continually how to prevent the outbreak of war. The main question in his mind was how to prevent a breach between Austria and Russia. Catherine wanted to gain more territory, while Austria could not allow her to make any conquests in Turkey. Frederick was led to inquire whether greater compliance might not be shown at Vienna, if Catherine, instead of a Turkish, were to take a Polish province, and were also to agree, on her part, to an annexation of Polish territory by Austria?" When this scheme — put forward as one originating with Count Lynar, a Saxon diplomatist — was broached at St. Petersburg, it met with no encouragement; but subsequently the same plan took shape in the mind of the young Emperor Joseph II., and he persuaded his mother, Maria Theresa, to consent to it. Negotiations to that end were opened with the Russian court. "After the foregoing proceedings, it was easy for Russia and Prussia to come to a speedy agreement. On February 17, 1772, a treaty was signed allotting West Prussia to the King, and the Polish territories east of the Dneiper and Duna to the Empress. The case of Austria was a more difficult one. . . . The treaty of partition was not signed by the three Powers until August, 1772. . . . The Prussian and Austrian troops now entered Poland on every side, simultaneously with the Russians. The bands of the Confederates, which had hitherto kept the Russians on the alert, now dispersed without further attempt at resistance. As soon as external tranquillity had been restored, a Diet was convened, in order at once to legalise the cession of the provinces to the three Powers by a formal compact, and to regulate

BURR & McPETRIDGE CO LITH PHILA

NTRAL EUROPE
E PEACE OF CAMPO FORMIO. (1797.)
RIAN
SSIAN
SIAN
CH SWEDISH
H PAPAL STATES
SIASTICAL STATES OF
MPIRE.
OUNDARY OF THE EMPIRE IS
N BY THE HEAVY RED LINE.
K'G D'M OF SWEDEN
K'G D'M OF DENMARK
BORNHOLM
RUSSIA
SAMOGITIA
LITHUANIA
PODLESIA
VOLHYNIA
EAST PRUSSIA
WEST PRUSSIA
POMERANIA
BRANDENBURG
K'G D'M OF PRUSSIA
SOUTH PRUSSIA
NEW GALICIA
SAXONY
SILESIA
BOHEMIA
MORAVIA
GALICIA AND LODOMERIA
AUSTRIA
K'G D'M OF HUNGARY
BUKOVINA
HANOVER
WESTPHALIA
HESSE CASSEL
HESSE DARMSTADT
WURTEMBURG
BAVARIA
SWITZERLAND
TYROL
SALZBURG
CARINTHIA
CARNIOLA
CROATIA
SLAVONIA
BOSNIA
HERZEGOVINA
DALMATIA
SERVIA
WALLACHIA
BULGARIA
TURKEY
ALBANIA
PRINCIPALITY OF PIEDMONT
DUCHY OF PARMA
GD. DUCHY OF TUSCANY
REPUBLIC OF THE STATES OF THE CHURCH
KINGDOM OF THE TWO SICILIES
K'G D'M OF SARDINIA
CORSICA
REP. REGUSA
MONTENEGRO
IONIAN ISLANDS
Copenhagen
Malmo
Memel
Konigsberg
Kowno
Niemen
Danzig
Colberg
Lubeck
Hamburg
Bremen
Hanover
Wittenberg
Stettin
Thorn
Grodno
Berlin
Posen
Warsaw
Magdeburg
Leipzig
Glogau
Breslau
Dresden
Weimar
Lublin
Sandomir
Vistula
Cracow
Lemberg
Prague
Nuremberg
Ratisbon
Zips
Halicz
Frankfurt
Mainz
Carlsruhe
Metz
Strasburg
Stuttgart
Ingolstadt
Ulm
Augsburg
Munich
Danube
Vienna
Pressburg
Buda Pest
Salzburg
Innsbruck
Zurich
Geneva
Bern
Milan
Turin
Cremona
Verona
Venice
Trieste
Agram
Drave
Theiss
Maros
Temesvar
Save
Belgrade
Osova
Genoa
Parma
Modena
Bologna
Florence
Arno
Ancona
Nice
Lucca
Rome
Sarajevo
Ragusa
Cattaro
Pristina
Widin
Sofia
Durazzo
Salonica
Janina
Corfu
Parga
Previsa
Monitza
Athens
Patras
Zante
Cerigo
Palermo
Messina
Reggio
Catania
Brindisi
Naples
Benevento
Pontecorvo
Terracina
Ajaccio
Bastia
Porto Ferrajo
Leghorn
Elba
Piombino
Civita Vecchia
Gaeta
Capua
Aversa
Salerno
Tarento
Otranto
Gallipoli
Augusta
Syracuse
Trapani
Marsala
Girgenti
Sciacca
Cagliari
Oristano
Sassari
Alghero
Porto Torres
Iglesias
Tempio
Bonifacio
Calvi
Bastia
5
10
15
20
25
55
50
45
40

the constitutional questions which had been unsettled since the revolt of the Confederation of Bar. It took some time to arrive at this result, and many a bold speech was uttered by the Poles; but it is sad to think that the real object of every discussion was the fixing the amount of donations and pensions which the individual senators and deputies were to receive from the Powers for their votes. Hereupon the act of cession was unanimously passed. . . . The Liberum Veto, the anarchy of the nobles, and the impotence of the Sovereign, were continued."—H. von Sybel, *The First Partition of Poland* (*Fortnightly Rev., July*, 1874, *v.* 22).—"One's clear belief . . . is of two things: First, that, as everybody admits, Friedrich had no real hand in starting the notion of Partitioning Poland;—but that he grasped at it with eagerness as the one way of saving Europe from War: Second, what has been much less noticed, that, under any other hand, it would have led Europe to War; and that to Friedrich is due the fact that it got effected without such accompaniment. [Carlyle's statement of the sharing of the Polish territory in the several partitions is incorrect. The following, from Witzleben, is more trustworthy: Russia, 8782 German square miles; Prussia, 2641; Austria, 2205] . . . Friedrich's share . . . as filling up the always dangerous gap between his Ost-Preussen and him, has, under Prussian administration, proved much the most valuable of the Three; and, next to Silesia, is Friedrich's most important acquisition. September 13th, 1772, it was at last entered upon,—through such waste-weltering confusions, and on terms never yet unquestionable. Consent of Polish Diet was not had for a year more; but that is worth little record."—T. Carlyle, *Hist. of Frederick the Great, bk.* 21, *ch.* 4 (*v.* 6).

Also in: W. Coxe, *Hist. of the House of Austria, ch.* 119 (*v.* 3).

A. D. 1791-1792.—The reformed Constitution of 1791 and its Russian strangulation.—"After the first Partition of Poland was completed in 1776, that devoted country was suffered for sixteen years to enjoy an interval of more undisturbed tranquillity than it had known for a century. Russian armies ceased to vex it. The dispositions of other foreign powers became more favourable. Frederic II now entered on that spotless and honourable portion of his reign, in which he made a just war for the defence of the integrity of Bavaria, and of the independence of Germany. . . . Attempts were not wanting to seduce him into new enterprises against Poland. . . . As soon as Frederic returned to counsels worthy of himself, he became unfit for the purposes of the Empress, who, in 1780, refused to renew her alliance with him, and found a more suitable instrument of her designs in the restless character, and shallow understanding, of Joseph II, whose unprincipled ambition was now released from the restraint which his mother's scruples had imposed on it. . . . Other powers now adopted a policy, of which the influence was favourable to the Poles. Prussia, as she receded from Russia, became gradually connected with England, Holland, and Sweden; and her honest policy in the care of Bavaria placed her at the head of all the independent members of the Germanic Confederacy. Turkey declared war against Russia; and the Austrian Government was disturbed by the discontent and revolts which the precipitate innovations of Joseph had excited in various provinces of the monarchy. A formidable combination against the power of Russia was in process of time formed. . . . In the treaty between Prussia and the Porte, concluded at Constantinople in January, 1790, the contracting parties bound themselves to endeavour to obtain from Austria the restitution of those Polish provinces to which she had given the name of Galicia. During the progress of these auspicious changes, the Polish nation began to entertain the hope that they might at length be suffered to reform their institutions, to provide for their own quiet and safety, and to adopt that policy which might one day enable them to resume their ancient station among European nations. From 1778 to 1788, no great measures had been adopted; but no tumults disturbed the country: reasonable opinions made some progress, and a national spirit was slowly reviving. The nobility patiently listened to plans for the establishment of a productive revenue and a regular army; a disposition to renounce their dangerous right of electing a king made perceptible advances; and the fatal law of unanimity had been so branded as an instrument of Russian policy, that in the Diets of these ten years no nuncio was found bold enough to employ his negative. . . . In the midst of these excellent symptoms of public sense and temper, a Diet assembled at Warsaw in October 1788, from whom the restoration of the republic was hoped, and by whom it would have been accomplished, if their prudent and honest measures had not been defeated by one of the blackest acts of treachery recorded in the annals of mankind. . . . The Diet applied itself with the utmost diligence and caution to reform the State. They watched the progress of popular opinion, and proposed no reformation till the public seemed ripe for its reception." On the 3d of May, 1791, a new Constitution, which had been outlined and discussed in the greater part of its provisions, during most of the previous two years, was reported to the Diet. That body had been doubled, a few months before, by the election of new representatives from every Dietine, who united with the older members, in accordance with a law framed for the occasion. By this double Diet, the new Constitution was adopted on the day of its presentation, with only twelve dissentient voices. "Never were debates and votes more free: these men, the most hateful of apostates, were neither attacked, nor threatened, nor insulted." The new Constitution "confirmed the rights of the Established Church, together with religious liberty, as dictated by the charity which religion inculcates and inspires. It established an hereditary monarchy in the Electoral House of Saxony; reserving to the nation the right of choosing a new race of Kings, in case of the extinction of that family. The executive power was vested in the King, whose ministers were responsible for its exercise. The Legislature was divided into two Houses, the Senate and the House of Nuncios, with respect to whom the ancient constitutional language and forms were preserved. The necessity of unanimity [the Liberum Veto] was taken away, and, with it, those dangerous remedies of Confederation and Confederate Diets which it had rendered necessary. Each considerable town received new rights, with a restoration of all their

ancient privileges. The burgesses recovered the right of electing their own magistrates. . . . All the offices of the State, the law, the church, and the army, were thrown open to them. The larger towns were empowered to send deputies to the Diet, with a right to vote on all local and commercial subjects, and to speak on all questions whatsoever. All these deputies became noble, as did every officer of the rank of captain, and every lawyer who filled the humblest office of magistracy, and every burgess who acquired a property in land paying £5 of yearly taxes. . . . Industry was perfectly unfettered. . . . Numerous paths to nobility were thus thrown open. Every art was employed to make the ascent easy. . . . Having thus communicated political privileges to hitherto disregarded freemen, . . . the constitution extended to all serfs the full protection of law, which before was enjoyed by those of the Royal demesnes; and it facilitated and encouraged voluntary manumission. . . . The storm which demolished this noble edifice came from abroad. . . . The remaining part of the year 1791 passed in quiet, but not without apprehension. On the 9th of January, 1792, Catharine concluded a peace with Turkey at Jassy; and, being thus delivered from all foreign enemies, began once more to manifest intentions of interfering in the affairs of Poland. . . . A small number of Polish nobles furnished her with that very slender pretext with which she was always content. Their chiefs were Rzewuski . . . and Felix Potocki. . . . These unnatural apostates deserted their long-suffering country at the moment when, for the first time, hope dawned on her. . . . They were received by Catharine with the honours due from her to the betrayers of their country. On the 12th of May, 1792, they formed a Confederation at Targowitz. On the 18th, the Russian minister at Warsaw declared that the Empress, 'called on by many distinguished Poles who had confederated against the pretended constitution of 1791, would, in virtue of her guarantee, march an army into Poland to restore the liberties of the Republic.'" The hope, meantime, of help from Prussia, which had been pledged to Poland by a treaty of alliance in March, 1790, was speedily and cruelly deceived. "Assured of the connivance of Prussia, Catharine now poured an immense army into Poland, along the whole line of frontier, from the Baltic to the neighbourhood of the Euxine. The spirit of the Polish nation was unbroken. . . . A series of brilliant actions [especially at Polonna and Dubienka] occupied the summer of 1792, in which the Polish army [under Poniatowski and Kosciusko], alternately victorious and vanquished, gave equal proofs of unavailing gallantry. Meantime Stanislaus . . . on the 4th of July published a proclamation declaring that he would not survive his country. But, on the 22d of the same month . . . [he] declared his accession to the Confederation of Targowitz; and thus threw the legal authority of the republic into the hands of that band of conspirators. The gallant army, over whom the Diet had intrusted their unworthy King with absolute authority, were now compelled, by his treacherous orders, to lay down their arms. . . . Such was the unhappy state of Poland during the remainder of the year 1792," while the Empress of Russia and the King of Prussia were secretly arranging the terms of a new Treaty of Partition.—Sir J. Mackintosh, *Account of the Partition of Poland* (*Edinburgh Rev., Nov.*, 1822; *reprinted in Miscellaneous Works*).

Also in: H. Von Sybel, *Hist. of the French Rev., bk.* 2, *ch.* 1 *and* 6, *bk.* 4, *ch.* 1, *and bk.* 6 (*v.* 1–2).—A. Gielgud, *The Centenary of the Polish Constitution* (*Westminster Rev., v.* 135, *p.* 547).—F. C. Schlosser, *Hist. of the* 18*th Century, v.* 6, *div.* 1, *ch.* 2, *sect.* 4.—See, also, Germany: A. D. 1791–1792.

A. D. 1793-1796.—The Second and Third Partitions.—Extinction of Polish nationality.—"The Polish patriots, remaining in ignorance of the treaty of partition, were unconscious of half their misfortunes. The King of Prussia in his turn crossed the western frontier [January, 1793], announcing in his manifesto that the troubles of Poland compromised the safety of his own States, that Dantzig had sent corn to the French revolutionaries, and that Great Poland was infested by Jacobin clubs, whose intrigues were rendered doubly dangerous by the continuation of the war with France. The King of Prussia affected to see Jacobins whenever it was his interest to find them. The part of each of the powers was marked out in advance. Russia was to have the eastern provinces, with a population of 3,000,000, as far as a line drawn from the eastern frontier of Courland, which, passing Pinsk, ended in Gallicia, and included Borissof, Minsk, Sloutsk, Volhynia, Podolia, and Little Russia. Prussia had the long-coveted cities of Thorn and Dantzig, as well as Great Poland, Posen, Gnezen, Kalisch, and Czenstochovo. If Russia still only annexed Russian or Lithuanian territory, Prussia for the second time cut Poland to the quick, and another million and a half of Slavs passed under the yoke of the Germans. It was not enough to despoil Poland, now reduced to a territory less extensive than that occupied by Russia; it was necessary that she should consent to the spoliation—that she should legalise the partition. A diet was convoked at Grodno, under the pressure of the Russian bayonets," and by bribery as well as by coercion, after long resistance, the desired treaty of cession was obtained. "The Polish troops who were encamped on the provinces ceded to the Empress, received orders to swear allegiance to her; the army that remained to the republic consisted only of 15,000 men." Meantime, Kosciuszko, who had won reputation in the war of the American Revolution, and enhanced it in the brief Polish struggle of 1792, was organizing throughout Poland a great revolt, directing the work from Dresden, to which city he had retired. "The order to disband the army hastened the explosion. Madalinski refused to allow the brigade that he commanded to be disarmed, crossed the Bug, threw himself on the Prussian Provinces, and then fell back on Cracow. At his approach, this city, the second in Poland, the capital of the ancient kings, rose and expelled the Russian garrison. Kosciuszko hastened to the scene of action, and put forth the 'act of insurrection,' in which the hateful conduct of the co-partitioners was branded, and the population called to arms. Five thousand scythes were made for the peasants, the voluntary offerings of patriots were collected, and those of obstinate and lukewarm people were extracted by force." On the 17th of April, 1794, the inhabitants of Warsaw rose and expelled the Russian troops, who left behind,

on retreating, 4,000 killed and wounded, 2,000 prisoners, and 12 cannon. "A provisional government installed itself at Warsaw, and sent a courier to Kosciuszko." But Russian, Prussian and Austrian armies were fast closing in upon the ill-armed and outnumbered patriots. The Prussians took Cracow; the Russians mastered Wilna; the Austrians entered Lublin; and Kosciuszko, forced to give battle to the Russians, at Macciowice, October 10, was beaten, and, half dead from many wounds, was left a prisoner in the hands of his enemies. Then the victorious Russian army, under Souvorof, made haste to Warsaw and carried the suburb of Praga by storm. "The dead numbered 12,000; the prisoners only one." Warsaw, in terror, surrendered, and Poland, as an independent state, was extinguished. "The third treaty of partition, forced on the Empress by the importunity of Prussia, and in which Austria also took part, was put in execution [1795–1796]. Russia took the rest of Lithuania as far as the Niemen (Wilna, Grodno, Kovno, Novogrodek, Slonim), and the rest of Volhynia to the Bug (Vladimir, Loutsk, and Kremenetz). . . . Besides the Russian territory, Russia also annexed the old Lithuania of the Jagellons, and finally acquired Courland and Samogitia. Prussia had all Eastern Poland, with Warsaw; Austria had Cracow, Sandomir, Lublin, and Chelm."—A. Rambaud, *Hist. of Russia, v.* 2, *ch.* 10.

Also in: R. N. Bain, *The Second Partition of Poland* (*Eng. Historical Rev., April*, 1891).—H. von Sybel, *Hist. of the French Rev., bk.* 7, *ch.* 5, *bk.* 9, *ch.* 3 (*v.* 3); *and bk.* 10, *ch.* 2–4 (*v.* 4).—See, also, France: A. D. 1793 (March—September).

A. D. 1806.—False hopes of national restoration raised by Napoleon. See Germany: A. D. 1806 (October—December); and 1806–1807.

A. D. 1807.—Prussian provinces formed into the grand duchy of Warsaw, and given to the king of Saxony. See Germany: A. D. 1807 (June—July).

A. D. 1809.—Cession of part of Bohemia, Cracow, and western Galicia, by Austria, to the grand duchy of Warsaw. See Germany: A. D. 1809 (July—September).

A. D. 1812.—Fresh attempt to re-establish the kingdom, not encouraged by Napoleon. See Russia: A. D. 1812 (June—September).

A. D. 1814-1815.—The Polish question in the Congress of Vienna.—The grand duchy of Warsaw given to Russia.—Constitution granted by the Czar. See Vienna, The Congress of.

A. D. 1830-1832.—Rising against the Russian oppressor.—Courageous struggle for independence.—Early victories and final defeat.—Barbarity of the conqueror.—"Poland, like Belgium and the Romagna, had felt the invigorating influence of the Revolution of July [in France]. The partition of Poland had been accomplished in a dark period of the preceding century. It was almost universally regarded in Western Europe as a mistake and a crime. It was a mistake to have removed the barrier which separated Russia from the West; it was a crime to have sacrificed a free and brave people to the ambition of a relentless autocrat. . . . The cause of freedom was identified with the cause of Poland, 'and freedom shrieked' when Poland's champion 'fell.' The statesmen, however, who parcelled out Europe amongst the victorious autocrats in 1815 were incapable of appreciating the feelings which had inspired the Scotch poet. Castlereagh, indeed, endeavoured to make terms for Poland. But he did not lay much stress on his demands. He contented himself with obtaining the forms of constitutional government for the Poles. Poland, constituted a kingdom, whose crown was to pass by hereditary succession to the Emperors of Russia, was to be governed by a resident Viceroy, assisted by a Polish Diet. Constantine, who had abdicated the crown of Russia in his brother's favour, was Viceroy of Poland. . . . He was residing at Warsaw when the news of the glorious days of July reached Poland. The Poles were naturally affected by the tidings of a revolution which had expelled autocracy from France. Kosciusko—the hero of 1794—was their favourite patriot. The cadets at the Military School in Warsaw, excited at the news, drank to his memory. Constantine thought that young men who dared to drink to Kosciusko deserved to be flogged. The cadets, learning his decision, determined on resisting it. Their determination precipitated a revolution which, perhaps, under any circumstances, would have occurred. Every circumstance which could justify revolt existed in Poland. The Constitution provided for the regular assembly of the Diet: the Diet had not been assembled for five years. The Constitution declared that taxes should not be imposed on the Poles without the consent of their representatives: for fifteen years no budget had been submitted to the Diet. The Constitution provided for the personal liberty of every Pole: the Grand Duke seized and imprisoned the wretched Poles at his pleasure. The Constitution had given Poland a representative government; and Constantine, in defiance of it, had played the part of an autocrat. The threat of punishment, which Constantine pronounced against the military cadets, merely lighted the torch which was already prepared. Eighteen young men, armed to the teeth, entered the Grand Duke's palace and forced their way into his apartments. Constantine had just time to escape by a back staircase. His flight saved his life. . . . The insurrection, commenced in the Archduke's palace, soon spread. Some of the Polish regiments passed over to the insurgents. Constantine, who displayed little courage or ability, withdrew from the city; and, on the morning of the 30th of November [1830], the Poles were in complete possession of Warsaw. They persuaded Chlopicki, a general who had served with distinction under Suchet in Spain, to place himself at their head. . . . Raised to the first position in the State, his warmest counsellors urged him to attack the few thousand men whom Constantine still commanded. Chlopicki preferred negotiating with the Russians. The negotiation, of course, failed. . . . Chlopicki—his own well-intentioned effort having failed—resigned his office; and his fellowcountrymen invested Radziwil with the command of their army, and placed Adam Czartoryski at the head of the Government. In the meanwhile Nicholas was steadily preparing for the contest which was before him. Diebitsch, who had brought the campaign of 1829 to a victorious conclusion, was entrusted with the command of the Russian army. . . . Three great military roads converge from the

east upon Warsaw. The most northerly of these enters Poland at Kovno, crosses the Narew, a tributary of the Bug, at Ostrolenka, and runs down the right bank of the first of these rivers; the central road crosses the Bug at Brzesc and proceeds almost due west upon Warsaw; the most southerly of the three enters Poland from the Austrian frontier, crosses the Vistula at Gora, and proceeds along its west bank to the capital. Diebitsch decided on advancing by all three routes on Warsaw. . . . Diebitsch, on the 20th of February, 1831, attacked the Poles; on the 25th he renewed the attack. The battle on the 20th raged round the village of Grochow; it raged on the 25th round the village of Praga. Fought with extreme obstinacy, neither side was able to claim any decided advantage. The Russians could boast that the Poles had withdrawn across the Vistula. The Poles could declare that their retreat had been conducted at leisure, and that the Russians were unable or unwilling to renew the attack. Diebitsch himself, seriously alarmed at the situation into which he had fallen, remained for a month in inaction at Grochow. Before the month was over Radziwil, who had proved unequal to the duties of his post, was superseded in the command of the Polish army by Skrzynecki. On the 30th of March, Skrzynecki crossed the Vistula at Praga, and attacked the division of the Russian army which occupied the forest of Waver, near Grochow. The attack was made in the middle of the night. The Russians were totally defeated; they experienced a loss of 5,000 in killed and wounded, and 6,000 prisoners. Crippled by this disaster, Diebitsch fell back before the Polish army. Encouraged by his success, Skrzynecki pressed forward in pursuit. The great central road by which Warsaw is approached crosses the Kostczyn, a tributary of the Bug, near the little village of Iganie, about half-way between Russia and Warsaw. Eleven days after the victory of the 30th of March the Russians were again attacked by the Poles at Iganie. The Poles won a second victory. The Russians, disheartened at a succession of reverses, scattered before the attack; and the cause of Poland seemed to have been already won by the gallantry of her children and the skill of their generals. Diebitsch, however, defeated at Grochow and Iganie, was not destroyed. . . . Foregoing his original intention of advancing by three roads on Warsaw, he determined to concentrate his right on the northern road at Ostrolenka, his left, on the direct road at Siedlice. It was open to Skrzynecki to renew the attack, where Diebitsch expected it, and throw himself on the defeated remnants of the Russian army at Siedlice. Instead of doing so he took advantage of his central situation to cross the Bug and throw himself upon the Russian right at Ostrolenka. . . . Skrzynecki had reason to hope that he might obtain a complete success before Diebitsch could by any possibility march to the rescue. He failed. Diebitsch succeeded in concentrating his entire force before the destruction of his right wing had been consummated. On the 26th of May, Skrzynecki found himself opposed to the whole Russian army. Throughout the whole of that day the Polish levies gallantly struggled for the victory. When evening came they remained masters of the field which had been the scene of the contest. A negative victory of this character, however, was not the object of the great movement upon the Russian right. The Polish general, his army weakened by heavy losses, resolved on retiring upon Warsaw. Offensive operations were over: the defensive campaign had begun. Victory with the Poles had, in fact, proved as fatal as defeat. The Russians, relying upon their almost illimitable resources, could afford to lose two men for every one whom Poland could spare. . . . It happened, too, that a more fatal enemy than even war fell upon Poland in the hour of her necessity. The cholera, which had been rapidly advancing through Russia during 1830, broke out in the Russian army in the spring of 1831. The prisoners taken at Iganie communicated the seeds of infection to the Polish troops. Both armies suffered severely from the disease; but the effects of it were much more serious to the cause of Poland than to the cause of Russia. . . . A fortnight after the battle of Ostrolenka, Diebitsch, who had advanced his head-quarters to Pultusk, succumbed to the malady. In the same week Constantine, the Viceroy of Poland, and his Polish wife, also died. . . . Diebitsch was at once succeeded in the command by Paskievitsch, an officer who had gained distinction in Asia Minor. . . . On the 7th of July, Paskievitsch crossed the Vistula at Plock, and threatened Warsaw from the rear. . . . Slowly and steadily he advanced against the capital. On the 6th of September he attacked the devoted city. Inch by inch the Russians made their way over the earthworks which had been constructed in its defence. On the evening of the 7th the town was at their mercy; on the 8th it capitulated. . . . The news of its fall reached Paris on the 15th of September. The news of Waterloo had not created so much consternation in the French capital. Business was suspended; the theatres were closed. The cause of Poland was in every mind, the name of Poland on every tongue. . . . On the 26th of February, 1832, Nicholas promulgated a new organic statute for the government of Poland, which he had the insolence to claim for Russia by the right of conquest of 1815. A draft of the statute reached Western Europe in the spring of 1832. About the same time stories were received of the treatment which the Russians were systematically applying to the ill-fated country. Her schools were closed; her national libraries and public collections removed; the children of the Poles were carried into Russia; their fathers were swept into the Russian army; whole families accused of participation in the rebellion were marched into the interior of the empire; columns of Poles, it was stated, could be seen on the Russian roads linked man to man by bars of iron; and little children, unable to bear the fatigues of a long journey, were included among them; the dead bodies of those who had perished on the way could be seen on the sides of the Russian roads. The wail of their wretched mothers — 'Oh, that the Czar could be drowned in our tears!' — resounded throughout Europe."—S. Walpole, *Hist. of England, ch.* 16 (*v.* 3).

Also in: J. Hordynski, *Hist. of the late Polish Rev.*—A. Rambaud, *Hist. of Russia, v.* 2, *ch.* 14. —Sir A. Alison, *Hist. of Europe*, 1815–52, *ch.* 26.

A. D. 1846.— Insurrection in Galicia suppressed.—Extinction of the republic of Cracow.—Its annexation to Austria. See Austria: A. D. 1815–1846.

A. D. 1860-1864.—The last insurrection.—"In 1860 broke out the last great Polish insurrection, in all respects a very ill-advised attempt. On the 29th of November of that year, on the occasion of the 30th anniversary of the revolution of 1830, national manifestations, taking a religious form, took place in the Warsaw churches. . . . On the 25th of February, 1861, on the anniversary of the battle of Grochow, the Agricultural Society of that city, presided over by Count Zamojski, held a meeting for the purpose of presenting a petition to the Emperor to grant a constitution. Although the Tsar did not concede this demand, he decreed by an ukase of the 26th of March a council of state for the kingdom, elective councils in each government, and municipal councils in Warsaw and the chief cities. Moreover, the Polish language was to be adopted in all the schools of the kingdom. . . . On the 8th of April the people appeared in crowds in front of the castle of the Viceroy, and when they refused to disperse, were fired upon by the soldiers. About 200 persons were killed in this unfortunate affair, and many more wounded. The viceroyalty of Count Lambert was not successful in conciliating the people; he was succeeded by Count Lüders, who was reactionary in his policy. An attempt was made in June, 1862, on the life of the Count in the Saxon Garden (Saksonski Sad), and he was soon afterwards recalled; his place being taken by the Grand Duke Constantine, who was chiefly guided by the Marquis Wielopolski, an unpopular but able man. Two attempts were made upon the life of the Grand Duke, the latter of which was nearly successful; the life of Wielopolski was also several times in danger. . . . On the night of June 15, 1863, a secret conscription was held, and the persons considered to be most hostile to the Government were taken in their beds and forcibly enlisted. Out of a population of 180,000 the number thus seized at Warsaw was 2,000; soon after this the insurrection broke out. Its proceedings were directed by a secret committee, styled Rzad (Government), and were as mysterious as the movements of the celebrated Fehmgerichte. The Poles fought under enormous difficulties. Most of the bands consisted of undisciplined men, unfamiliar with military tactics, and they had to contend with well-organised troops. Few of them had muskets; the generality were armed only with pikes, scythes, and sticks. . . . The bands of the insurgents were chiefly composed of priests, the smaller landowners, lower officials, and peasants who had no land, but those peasants who possessed any land refused to join. Many showed but a languid patriotism on account of the oppressive laws relating to the poorer classes, formerly in vigour in Poland, of which the tradition was still strong. The war was only guerilla fighting, in which the dense forests surrounding the towns were of great assistance to the insurgents. The secret emissaries of the revolutionary Government were called stiletcziki, from the daggers which they carried. They succeeded in killing many persons who had made themselves obnoxious to the national party. . . . No quarter was given to the chiefs of the insurgents; when captured they were shot or hanged. . . . When the Grand Duke Constantine resigned the viceroyalty at Warsaw he was succeeded by Count Berg. . . . By May, 1864, the insurrection was suppressed, but it had cost Poland dear. All its old privileges were now taken away; henceforth all teaching, both in the universities and schools, must be in the Russian language. Russia was triumphant, and paid no attention to the demands of the three Great Powers, England, France, and Austria. Prussia had long been silently and successfully carrying on her plan for the Germanisation of Posen, and on the 8th of February, 1863, she had concluded a convention with Russia with a view of putting a stop to the insurrection. Her method throughout has been more drastic; she has slowly eliminated or weakened the Polish element, carefully avoiding any of those reprisals which would cause a European scandal."—W. R. Morfill, *The Story of Poland, ch.* 12.

A. D. 1868.—Complete incorporation with Russia.—By an imperial ukase, February 23, 1868, the government of Poland was absolutely incorporated with that of Russia.

POLAR STAR, The Order of the.—A Swedish order of knighthood, the date of the founding of which is uncertain.

POLEMARCH. See GREECE: FROM THE DORIAN MIGRATION TO B. C. 683.

POLETÆ.—POLETERIUM.—"Every thing which the state [Athens] sold, or leased; revenues, real property, mines, confiscated estates, in which is to be included also the property of public debtors, who were in arrear after the last term of respite, and the bodies of the aliens under the protection of the state, who had not paid the sum required for protection, and of foreigners who had been guilty of assuming the rights of citizenship, or of the crime called apostasion; all these, I say, together with the making of contracts for the public works, at least in certain cases and periods, were under the charge of the ten poletæ, although not always without the coöperation of other boards of officers. Each of the tribes appointed one of the members of this branch of the government, and their sessions were held in the edifice called the Poleterium."—A. Boeckh, *Public Economy of Athens* (*Lamb's tr.*), *bk.* 2, *ch.* 3.

POLITIQUES, The Party of the. See FRANCE: A. D. 1573–1576.

POLK, James K.: Presidential election and administration. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1844, to 1848.

POLKOS, The. See MEXICO: A. D. 1846–1847.

POLLENTIA, Battle of. See GOTHS: A. D. 400–403.

POLLICES. See FOOT, THE ROMAN.

POLO, Marco, The travels of.—"This celebrated personage was not, in the strict sense of the word, a traveller. He was one of those professional politicians of the Middle Ages who are familiar to the student of Italian history. The son of a travelling Venetian merchant, who had already passed many years in Tartary, and been regarded with welcome and consideration by the Grand Khan himself, he was taken at an early age to the Grand Khan's court, and apprenticed, as it were, to the Grand Khan's service. The young adventurer possessed in a high degree that subtlety and versatility which opinion attributes to his nation. Profiting by his opportunities, he soon succeeded in transmuting himself into a

Tartar. He adopted the Tartar dress, studied the Tartar manners, and mastered the four languages spoken in the Grand Khan's dominions. Kublai appears first to have employed him as a secretary, and then to have sent him on confidential missions: and during a service of seventeen years Marco was engaged in this way, in journeys by land and sea, in every part of the Grand Khan's empire and dependencies. More than this, he travelled on his own account, everywhere, it would appear, recording his notes and observations, partly for his own use, and partly for the information or entertainment of his master. These notes and observations were given to the world of Europe under the following circumstances. After a residence of seventeen years, Marco obtained permission to revisit Venice, accompanied by his father and uncle. Not long after his return, he was taken in a sea-fight with the Genoese, and committed to prison. To relieve the ennui of his confinement, he procured his rough notes from Venice, and dictated to a fellow-prisoner the narrative which passes under his name. This narrative soon became known to the world: and from its publication may be dated that intense and active interest in the East which has gone on steadily increasing ever since. The rank and dignified character of this famous adventurer, the romance of his career, the wealth which he amassed, the extent of his observations, the long series of years they had occupied, the strange and striking facts which he reported, and the completeness and perspicuity of his narrative, combined to produce a marked effect on the Italian world. Marco Polo was the true predecessor of Columbus. From an early time we find direct evidence of his influence on the process of exploration. . . . Wherever the Italian captains went, the fame of the great Venetian's explorations was noised abroad: and, as we shall presently see, the Italian captains were the chief directors of navigation and discovery in every seaport of Western Europe. The work dictated by Marco Polo to his fellow-captive, though based upon his travels both in form and matter, is no mere journal or narrative of adventure. A brief account of his career in the East is indeed prefixed, and the route over which he carries his reader is substantially that chronologically followed by himself; for he takes his reader successively overland to China, by way of the Black Sea, Armenia, and Tartary, backwards and forwards by land and sea, throughout the vast dominions of the Grand Khan, and finally homeward by the Indian Ocean, touching by the way at most of those famous countries which bordered thereon. Yet the book is no book of travels. It is rather a Handbook to the East for the use of other European travellers, and was clearly compiled as such and nothing more. Perhaps no compiler has ever laid down a clearer or more practical plan, adopted a more judicious selection of facts, or relieved it by a more attractive embroidery of historical anecdote. . . . It is not here to the purpose to dwell on his notices of Armenia, Turcomania, and Persia: his descriptions of the cities of Bagdad, Ormus, Tabriz, and many others, or to follow him to Kashmir, Kashghar, and Samarkhand, and across the steppes of Tartary. The main interest of Marco Polo lies in his description of the Grand Khan's Empire, and of those wide-spread shores, all washed by the Indian Ocean, which from Zanzibar to Japan went by the general name of India. . . . The Pope alone, among European potentates of the 15th century, could be ranked as approaching in state and dignity to the Tartar sovereign of China. For any fair parallel, recourse must be had to the Great Basileus of Persia: and in the eyes of his Venetian secretary the Grand Khan appeared much as Darius or Cyrus may have appeared to the Greek adventurers who crowded his court, and competed for the favour of a mighty barbarian whom they at once flattered and despised."—E. J. Payne, *Hist. of the New World, bk.* 1.

Also in: *The Book of Ser Marco Polo; ed. by Colonel H. Yule.*—T. W. Knox, *Travels of Marco Polo for Boys and Girls.*—G. M. Towle, *Marco Polo.*—See, also, China: A. D. 1259–1294.

POLONNA, Battle of (1792). See Poland: A. D. 1791–1792.

POLYNESIANS, The. See Malayan Race.

POLYPOTAMIA, The proposed State of. See Northwest Territory: A. D. 1784.

POMERANIANS, The.—"Adam of Bremen first mentions these Pomeranians [east of the Oder], and he mentions them as Slavonians, the Oder being their boundary to the West. On the east they were conterminous with the Prussians. Their name is Slavonic, 'po'='on' and 'more'='sea,'='coastmen.' All their antiquities and traditions are equally so; in other words there is neither evidence, nor shadow of evidence, of their ever having dispossessed an older Germanic population. Nor are they wholly extinct at the present moment. On the promontories which project into the Gulf of Dantzig we find the Slavonic Kassub, Cassubitæ, or Kaszeb. Their language approaches the Polish."—R. G. Latham, *The Germania of Tacitus, Prolegomena, sect.* 7.

POMERIUM, The Roman.—"The pomerium was a hallowed space, along the whole circuit of the city, behind the wall, where the city auspices were taken, over which the augurs had full right, and which could never be moved without their first consulting the will of the gods. The pomerium which encircled the Palatine appears to have been the space between the wall and the foot of the hill."—H. M. Westropp, *Early and Imperial Rome, p.* 40.

POMPADOUR, Madame de, Ascendancy of. See France: A. D. 1723–1774.

POMPÆ.—The solemn processions of the ancient Athenians, on which they expended great sums of money, were so called.—A. Boeckh, *Public Economy of Athens, bk.* 2, *ch.* 12.

POMPEII.—"Pompeii was a maritime city at the mouth of the river Sarnus, the most sheltered recess of the Neapolitan Crater. Its origin was lost in antiquity, and the tradition that it was founded by Hercules, together with the other spot [Herculaneum] which bore the name of the demigod, was derived perhaps from the warm springs with which the region abounded. The Greek plantations on the Campanian coast had been overrun by the Oscans and Samnites; nevertheless the graceful features of Grecian civilization were still everywhere conspicuous, and though Pompeii received a Latin name, and though Sulla, Augustus, and Nero had successively endowed it with Roman colonists, it retained the manners and to a great extent the

language of the settlers from beyond the sea."—C. Merivale, *Hist. of the Romans, ch.* 60.—Pompeii, and the neighboring city of Herculaneum, were overwhelmed by a volcanic eruption from Mount Vesuvius, on the 23d of August, A. D. 79. They were buried, but did not perish; they were death-stricken, but not destroyed; and by excavations, which began at Pompeii A. D. 1748, they have been extensively uncovered, and made to exhibit to modern times the very privacies and secrets of life in a Roman city of the age of Titus.—Pliny the Younger, *Letters, bk.* 6, *ep.* 16 *and* 20.

Also in: T. H. Dyer, *Pompeii.*

POMPEII AND HERCULANEUM, Exhumed Libraries of. See Libraries, Ancient: Herculaneum.

POMPEIUS, the Great, and the first Triumvirate. See Rome: B. C. 78–68, to B. C. 48; and Alexandria: B. C. 48–47.

PONCAS, PONKAS, OR PUNCAS, The. See American Aborigines: Siouan Family, and Pawnee (Caddoan) Family.

PONDICHERRY: A. D. 1674-1697.—Founded by the French.—Taken by the Dutch.—Restored to France. See India: A. D. 1665–1743.

A. D. 1746.—Siege by the English. See India: A. D. 1743–1752.

A. D. 1761.—Capture by the English. See India: A. D. 1758–1761.

PONIATOWSKY, Stanislaus Augustus, King of Poland, A. D. 1764–1795.

PONKAS. See Poncas.

PONS ÆLII.—A Roman bridge and military station on the Tyne, where Newcastle is now situated.—H. M. Scarth, *Roman Britain, ch.* 8.

PONS SUBLICIUS, The. See Sublician Bridge.

PONT ACHIN, Battle of. See France: A. D. 1794 (March—July).

PONTCHARRA, Battle of (1591). See France: A. D. 1591–1593.

PONTE NUOVO, Battle of (1769). See Corsica: A. D. 1729–1769.

PONTIAC'S WAR (A. D. 1763-1764).—"With the conquest of Canada and the expulsion of France as a military power from the continent, the English colonists were abounding in loyalty to the mother country, were exultant in the expectation of peace, and in the assurance of immunity from Indian wars in the future; for it did not seem possible that, with the loose system of organization and government common to the Indians, they could plan and execute a general campaign without the co-operation of the French as leaders. This feeling of security among the English settlements was of short duration. A general discontent pervaded all the Indian tribes from the frontier settlements to the Mississippi, and from the great lakes to the Gulf of Mexico. The extent of this disquietude was not suspected, and hence no attempt was made to gain the goodwill of the Indians. There were many real causes for this discontent. The French had been politic and sagacious in their intercourse with the Indian. They gained his friendship by treating him with respect and justice. They came to him with presents, and, as a rule, dealt with him fairly in trade. They came with missionaries, unarmed, heroic, self-denying men. . . . Many Frenchmen married Indian wives, dwelt with the native tribes, and adopted their customs. To the average Englishman, on the other hand, Indians were disgusting objects; he would show them no respect, nor treat them with justice except under compulsion. . . . The French had shown little disposition to make permanent settlements; but the English, when they appeared, came to stay, and they occupied large tracts of the best land for agricultural purposes. The French hunters and traders, who were widely dispersed among the native tribes, kept the Indians in a state of disquietude by misrepresenting the English, exaggerating their faults, and making the prediction that the French would soon recapture Canada and expel the English from the Western territories. Pontiac, the chief of the Ottawas [see Canada: A. D. 1760], was the Indian who had the motive, the ambition, and capacity for organization which enabled him to concentrate and use all these elements of discontent for his own malignant and selfish purposes. After the defeat of the French, he professed for a time to be friendly with the English, expecting that, under the acknowledged supremacy of Great Britain, he would be recognized as a mighty Indian prince, and be assigned to rule over his own, and perhaps a confederacy of other tribes. Finding that the English government had no use for him, he was indignant, and he devoted all the energies of his vigorous mind to a secret conspiracy of uniting the tribes west of the Alleghanies to engage in a general war against the English settlements ['The tribes thus banded together against the English comprised, with a few unimportant exceptions, the whole Algonquin stock, to whom were united the Wyandots, the Senecas, and several tribes of the lower Mississippi. The Senecas were the only members of the Iroquois confederacy who joined in the league, the rest being kept quiet by the influence of Sir William Johnson.'—F. Parkman, *Conspiracy of Pontiac, v.* 1, *p.* 187]. . . . His scheme was to make a simultaneous attack on all the Western posts in the month of May, 1763; and each attack was assigned to the neighboring tribes. His summer home was on a small island at the entrance of Lake St. Clair; and being near Detroit, he was to conduct in person the capture of that fort. On the 6th of May, 1763, Major Gladwin, in command at Detroit, had warning from an Indian girl that the next day an attempt would be made to capture the fort by treachery. When Pontiac, on the appointed morning, accompanied by 60 of his chiefs, with short guns concealed under their blankets, appeared at the fort, and, as usual, asked for admission, he was startled at seeing the whole garrison under arms, and that his scheme of treachery had miscarried. For two months the savages assailed the fort, and the sleepless garrison gallantly defended it, when they were relieved by the arrival of a schooner from Fort Niagara, with 60 men, provisions, and ammunition. Fort Pitt, on the present site of Pittsburg, Pa., was in command of Captain Ecuyer, another trained soldier, who had been warned of the Indian conspiracy by Major Gladwin in a letter written May 5th. Captain Ecuyer, having a garrison of 330 soldiers and backwoodsmen, immediately made every preparation for defence. On May 27th, a party of Indians appeared at the fort under the pretence of wish-

ing to trade, and were treated as spies. Active operations against Fort Pitt were postponed until the smaller forts had been taken. Fort Sandusky was captured May 16th; Fort St. Joseph (on the St. Joseph River, Mich.), May 25th; Fort Ouatanon (now Lafayette, Ind.), May 31st; Fort Michillimackinac (now Mackinaw, Mich.), June 2d; Fort Presqu' Isle (now Erie, Pa.), June 17th; Fort Le Bœuf (Erie County, Pa.), June 18th; Fort Venango (Venango County, Pa.), June 18th; and the posts at Carlisle and Bedford, Pa., on the same day. No garrison except that at Presqu' Isle had warning of danger. The same method of capture was adopted in each instance. A small party of Indians came to the fort with the pretence of friendship, and were admitted. Others soon joined them, when the visitors rose upon the small garrisons, butchered them, or took them captive. At Presqu' Isle the Indians laid siege to the fort for two days, when they set it on fire. At Venango no one of the garrison survived to give an account of the capture. On June 22d, a large body of Indians surrounded Fort Pitt and opened fire on all sides, but were easily repulsed. . . . The Indians departed next day and did not return until July 26th," when they laid siege to the fort for five days and nights, with more loss to themselves than to the garrison. They "then disappeared, in order to intercept the expedition of Colonel Bouquet, which was approaching from the east with a convoy of provisions for the relief of Fort Pitt. It was fortunate for the country that there was an officer stationed at Philadelphia who fully understood the meaning of the alarming reports which were coming in from the Western posts. Colonel Henry Bouquet was a gallant Swiss officer who had been trained in war from his youth, and whose personal accomplishments gave an additional charm to his bravery and heroic energy. He had served seven years in fighting American Indians, and was more cunning than they in the practice of their own artifices. General Amherst, the commander-in-chief, was slow in appreciating the importance and extent of the Western conspiracy; yet he did good service in directing Colonel Bouquet to organize an expedition for the relief of Fort Pitt. The promptness and energy with which this duty was performed, under the most embarrassing conditions, make the expedition one of the most brilliant episodes in American warfare. The only troops available for the service were about 500 regulars recently arrived from the siege of Havana, broken in health." At Bushy Run, 25 miles east of Fort Pitt, Bouquet fought a desperate battle with the savages, and defeated them by the stratagem of a pretended retreat, which drew them into an ambuscade. Fort Pitt was then reached in safety. "On the 29th of July Detroit was reinforced by 280 men under Captain Dalzell, who in June had left Fort Niagara in 22 barges, with several cannon and a supply of provisions and ammunition. The day after his arrival, Captain Dalzell proposed, with 250 men, to make a night attack on Pontiac's camp and capture him. Major Gladwin discouraged the attempt, but finally, against his judgment, consented. Some Canadians obtained the secret and carried it to Pontiac, who waylaid the party in an ambuscade [at a place called Bloody Bridge ever since]. Twenty of the English were killed and 39 wounded. Among the killed was Captain Dalzell himself. Pontiac could make no use of this success, as the fort was strongly garrisoned and well supplied. . . . Elsewhere there was nothing to encourage him." His confederation began to break, and in November he was forced to raise the siege of Detroit. "There was quietness on the frontiers during the winter of 1763–64. In the spring of 1764 scattered war parties were again ravaging the borders. Colonel Bouquet was recruiting in Pennsylvania, and preparing an outfit for his march into the valley of the Ohio. In June, Colonel Bradstreet, with a force of 1,200 men, was sent up the great lakes," where he made an absurd and unauthorized treaty with some of the Ohio Indians. He arrived at Detroit on the 26th of August. "Pontiac had departed, and sent messages of defiance from the banks of the Maumee." Colonel Bouquet had experienced great difficulty in raising troops and supplies and it was not until September, 1764, that he again reached Fort Pitt. But before two months passed he had brought the Delawares and Shawanees to submission and had delivered some 200 white captives from their hands. Meantime, Sir William Johnson, in conjunction with Bradstreet, had held conferences with a great council of 2,000 warriors at Fort Niagara, representing Iroquois, Ottawas, Ojibways, Wyandots and others, and had concluded several treaties of peace. By one of these, with the Senecas, a strip of land four miles wide on each side of Niagara River, from Erie to Ontario, was ceded to the British government. "The Pontiac War, so far as battles and campaigns were concerned, was ended; but Pontiac was still at large and as untamed as ever. His last hope was the Illinois country, where the foot of an English soldier had never trod;" and there he schemed and plotted without avail until 1765. In 1769 he was assassinated, near St. Louis.—W. F. Poole, *The West*, 1763–1783 (*Narrative and Critical Hist. of Am., v. 6, ch. 9*).

Also in: F. Parkman, *Conspiracy of Pontiac.*—S. Farmer, *Hist. of Detroit and Mich., ch. 38.*—*Historical Account of Bouquet's Expedition.*—A. Henry, *Travels and Adventures in Canada, pt. 1, ch. 9–23.*—W. L. Stone, *Life and Times of Sir Wm. Johnson, v. 2, ch. 9–12.*—J. R. Brodhead, *Docs. Relative to Col. Hist. of N. Y., v. 7.*

PONTIFEX MAXIMUS.— PONTIFICES, Roman. See Augurs.

PONTIFF, The Roman.—The Pope is often alluded to as the Roman Pontiff, the term implying an analogy between his office and that of the Pontifex Maximus of the ancient Romans.

PONTIFICAL INDICTIONS. See Indictions.

PONTUS. See Mithridatic Wars.

PONTUS EUXINUS, OR EUXINUS PONTUS.—The Black Sea, as named by the Greeks.

PONZA, Naval Battle of (1435). See Italy: A. D. 1412–1447.

POOR LAWS, The English.—"It has been often said and often denied that the monasteries supplied the want which the poor law, two generations after the dissolution of these bodies, enforced. That the monasteries were renowned for their almsgiving is certain. The duty of aiding the needy was universal. Themselves the creatures of charity, they could not deny to others that on which they subsisted. . . . It is possible that these institutions created the men-

dicancy which they relieved, but it cannot be doubted that they assisted much which needed their help. The guilds which existed in the towns were also found in the country villages. . . . They were convenient instruments for charity before the establishment of a poor law, and they employed no inconsiderable part of their revenues, collected from subscriptions and from lands and tenements, in relieving the indigent and treating poor strangers hospitably. . . . Before the dissolution of the monasteries, but when this issue was fairly in view, in 1536, an attempt was made to secure some legal provision for destitution. The Act of this year provides that the authorities in the cities and boroughs should collect alms on Sundays and holy days, that the ministers should on all occasions, public and private, stir up the people to contribute to a common fund, that the custom of giving doles by private persons should be forbidden under penalty, and that the church-wardens should distribute the alms when collected. The Act, however, is strictly limited to free gifts, and the obligations of monasteries, almshouses, hospitals, and brotherhoods are expressly maintained. . . . There was a considerable party in England which was willing enough to see the monasteries destroyed, root and branch, and one of the most obvious means by which this result could be attained would be to allege that all which could be needed for the relief of destitution would be derived from the voluntary offerings of those who contributed so handsomely to the maintenance of indolent and dissolute friars. The public was reconciled to the Dissolution by the promise made that the monastic estates should not be converted to the king's private use, but be devoted towards the maintenance of a military force, and that therefore no more demands should be made on the nation for subsidies and aids. Similarly when the guild lands and chantry lands were confiscated at the beginning of Edward's reign, a promise was made that the estates of these foundations should be devoted to good and proper uses, for erecting grammar schools, for the further augmentation of the universities, and the better provision for the poor and needy. They were swept into the hands of Seymour and Somerset, of the Dudleys and Cecils, and the rest of the crew who surrounded the throne of Edward. It cannot, therefore, I think, be doubted that this violent change of ownership, apart from any considerations of previous practice in these several institutions, must have aggravated whatever evils already existed. . . . The guardians of Edward attempted, in a savage statute passed in the first year of his reign, to restrain pauperism and vagabondage by reducing the landless and destitute poor to slavery, by branding them, and making them work in chains. The Act, however, only endured for two years. In the last year of Edward's reign two collectors were to be appointed in every parish, who were to wait on every person of substance and inquire what sums he will give weekly to the relief of the poor. The promises are to be entered in a book, and the collectors were authorized to employ the poor in such work as they could perform, paying them from the fund. Those who refused to aid were to be first exhorted by the ministers and church wardens, and if they continued obstinate were to be denounced to the bishop, who is to remonstrate with such uncharitable folk. . . . In the beginning of Elizabeth's reign (5, cap. 3) the unwilling giver, after being exhorted by the bishop, is to be bound to appear before the justices, in quarter sessions, where, if he be still obdurate to exhortation, the justices are empowered to tax him in a weekly sum, and commit him to prison till he pays. . . . There was only a step from the process under which a reluctant subscriber to the poor law was assessed by the justices and imprisoned on refusal, to the assessment of all property under the celebrated Act of 43 Elizabeth [1601], cap. 3. The law had provided for the regular appointment of assessors for the levy of rates, for supplying work to the able-bodied, for giving relief to the infirm and old, and for binding apprentices. It now consolidates the experience of the whole reign, defines the kind of property on which the rate is to be levied, prescribes the manner in which the assessors shall be appointed, and inflicts penalties on parties who infringe its provisions. It is singular that the Act was only temporary. It was, by the last clause, only to continue to the end of the next session of parliament. It was, however, renewed, and finally made perpetual by 16 Car. I., cap. 4. The economical history of labour in England is henceforward intimately associated with this remarkable Act. . . . The Act was to be tentative, indeed, but in its general principles it lasted till 1835. . . . The effect of poor law relief on the wages of labour was to keep them hopelessly low, to hinder a rise even under the most urgent circumstances."— J. E. Thorold Rogers, *Six Centuries of Work and Wages, ch.* 15 (*v.* 2).—"In February 1834 was published perhaps the most remarkable and startling document to be found in the whole range of English, perhaps, indeed, of all, social history. It was the Report upon the administration and practical operation of the Poor Laws by the Commissioners who had been appointed to investigate the subject. . . . It was their rare good fortune not only to lay bare the existence of abuses and trace them to their roots, but also to propound and enforce the remedies by which they might be cured."— T. W. Fowle, *The Poor Law, ch.* 4.—"The poor-rate had become public spoil. The ignorant believed it an inexhaustible fund which belonged to them. To obtain their share, the brutal bullied the administrators, the profligate exhibited their bastards which must be fed, the idle folded their arms and waited till they got it; ignorant boys and girls married upon it; poachers, thieves, and prostitutes extorted it by intimidation; country justices lavished it for popularity, and guardians for convenience. This was the way the fund went. As for whence it arose — it came, more and more every year, out of the capital of the shopkeeper and the farmer, and the diminishing resources of the country gentleman. . . . Instead of the proper number of labourers to till his lands — labourers paid by himself — the farmer was compelled to take double the number, whose wages were paid partly out of the rates; and these men, being employed by compulsion on him, were beyond his control — worked or not as they chose — let down the quality of his land, and disabled him from employing the better men who would have toiled hard for independence. These better men sank down among the worse; the rate-paying cottager, after a vain struggle, went to the pay-table to seek relief; the modest girl

might starve, while her bolder neighbour received 1s. 6d. per week for every illegitimate child. Industry, probity, purity, prudence — all heart and spirit — the whole soul of goodness — were melting down into depravity and social ruin, like snow under the foul internal fires which precede the earthquake. There were clergymen in the commission, as well as politicians and economists; and they took these things to heart, and laboured diligently to frame suggestions for a measure which should heal and recreate the moral spirit as well as the economical condition of society in England. To thoughtful observers it is clear that the . . . grave aristocratic error . . . of confounding in one all ranks below a certain level of wealth was at the bottom of much poor-law abuse, as it has been of the opposition to its amendment. . . . Except the distinction between sovereign and subject, there is no social difference in England so wide as that between the independent labourer and the pauper; and it is equally ignorant, immoral, and impolitic to confound the two. This truth was so apparent to the commissioners, and they conveyed it so fully to the framers of the new poor-law, that it forms the very foundation of the measure. . . . Enlightened by a prodigious accumulation of evidence, the commissioners offered their suggestions to government; and a bill to amend the poor-law was prepared and proposed to the consideration of parliament early in 1834. . . . If one main object of the reform was to encourage industry, it was clearly desirable to remove the impediments to the circulation of labour. Settlement by hiring and service was to exist no longer; labour could freely enter any parish where it was wanted, and leave it for another parish which might, in its turn, want hands. In observance of the great principle that the independent labourer was not to be sacrificed to the pauper, all administration of relief to the able-bodied at their own homes was to be discontinued as soon as possible; and the allowance system was put an end to entirely. . . . Henceforth, the indigent must come into the workhouse for relief, if he must have it. . . . The able-bodied should work — should do a certain amount of work for every meal. They might go out after the expiration of twenty-four hours; but while in the house they must work. The men, women, and children must be separated; and the able-bodied and infirm. . . . In order to a complete and economical classification in the workhouses, and for other obvious reasons, the new act provided for unions of parishes. . . . To afford the necessary control over such a system . . . a central board was indispensable, by whose orders, and through whose assistant-commissioners, everything was to be arranged, and to whom all appeals were to be directed. . . . Of the changes proposed by the new law, none was more important to morals than that which threw the charge of the maintenance of illegitimate children upon the mother. . . . The decrease of illegitimate births was what many called wonderful, but only what the framers of the law had anticipated from the removal of direct pecuniary inducement to profligacy, and from the awakening of proper care in parents of daughters, and of reflection in the women themselves. . . . On the 14th of August 1834, the royal assent was given to the Poor-law Amendment Act, amidst prognostications of utter failure from the timid, and some misgivings among those who were most confident of the absolute necessity of the measure. . . . Before two years were out, wages were rising and rates were falling in the whole series of country parishes; farmers were employing more labourers; surplus labour was absorbed; bullying paupers were transformed into steady working-men; the decrease of illegitimate births, chargeable to the parish, throughout England, was nearly 10,000, or nearly 13 per cent.; . . . and, finally, the rates, which had risen nearly a million in their annual amount during the five years before the poor-law commission was issued, sank down, in the course of the five years after it, from being upwards of seven millions to very little above four."— H. Martineau, *A History of the Thirty Years Peace, bk.* 4, *ch.* 7 (*v.* 2). —In 1838 the Act was extended to Ireland, and in 1845 to Scotland.—T. W. Fowle, *The Poor Law, ch.* 4.—"The new Poor Law was passed by Parliament in 1834; and the oversight of its administration was placed in the hands of a special board of commissioners, then known as the Central Poor Law Board. This board, which was not represented in Parliament, was continued until 1847. In that year it was reconstructed and placed under the presidency of a minister with a seat in the House of Commons — a reconstruction putting it on a political level with the Home Office and the other important Government Departments at Whitehall. The Department was henceforward known as the Poor Law Board, and continued to be so named until 1871, when there was another reconstruction. This time the Poor Law Board took over from the Home Office various duties in respect of municipal government and public health, and from the Privy Council the oversight of the administration of the vaccination laws and other powers, and its title was changed to that of the Local Government Board. Since then hardly a session of Parliament has passed in which its duties and responsibilities have not been added to, until at the present time the Local Government Board is more directly in touch with the people of England and Wales than any other Government Department. There is not a village in the land which its inspectors do not visit or to which the official communications of the Board are not addressed."— E. Porritt, *The Englishman at Home, ch.* 2.

Also in: Sir G. Nicholls, *Hist. of the English Poor-Law.*— F. Peek, *Social Wreckage.*

POOR MEN OF LYONS.—POOR MEN OF LOMBARDY. See Waldenses.

POOR PRIESTS OF LOLLARDY, The. See England: A. D. 1360-1414.

POPE, General John.—Capture of New Madrid and Island Number Ten. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1862 (March—April: On the Mississippi).....**Command of the Army of the Mississippi.** See United States of Am.: A. D. 1862 (April—May: Tennessee — Mississippi).....**Virginia campaign.** See United States of Am.: A. D. 1862 (July—August: Virginia); (August: Virginia); and (August—September: Virginia).

POPE, The. See Papacy.

POPHAM COLONY, The. See Maine: A. D. 1607-1608.

POPISH PLOT, The. See England: A. D. 1678-1679.

POPOL VUH, The. See American Aborigines: Quiches.

POPOLOCAS, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: CHONTALS.

POPULARES. See OPTIMATES.

PORNOCRACY AT ROME. See ROME: A. D. 903–964.

PORT GIBSON, Battle of. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1863 (APRIL—JULY: ON THE MISSISSIPPI).

PORT HUDSON, Siege and capture of. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1863 (MAY—JULY: ON THE MISSISSIPPI).

PORT JACKSON: A. D. 1770-1788.—The discovery.—The naming.—The first settlement. See AUSTRALIA: A. D. 1601–1800.

PORT MAHON. See MINORCA.

PORT PHILLIP DISTRICT. See AUSTRALIA: A. D. 1800–1840, and 1839–1855.

PORT REPUBLIC, Battle of. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1862 (MAY—JUNE: VIRGINIA).

PORT ROYAL, and the Jansenists: A. D. 1602-1660.—The monastery under Mère Angelique and the hermits of the Port Royal Valley.—Their acceptance of the doctrines of Jansenius.—Their conflict with the Jesuits.—"The monastery of Port Royal . . . was founded in the beginning of the 13th century, in the reign of Philip Augustus; and a later tradition claimed this magnificent monarch as the author of its foundation and of its name. . . . But this is the story of a time when, as it has been said, 'royal founders were in fashion.' More truly, the name is considered to be derived from the general designation of the fief or district in which the valley lies, Porrois—which, again, is supposed to be a corruption of Porra or Borra, meaning a marshy and woody hollow. The valley of Port Royal presents to this day the same natural features which attracted the eye of the devout solitary in the seventeenth century. . . . It lies about eighteen miles west of Paris, and seven or eight from Versailles, on the road to Chevreuse. . . . The monastery was founded, not by Philip Augustus, but by Matthieu, first Lord of Marli, a younger son of the noble house of Montmorency. Having formed the design of accompanying the crusade proclaimed by Innocent III. to the Holy Land, he left at the disposal of his wife, Mathilde de Garlande, and his kinsman, the Bishop of Paris, a sum of money to devote to some pious work in his absence. They agreed to apply it to the erection of a monastery for nuns in this secluded valley, that had already acquired a reputation for sanctity in connection with the old chapel dedicated to St. Lawrence, which attracted large numbers of worshippers. The foundations of the church and monastery were laid in 1204. They were designed by the same architect who built the Cathedral of Amiens, and ere long the graceful and beautiful structures were seen rising in the wilderness. The nuns belonged to the Cistercian order. Their dress was white woollen, with a black veil; but afterwards they adopted as their distinctive badge a large scarlet cross on their white scapulary, as the symbol of the 'Institute of the Holy Sacrament.' The abbey underwent the usual history of such institutions. Distinguished at first by the strictness of its discipline and the piety of its inmates, it became gradually corrupted with increasing wealth, till, in the end of the sixteenth century, it had grown notorious for gross and scandalous abuses. . . . But at length its revival arose out of one of the most obvious abuses connected with it. The patronage of the institution, like that of others, had been distributed without any regard to the fitness of the occupants, even to girls of immature age. In this manner the abbey of Port Royal accidentally fell to the lot of one who was destined by her ardent piety to breathe a new life into it, and by her indomitable and lofty genius to give it an undying reputation. Jacqueline Marie Arnauld—better known by her official name, La Mère Angélique—was appointed abbess of Port Royal when she was only eight years of age. She was descended from a distinguished family belonging originally to the old noblesse of Provence, but which had migrated to Auvergne and settled there. Of vigorous healthiness, both mental and physical, the Arnaulds had already acquired a merited position and name in the annals of France. In the beginning of the sixteenth century it found its way to Paris in the person of Antoine Arnauld, Seigneur de la Mothe, the grandfather of the heroine of Port Royal. . . . Antoine Arnauld married the youthful daughter of M. Marion, the Avocat-général. . . . The couple had twenty children, and felt, as may be imagined, the pressure of providing for so many. Out of this pressure came the remarkable lot of two of the daughters. The benefices of the Church were a fruitful field of provision, and the avocat-général, the maternal grandfather of the children, had large ecclesiastical influence. The result was the appointment not only of one daughter to the abbey of Port Royal, but also of a younger sister, Agnès, only six years of age, to the abbey of St Cyr, about six miles distant from Port Royal. . . . At the age of eleven, in the year 1602, Angélique was installed Abbess of Port Royal. Her sister took the veil at the age of seven. . . . The remarkable story of Angélique's conversion by the preaching of a Capucin friar in 1608, her strange contest with her parents which followed, the strengthening impulses in different directions which her religious life received, first from the famous St Francis de Sales, and finally, and especially, from the no less remarkable Abbé de St Cyran, all belong to the history of Port Royal."—J. Tulloch, *Pascal, ch.* 4.—"The numbers at the Port Royal had increased to eighty, and the situation was so unhealthy that there were many deaths. In 1626 they moved to Paris, and the abbey in the fields remained for many years deserted. M. Zamet, a pious but not a great man, for a while had the spiritual charge of the Port Royal, but in 1634 the abbé of St. Cyran became its director. To his influence is due the position it took in the coming conflict of Jansenism, and the effects of his teachings can be seen in the sisters, and in most of the illustrious recluses who attached themselves to the monastery. St. Cyran had been an early associate of Jansenius, whose writings became such a fire-brand in the Church. As young men they devoted the most of five years to an intense study of St. Augustine. It is said Jansenius read all of his works ten times, and thirty times his treatises against the Pelagians. The two students resolved to attempt a reformation in the belief of the Church, which they thought was falling away from many of the tenets of the father. Jansenius was presently made bishop of

Ypres by the Spanish as a reward for a political tract, but he pursued his studies in his new bishopric. . . . In 1640, the Augustinus appeared, in which the bishop of Ypres sought, by a full reproduction of the doctrines of St. Augustine, to bring the Church back from the errors of the Pelagians to the pure and severe tenets of the great father. The doctrine of grace, the very corner-stone of the Christian faith, was that which Jansenius labored to revive. Saint Augustine had taught that, before the fall of our first parents, man, being in a state of innocence, could of his own free will do works acceptable to God; but after that his nature was so corrupted, that no good thing could proceed from it, save only as divine grace worked upon him. This grace God gave as He saw fit, working under his eternal decrees, and man, except as predestined and elected to its sovereign help, could accomplish no righteous act, and must incur God's just wrath. But the Pelagians and semi-Pelagians had departed from this doctrine, and attributed a capacity to please God, to man's free will and the deeds proceeding from it — a belief which could but foster his carnal pride and hasten his damnation. The Jesuits were always desirous to teach religion so that it could most easily be accepted, and they had inclined to semi-Pelagian doctrines, rather than to the difficult truths of St. Augustine. Yet no one questioned his authority. The dispute was as to the exact interpretation of his writings. Jansenius claimed to have nothing in his great book save the very word of Augustine, or its legitimate result. The Jesuits replied that his writings contained neither the doctrine of Augustine nor the truth of God. They appealed to the Pope for the condemnation of these heresies. Jansenius had died before the publication of his book, but his followers, who were soon named after him, endeavored to defend his works from censure. . . . It was not until 1653 that the influence of the Jesuits succeeded in obtaining the condemnation of the offending book. In that year, Innocent X. issued a bull, by which he condemned as heretical five propositions contained in the Augustinus. . . . The members of the Port Royal adopted the Jansenist cause. Saint Cyran had been a fellow worker with Jansenius, and he welcomed the Augustinus as a book to revive and purify the faith of the Church. . . . The rigid predestinarianism of Jansen had a natural attraction for the stern zeal of the Port Royal. The religion of the convent and of those connected with it bordered on asceticism. They lived in the constant awe of God, seeking little communion with the world, and offering to it little compromise. . . . An intense and rigorous religious life adopts an intense and rigorous belief. The Jansenists resembled the English and American Puritans. They shared their Calvinistic tenets and their strict morality. A Jansenist, said the Jesuits, is a Calvinist saying mass. No accusation was more resented by those of the Jansenist party. They sought no alliance with the Protestants. Saint Cyran and Arnauld wrote prolifically against the Calvinists. They were certainly separated from the latter by their strong devotion to two usages of the Catholic Church which were especially objectionable to Protestants — the mass and the confessional. . . . In 1647, Mother Angelique with some of the sisters returned to Port Royal in the Fields. The convent at Paris continued in close relations with it, but the abbey in the fields was to exhibit the most important phases of devotional life. Before the return of the sisters, this desolate spot had begun to be the refuge for many eminent men, whose careers became identified with the fate of the abbey. 'We saw arrive,' writes one of them, 'from diverse provinces, men of different professions, who, like mariners that had suffered shipwreck, came to seek the Port.' M. le Maitre, a nephew of Mother Angelique, a lawyer of much prominence, a counsellor of state, a favorite of the chancellor and renowned for his eloquent harangues, abandoned present prosperity and future eminence, and in 1638 built a little house, near the monastery, and became the first of those who might be called the hermits of the Port Royal. Not taking orders, nor becoming a member of any religious body, he sought a life of lonely devotion in this barren place. . . . Others gradually followed, until there grew up a community, small in numbers, but strong in influence, united in study, in penance, in constant praise and worship. Though held together by no formal vows, few of those who put hand to the plough turned back from the work. They left their beloved retreat only when expelled by force, and with infinite regret. The monastery itself had become dilapidated. It was surrounded by stagnant waters, and the woods near by were full of snakes. But the recluses found religious joy amid this desolation. . . . As their numbers increased they did much, however, to improve the desolate retreat they had chosen. . . . Some of the recluses cultivated the ground. Others even made shoes, and the Jesuits dubbed them the cobblers. They found occupation not only in such labors and in solitary meditation, but in the more useful work of giving the young an education that was sound in learning and grounded in piety. The schools of the Port Royal had a troubled existence of about fifteen years. Though they rarely had over fifty pupils, yet in this brief period they left their mark. Racine, Tillemont, and many others of fruitful scholarship and piety were among the pupils who were watched and trained by the grave anchorites with a tender and fostering care. . . . The judicious teachers of the Port Royal taught reading in French, and in many ways did much to improve the methods of French instruction and scholarship. The children were thoroughly trained also in Greek and Latin, in logic and mathematics. Their teachers published admirable manuals for practical study in many branches. 'They sought,' says one, 'to render study more agreeable than play or games.' The jealousy of the Jesuits, who were well aware of the advantages of controlling the education of the young, at last obtained the order for the final dispersion of these little schools, and in 1660 they were closed for ever. Besides these manuals for teaching, the literature of the Port Royal comprised many controversial works, chief among them the forty-two volumes of Arnauld. It furnished also a translation of the Bible by Saci, which, though far from possessing the merits of the English version of King James, is one of the best of the many French translations. But the works of Blaise Pascal were the great productions of the Port Royal, as he himself was its chief glory. The famous Provincial Letters

originated from the controversy over Jansenism, though they soon turned from doctrinal questions to an attack on the morality of the Jesuits that permanently injured the influence of that body."—J. B. Perkins, *France under Mazarin, ch.* 20 (*v.* 2).

ALSO IN: M. A. Schimmelpenninck, *Select Memoirs of Port Royal.*

A. D. 1702-1715.—Renewed persecution.—Suppression and destruction of the Monastery.—The odious Bull Unigenitus, and its tyrannical enforcement.—"The Jesuits had been for some time at a low ebb, in the beginning of the 18th century, the Cardinal de Noailles, Archbishop of Paris, then ruling the King through Madame de Maintenon, and himself submitting to the direction of Bossuet. The imprudence of the Jansenists, their indefatigable spirit of dispute, restored to their enemies the opportunity to retrieve their position. In 1702, forty Sorbonne doctors resuscitated the celebrated question of fact concerning the five propositions of Jansenius, and maintained that, in the presence of the decisions of the Church on points of fact and not of dogma, a respectful silence sufficed without internal acquiescence. Some other propositions of a Jansenistic tendency accompanied this leading question. Bossuet hastened to interfere to stifle the matter, and to induce the doctors to retract. . . . Thirty-nine doctors retracted out of forty. The King forbade the publication thenceforth of anything concerning these matters, but, in his own name, and that of Philip V. [of Spain, his grandson], entreated Pope Clement XI. to renew the constitutions of his predecessors against Jansenism. . . . Clement XI. responded to the King's wishes by a Bull which fell in the midst of the assembly of the clergy in 1705. Cardinal de Noailles, who presided, made reservations against the infallibility of the Church in affairs of fact. The assembly, animated with a Gallican spirit, accepted the Bull, but established that the constitutions of the Popes bind the whole Church only 'when they have been accepted by the bodies of the pastors,' and that this acceptance on the part of the bishops is made 'by way of judgment.' The court of Rome was greatly offended that the bishops should claim to 'judge' after it, and this gave rise to long negotiations: the King induced the bishops to offer to the Pope extenuating explanations. The Jesuits, however, regained the ascendency at Versailles, and prepared against Cardinal de Noailles a formidable engine of war." The Cardinal had given his approval, some years before, to a work—"Moral Reflections on the New Testament"—published by Father Quesnel, who afterwards became a prominent Jansenist. The Jesuits now procured the condemnation of this work, by the congregation of the Index, and a decree from the Pope prohibiting it. "This was a rude assault on Cardinal de Noailles. The decree, however, was not received in France, through a question of form, or rather, perhaps, because the King was then dissatisfied with the Pope, on account of the concessions of Clement XI. to the House of Austria. The Jansenists gained nothing thereby. At this very moment, a terrible blow was about to fall on the dearest and most legitimate object of their veneration." The nuns of Port-Royal of the Fields having refused to subscribe to the papal constitution of 1705, the Pope had subjected them to the Abbess of Port-Royal of Paris, "who did not share their Augustinian faith (1708). They resisted. Meanwhile, Father La Chaise [the King's confessor] died, and Le Tellier succeeded him. The affair was carried to the most extreme violence. Cardinal de Noailles, a man of pure soul and feeble character, was persuaded, in order to prove that he was not a Jansenist, to cruelty, despite himself, towards the rebellious nuns. They were torn from their monastery and dispersed through different convents (November, 1709). The illustrious abbey of Port-Royal, hallowed, even in the eyes of unbelievers, by the name of so many great men, by the memory of so much virtue, was utterly demolished, by the order of the lieutenant of police, D'Argenson. Two years after, as if it were designed to exile even the shades that haunted the valley, the dead of Port-Royal were exhumed, and their remains transferred to a village cemetery (at Magny). Noailles, while he entered into this persecution, took the same course, nevertheless, as the nuns of Port-Royal, by refusing to retract the approbation which he had given to the 'Moral Reflections.' Le Tellier caused him to be denounced to the King. . . . The King prohibited Quesnel's book by a decree in council (November 11, 1711), and demanded of the Pope a new condemnation of this book, in a form that could be received in France. The reply of Clement XI. was delayed until September 8, 1713; this was the celebrated Unigenitus Bull, the work of Le Tellier far more than of the Pope, and which, instead of the general terms of the Bull of 1708, expressly condemned 101 propositions extracted from the 'Moral Reflections.' . . . The Bull dared condemn the very words of St. Augustine and of St. Paul himself; there were propositions, on other matters than grace, the condemnation of which was and should have been scandalous, and seemed veritably the triumph of Jesuitism over Christianity; for example, those concerning the necessity of the love of God. It had dared to condemn this: 'There is no God, there is no religion, where there is not charity.' This was giving the pontifical sanction to the Jesuitical theories most contrary to the general spirit of Christian theology. It was the same with the maxims relative to the Holy Scriptures. The Pope had anathematized the following propositions: 'The reading of the Holy Scriptures is for all. Christians should keep the Sabbath-day holy by reading the Scriptures; it is dangerous to deprive them of these.' And also this: 'The fear of unjust excommunication should not prevent us from doing our duty.' This was overturning all political Gallicanism." The acceptance of the Bull was strongly but vainly resisted. The King and the King's malignant confessor spared no exercise of their unbridled power to compel submission to it. "It was endeavored to stifle by terror public opinion contrary to the Bull: exiles, imprisonments, were multiplied from day to day." And still, when Louis XIV. died, on the 1st day of September, 1715, the struggle was not at an end.—H. Martin, *Hist. of France: Age of Louis XIV., v.* 2, *ch.* 6.—"It is now time that I should say something of the infamous bull Unigenitus, which by the unsurpassed audacity and scheming of Father Le Tellier and his friends was forced upon the Pope and the world. I need not

enter into a very lengthy account of the celebrated Papal decree which has made so many martyrs, depopulated our schools, introduced ignorance, fanaticism, and misrule, rewarded vice, thrown the whole community into the greatest confusion, caused disorder everywhere, and established the most arbitrary and the most barbarous inquisition; evils which have doubled within the last thirty years. I will content myself with a word or two, and will not blacken further the pages of my Memoirs. . . . It is enough to say that the new bull condemned in set terms the doctrines of St. Paul, . . . and also those of St. Augustin, and of other fathers; doctrines which have always been adopted by the Popes, by the Councils, and by the Church itself. The bull, as soon as published, met with a violent opposition in Rome from the cardinals there, who went by sixes, by eights, and by tens, to complain of it to the Pope. . . . He protested . . . that the publication had been made without his knowledge, and put off the cardinals with compliments, excuses, and tears, which last he could always command. The constitution had the same fate in France as in Rome. The cry against it was universal."—Duke of Saint Simon, *Memoirs (abridged trans. by St. John)*, *v.* 3, *ch.* 6. —"Jansenism . . . laid hold upon all ecclesiastical bodies with very few exceptions, it predominated altogether in theological literature; all public schools that were not immediately under the Jesuits, or, as in Spain, under the Inquisition, held Jansenist opinions, at least so far as the majority of their theologians were concerned. In Rome itself this teaching was strongly represented amongst the cardinals." Fenelon declared "that nobody knew—now that the controversy and the condemnations had gone on for sixty years—in what the erroneous doctrine exactly consisted; for the Roman court stuck fast to the principle of giving no definition of what ought to be believed, so that the same doctrine which it apparently rejected in one form, was unhesitatingly accepted at Rome itself when expressed in other though synonymous terms. . . . The same thing which under one name was condemned, was under another, as the teaching of the Thomists or Augustinians, declared to be perfectly orthodox. . . . Just because nobody could tell in what sense such propositions as those taken from the works of Jansenius or Quesnel were to be rejected, did they become valuable; for the whole question was turned into one of blind obedience and submission, without previous investigation. The Jesuit D'Aubenton, who as Tellier's agent in Rome had undertaken to procure that the passages selected from Quesnel's book should be condemned, repeatedly informed his employer that at Rome everything turned upon the papal infallibility; to get this passed whilst the king was ready to impose, by force of arms, upon the bishops and clergy the unquestioning acceptance of the papal constitution, was the only object."—J. I. von Döllinger, *Studies in European Hist.*, *ch.* 12.

Also in: W. H. Jarvis, *Hist. of the Church of France*, *v.* 2, *ch.* 5–7.—F. Rocquain, *The Revolutionary Spirit preceding the French Revolution*, *ch.* 1.

PORT ROYAL, Nova Scotia: A. D. 1603-1613.—Settled by the French, and destroyed by the English. See Canada: A. D. 1603–1605; 1606–1608; and 1610–1613.

A. D. 1690.—Taken by an expedition from Massachusetts. See Canada: A. D. 1689–1690.

A. D. 1691.—Recovered by the French. See Canada: A. D. 1692–1697.

A. D. 1710.—Final conquest by the English and change of name to Annapolis Royal. See New England: A. D. 1702–1710.

PORT ROYAL EXPEDITION, The. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1861 (October—December: South Carolina—Georgia).

PORTCHESTER, Origin of. See Portus Magnus.

PORTE, The Sublime. See Sublime Porte; also Pharaoh.

PORTEOUS RIOT, The. See Edinburgh: A. D. 1736.

PORTER, Admiral David D.: Capture of New Orleans. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1862 (April: On the Mississippi)..... **Second attempt against Vicksburg.** See United States of Am.: A. D. 1862 (December: On the Mississippi).

PORTICO, The Athenian, Suppression of. See Athens: A. D. 529.

PORTLAND MINISTRY, The. See England: A. D. 1806–1812.

PORTO NOVO, Battle of (1781). See India: A. D. 1780–1783.

PORTO RICO: Discovery by Columbus (1493). See America: A. D. 1493–1496.

PORTO VENERE, Naval Battle of (1494). See Italy: A. D. 1494–1496.

PORTOBELLO: A. D. 1668.—Capture by the Buccaneers. See America: A. D. 1639–1700.

A. D. 1740.—Capture by Admiral Vernon. See England: A. D. 1739–1741.

PORTOLONGO, or Sapienza, Battle of (1354). See Constantinople: A. D. 1348–1355.

PORTUGAL: Early history.—Mistaken identification with ancient Lusitania.—Roman, Gothic, Moorish and Spanish conquests. —The county of Henry of Burgundy.—"The early history of the country, which took the name of Portugal from the county which formed the nucleus of the future kingdom, is identical with that of the rest of the Iberian peninsula, but deserves some slight notice because of an old misconception, immortalized in the title of the famous epic of Camoens, and not yet entirely eradicated even from modern ideas. Portugal, like the rest of the peninsula, was originally inhabited by men of the prehistoric ages. . . . There seems to be no doubt that the Celts, the first Aryan immigrants, were preceded by a non-Aryan race, which is called by different writers the Iberian or Euskaldunac nation, but this earlier race speedily amalgamated with the Celts, and out of the two together were formed the five tribes inhabiting the Iberian peninsula, which Strabo names as the Cantabrians, the Vasconians, the Asturians, the Gallicians and the Lusitanians. It is Strabo, also, who mentions the existence of Greek colonies at the mouth of the Tagus, Douro, and Minho, and it is curious to note that the old name of Lisbon, Olisipo, was from the earliest times identified with that of the

hero of the Odyssey, and was interpreted to mean the city of Ulysses. . . . The Carthaginians, though they had colonies all over the peninsula, established their rule mainly over the south and east of it, having their capital at Carthagena or Nova Carthago, and seem to have neglected the more barbarous northern and western provinces. It was for this reason that the Romans found far more difficulty in subduing these latter provinces. . . . In 189 B. C. Lucius Æmilius Paullus defeated the Lusitanians, and in 185 B. C. Gaius Calpurnius forced his way across the Tagus. There is no need here to discuss the gradual conquest by the Romans of that part of the peninsula which includes the modern kingdom of Portugal, but it is necessary to speak of the gallant shepherd Viriathus, who sustained a stubborn war against the Romans from 149 B. C. until he was assassinated in 139 B. C., because he has been generally claimed as the first national hero of Portugal. This claim has been based upon the assumed identification of the modern Portugal with the ancient Lusitania [see LUSITANIA], an identification which has spread its roots deep in Portuguese literature, and has until recently been generally accepted. . . . The Celtic tribe of Lusitanians dwelt, according to Strabo, in the districts north of the Tagus, while the Lusitania of the Latin historians of the Republic undoubtedly lay to the south of that river, though it was not used as the name of a province until the time of Augustus, when the old division of the peninsula into Hispania Citerior and Hispania Ulterior was superseded by the division into Betica, Tarraconensis, and Lusitania. Neither in this division, nor in the division of the peninsula into the five provinces of Tarraconensis, Carthaginensis, Betica, Lusitania, and Gallicia, under Hadrian, was the province called Lusitania coterminous with the modern kingdom of Portugal. Under each division the name was given to a district south of the Tagus. . . . It is important to grasp the result of this misconception, for it emphasizes the fact that the history of Portugal for many centuries is merged in that of the rest of the Iberian peninsula, and explains why it is unnecessary to study the wars of the Lusitanians with the Roman Republic, as is often done in histories of Portugal. Like the rest of the peninsula Portugal was thoroughly Latinized in the days of the Roman Empire; Roman 'coloniæ' and 'municipia' were established in places suited for trade, such as Lisbon and Oporto. . . . Peaceful existence under the sway of Rome continued until the beginning of the 5th century, when the Goths first forced their way across the Pyrenees [see GOTHS (VISIGOTHS): A. D. 410–419]. . . . The Visigothic Empire left but slight traces in Portugal." The Mohammedan conquest by the Arab-Moors, which began early in the 8th century, extended to Portugal, and for a general account of the struggle in the peninsula between Christians and Moslems during several succeeding centuries the reader is referred to SPAIN: A. D. 711–713, and after. "In 997 Bermudo II., king of Gallicia, won back the first portion of modern Portugal from the Moors by seizing Oporto and occupying the province now known as the Entre Minho e Douro. . . In 1055 Ferdinand 'the Great,' king of Leon, Castile, and Gallicia, invaded the Beira; in 1057 he took Lamego and Viseu; and in 1064 Coimbra, where he died in the following year. He arranged for the government of his conquests in the only way possible under the feudal system, by forming them into a county, extending to the Mondego, with Coimbra as its capital. The first count of Coimbra was Sesnando, a recreant Arab vizir, who had advised Ferdinand to invade his district and had assisted in its easy conquest. . . . But though Sesnando's county of Coimbra was the great frontier county of Gallicia, and the most important conquest of Ferdinand 'the Great,' it was not thence that the kingdom which was to develop out of his dominions was to take its name. Among the counties of Gallicia was one called the 'comitatus Portucalensis,' because it contained within its boundaries the famous city at the mouth of the Douro, known in Roman and Greek times as the Portus Cale, and in modern days as Oporto, or 'The Port.' This county of Oporto or Portugal was the one destined to give its name to the future kingdom, and was held at the time of Ferdinand's death by Nuno Mendes, the founder of one of the most famous families in Portuguese history. Ferdinand 'the Great' was succeeded in his three kingdoms of Castile, Leon, and Gallicia, by his three sons, Sancho, Alfonso, and Garcia, the last of whom received the two counties of Coimbra and Oporto as fiefs of Gallicia, and maintained Nuno Mendes and Sesnando as his feudatories." Wars between the three sons ensued, as the result of which "the second of them, Alfonso of Leon, eventually united all his father's kingdoms in 1073, as Alfonso VI." This Alfonso was now called upon to encounter a new impulse of Mohammedan aggression, under a new dynasty, that of the Almoravides—see ALMORAVIDES. "The new dynasty collected great Moslem armies, and in 1086 Yusuf Ibn Teshfin routed Alfonso utterly at the battle of Zalaca, and reconquered the peninsula up to the Ebro. . . . Alfonso tried to compensate for this defeat and his loss of territory in the east of his dominions by conquests in the west, and in 1093 he advanced to the Tagus and took Santarem and Lisbon, and made Sueiro Mendes, count of the new district. But these conquests he did not hold for long. . . . In 1093 Seyr, the general of the Almoravide caliph Yusuf, took Evora from the Emir of Badajoz; in 1094 he took Badajoz itself, and killed the emir; and retaking Lisbon and Santarem forced his way up to the Mondego. To resist this revival of the Mohammedan power, Alfonso summoned the chivalry of Christendom to his aid. Among the knights who joined his army eager to win their spurs, and win dominions for themselves, were Count Raymond of Toulouse and Count Henry of Burgundy. To the former, Alfonso gave his legitimate daughter, Urraca, and Gallicia; to the latter, his illegitimate daughter Theresa, and the counties of Oporto and Coimbra, with the title of Count of Portugal. The history of Portugal now becomes distinct from that of the rest of the peninsula, and it is from the year 1095 that the history of Portugal commences. The son of Henry of Burgundy was the great monarch Affonso Henriques, the hero of his country and the founder of a great dynasty."—H. M. Stephens, *The Story of Portugal, ch.* 1.

A. D. 1095-1325.—The county made independent and raised to the rank of a kingdom.—Completion of conquests from the Moors.—Limits of the kingdom established.—Count

Henry of Burgundy waged war for seven years with his Moorish neighbors; then went crusading to Palestine for two years. On his return in 1105 he made common cause with his brother-in-law and brother-adventurer, Count Raymond of Gallicia, against the suspected intention of King Alfonso to declare his bastard, half-Moorish son, Sancho, the heir to his dominions. "This peaceful arrangement had no result, owing to the death of Count Raymond in 1107, followed by that of young Sancho at the battle of Uclés with the Moors, in 1108, and finally by the death of Alfonso VI. himself in 1109. The king's death brought about the catastrophe. He left all his dominions to his legitimate daughter, Urraca, with the result that there was five years of fierce fighting between Henry of Burgundy, Alfonso Raimundes, the son of Count Raymond, Alfonso I. of Aragon, and Queen Urraca. . . . While they fought with each other the Mohammedans advanced. . . . On May 1, 1114, Count Henry died, . . . leaving his wife Theresa as regent during the minority of his son Affonso Henriques, who was but three years old. Theresa, who made the ancient city of Guimaraens her capital, devoted all her energies to building up her son's dominions into an independent state; and under her rule, while the Christian states of Spain were torn by internecine war, the Portuguese began to recognize Portugal as their country, and to cease from calling themselves Gallicians. This distinction between Portugal and Gallicia was the first step towards the formation of a national spirit, which grew into a desire for national independence." The regency of Theresa, during which she was engaged in many contests, with her half-sister Urraca and others, ended in 1128. In the later years of it she provoked great discontent by her infatuation with a lover to whom she was passionately devoted. In the end, her son headed a revolt which expelled her from Portugal. The son, Affonso Henriques, assumed the reins of government at the age of seventeen years. In 1130 he began a series of wars with Alfonso VII. of Castile, the aim of which was to establish the independence of Portugal. These wars were ended in 1140 by an agreement, "in consonance with the ideas of the times, to refer the great question of Portuguese independence to a chivalrous contest. In a great tournament, known as the Tourney of Valdevez, the Portuguese knights were entirely successful over those of Castile, and in consequence of their victory Affonso Henriques assumed the title of King of Portugal. This is the turning-point of Portuguese history, and it is a curious fact that the independence of Portugal from Gallicia was achieved by victory in a tournament and not in war. Up to 1136, Affonso Henriques had styled himself Infante, in imitation of the title borne by his mother; from 1136 to 1140 he styled himself Principe, and in 1140 he first took the title of King." A little before this time, on the 25th of July, 1139, Affonso had defeated the Moors in a famous and much magnified battle — namely that of Orik or Ourique — "which, until modern investigators examined the facts, has been considered to have laid the foundations of the independence of Portugal. Chroniclers, two centuries after the battle, solemnly asserted that five kings were defeated on this occasion, that 200,000 Mohammedans were slain, and that after the victory the Portuguese soldiers raised Affonso on their shields and hailed him as king. This story is absolutely without authority from contemporary chronicles, and is quite as much a fiction as the Cortes of Lamego, which has been invented as sitting in 1143 and passing the constitutional laws on which Vertot and other writers have expended so much eloquence. . . . It was not until the modern school of historians arose in Portugal, which examined documents and did not take the statements of their predecessors on trust, that it was clearly pointed out that Affonso Henriques won his crown by his long struggle with his Christian cousin, and not by his exploits against the Moors."— H. M. Stephens, *The Story of Portugal, ch.* 2–3.—"The long reign of Affonso I., an almost uninterrupted period of war, is the most brilliant epoch in the history of the Portuguese conquests. Lisbon, which had already under its Moorish masters become the chief city of the west, was taken in 1147, and became at once the capital of the new kingdom. The Tagus itself was soon passed. Large portions of the modern Estremadura and Alemtejo were permanently annexed. The distant provinces of Algarve and Andalucia were overrun; and even Seville trembled at the successes of the Portuguese. It was in vain that Moorish vessels sailed from Africa to chastise the presumption of their Christian foes: their ships were routed off Lisbon by the vessels of Affonso; their armies were crushed by a victory at Santarem [1184], the last, and perhaps the most glorious of the many triumphs of the King. . . . Every conquest saw the apportionment of lands to be held by military tenure among the conquerors; and the Church, which was here essentially a militant one, received not only an endowment for its religion but a reward for its sword. The Orders of St. Michael and of Avis [St. Benedict of Avis] which were founded had a religious as well as a military aspect. Their members were to be distinguished by their piety not less than by their courage, and were to emulate the older brotherhoods of Jerusalem and of Castile. . . . Sancho I. [who succeeded his father Affonso in 1185], though not adverse to military fame, endeavoured to repair his country's wounds; and his reign, the complement of that of Affonso, was one of development rather than of conquest. . . . The surname of El Povoador, the Founder, is the indication of his greatest work. New towns and villages arose, new wealth and strength were given to the rising country. Affonso II. [1211] continued what Sancho had begun; and the enactment of laws, humane and wise, are a testimony of progress, and an honourable distinction to his reign." But Affonso II. provoked the hostility of an arrogant and too powerful clergy, and drew upon himself a sentence of excommunication from Rome. "The divisions and the weakness which were caused by the contest between the royal and ecclesiastical authority brought misery upon the kingdom. The reign of Sancho II. [who succeeded to the throne in 1223] was more fatally influenced by them even than that of his father. . . . The now familiar terrors of excommunication and interdict were followed [1245] by a sentence of deposition from Innocent IV.; and Sancho, weak in character, and powerless before a hostile priesthood and a disaffected people, retired to end his days in a cloister of Castile. The successor to Sancho was Affonso III. He had intrigued

for his brother's crown; he had received the support of the priesthood, and he had promised them their reward in the extension of their privileges"; but his administration of the government was wise and popular. He died in 1279. "The first period of the history of Portugal is now closed. Up to this time, each reign, disturbed and enfeebled though it may have been, had added something to the extent of the country. But now the last conquest from the Moors had been won. On the south, the impassable barrier of the ocean; on the east, the dominions of Castile, confined the kingdom. . . . The crusading days were over. . . . The reign of Denis, who ruled from 1279 to 1325, is at once the parallel to that of Affonso I. in its duration and importance, the contrast to it in being a period of internal progress instead of foreign conquest. . . . That Denis should have been able to accomplish as much as he did, was the wonder even of his own age. . . . Successive reigns still found the country progressing."—C. F. Johnstone, *Historical Abstracts, ch.* 4.

Also in: E. McMurdo, *Hist. of Portugal, v.* 1, *bk.* 1–4, *and v.* 2, *bk.* 1.

A. D. 1383-1385.—The founding of the new dynasty, of the House of Avis.—"The legitimate descent of the kings of Portugal from Count Henry, of the house of Burgundy, terminated with Ferdinand (the son of Peter I.) . . . in 1383. After wasting the resources of his people in the vain support of his claims to the crown of Castile, exposing Lisbon to a siege, and the whole country to devastation, this monarch gave his youthful daughter in marriage to the natural enemy of Portugal, John I., at that time the reigning king of Castile. . . . It was agreed between the contracting parties that the male issue of this connection should succeed to the Portuguese sceptre, and, that failing, that it should devolve into the hands of the Castilian monarch. Fortunately, however, the career of this Spanish tyrant was short, and no issue was left of Beatrix, for whom the crown of Portugal could be claimed; and therefore all the just pretensions of the Spaniard ceased. The marriage had scarcely been concluded, when Ferdinand died. It had been provided by the laws of the constitution, that in a case of emergency, such as now occurred, the election of a new sovereign should immediately take place. The legal heir to the crown, Don Juan [the late king's brother], the son of Pedro and Ignes de Castro, whose marriage had been solemnly recognised by an assembly of the states, was a prisoner at this time in the hands of his rival, the king of Castile. The necessity of having a head to the government appointed without delay, opened the road to the throne for John, surnamed the Bastard, the natural son of Don Pedro, by Donna Theresa Lorenzo, a Galician lady. Availing himself of the natural aversion by which the Portuguese were influenced against the Castilians, he seized the regency from the hands of the queen-dowager, . . . successfully defended Lisbon, and forced the Spaniards to retire into Spain after their memorable defeat on the plain of Aljubarota. . . . This battle . . . completely established the independence of the Portuguese monarchy. John was, in consequence, unanimously elected King by the Cortes, assembled at Coimbra in 1385. . . . In aid of his natural talents John I. had received an excellent education from his father, and during his reign exhibited proofs of being a profound politician, as well as a skilful general. . . . He became the founder of a new dynasty of kings, called the house of 'Avis,' from his having been grand master of that noble order. The enterprises, however, of the great Prince Henry, a son of John I., form a distinguishing feature of this reign."—W. M. Kinsey, *Portugal Illustrated, pp.* 34–35.

A. D. 1415-1460.—The taking of Ceuta.—The exploring expeditions of Prince Henry the Navigator down the African coast.—"King John [the First] had married an English wife, Philippa Plantagenet—a grand-daughter of our King Edward III., thoroughly English, too, on her mother's side, and not without a dash of Scottish blood, for her great-great-grandmother was a Comyn of Broghan. King John of Portugal was married to his English wife for twenty-eight years, they had five noble sons and a daughter (who was Duchess of Burgundy and mother of Charles the Bold); and English habits and usages were adopted at the Portuguese Court. We first meet with Prince Henry and his brothers, Edward and Peter, at the bed-side of their English mother. The king had determined to attack Ceuta, the most important seaport on the Moorish coast; and the three young princes were to receive knighthood if they bore themselves manfully, and if the place was taken. Edward, the eldest, was twenty-four, Peter twenty-three, and Henry just twenty-one. He was born on March 4th, 1394. There were two other brothers, John and Ferdinand, but they were still too young to bear arms. Their mother had caused three swords to be made with which they were to be girt as knights; and the great fleet was being assembled at Lisbon. But the Queen was taken ill, and soon there was no hope. Husband and sons gathered round her deathbed. When very near her end she asked: 'How is the wind?' she was told that it was northerly. 'Then,' she said, 'You will all sail for Ceuta on the feast of St. James.' A few minutes afterwards she died, and husband and sons sailed for Ceuta on St. James's day, the 25th of July, 1415, according to her word. . . . Ceuta was taken after a desperate fight. It was a memorable event, for the town never again passed into the hands of the Moors unto this day. . . . From the time of this Ceuta expedition Prince Henry set his mind steadfastly on the discovery of Guinea and on the promotion of commercial enterprise. During his stay at Ceuta he collected much information respecting the African coast. . . . His first objects were to know what was beyond the farthest cape hitherto reached on the coast of Africa, to open commercial relations with the people, and to extend the Christian faith. Prince Henry had the capacity for taking trouble. He undertook the task, and he never turned aside from it until he died. To be close to his work he came to live on the promontory of Sagres, near Cape St. Vincent, and not far from the seaport of Lagos. He was twenty-four years old when he came to live at this secluded spot, in December, 1418; and he died there in his sixty-seventh year. . . . He established a school at Sagres for the cultivation of map-drawing and the science of navigation. At great expense he procured the services of Mestre Jacome from Majorca, a man very learned in the art of navi-

gation, as it was then understood, and he erected an observatory. . . . My readers will remember that during the time of the Crusades a great order of knighthood was established, called the Templars, which became very rich and powerful, and held vast estates in most of the countries of Europe. At last the kings became jealous of their prosperity and, in the days of our Edward II. and of the French Philip IV., their wealth was confiscated, and the order of Knights Templars was abolished in all countries except Portugal. But King Dionysius of Portugal refused either to rob the knights or to abolish the order. In the year 1319 he reformed the order, and changed the name, calling it the Order of Christ, and he encircled the white cross of the Templars with a red cross as the future badge of the knights. They retained their great estates. Prince Henry was appointed, by his father, Grand Master of the Order of Christ in the year 1419. He could imagine no nobler nor more worthy employment for the large revenues of the Order than the extension of geographical discovery. Thus were the funds for his costly expeditions supplied by the Order of Chivalry of which he was Grand Master. When Prince Henry first began to send forth expeditions along the coast of Africa, the farthest point to the southward that had been sighted was Cape Bojador. The discovery of the extreme southern point of Africa, and of a way thence to India, was looked upon then exactly as the discovery of the North Pole is now. Fools asked what was the use of it. Half-hearted men said it was impossible. Officials said it was impractical. Nevertheless, Prince Henry said that it could be done, and that, moreover it should be done. . . . In 1434 he considered that the time had come to round Cape Bojador. He selected for the command of the expedition an esquire of his household named Gil Eannes, who was accompanied by John Diaz, an experienced seaman of a seafaring family at Lagos, many of whose members became explorers. Prince Henry told them that the current which they feared so much was strongest at a distance of about three to five miles from the land. He ordered them, therefore, to stand out boldly to sea. 'It was a place before terrible to all men,' but the Prince told them that they must win fame and honour by following his instructions. They did so, rounded the Cape, and landed on the other side. There they set up a wooden cross as a sign of their discovery. . . . The Prince now equipped a larger vessel than had yet been sent out, called a varinel, propelled by oars as well as sails. Many were the eager volunteers among the courtiers at Sagres. Prince Henry's cup-bearer, named Alfonso Gonsalves Baldaya, was selected to command the expedition, and Gil Eannes — he who first doubled Cape Bojador — went with it in a smaller vessel. . . . They sailed in the year 1436, and, having rounded Cape Bojador without any hesitation, they proceeded southward along the coast for 120 miles, until they reached an estuary called by them Rio d'Ouro. . . . During the five following years Prince Henry was much engaged in State affairs. The disastrous expedition to Tangiers took place, and the imprisonment of his young brother Ferdinand by the Moors, whose noble resignation under cruel insults and sufferings until he died at Fez, won for him the title of the 'Constant Prince.' But in 1441 Prince Henry was able to resume the despatch of vessels of discovery. In that year he gave the command of a small ship to his master of the wardrobe, Antam Gonsalves. . . . He [Gonsalves] was followed in the same year by Nuño Tristram. . . . Tristram discovered a headland which, from its whiteness, he named Cape Blanco. . . . The next discovery was that of the island of Arguin, south of Cape Blanco, which was first visited in 1443 by Nuño Tristram in command of a caravel. . . . The next voyage of discovery was one of great importance, because it passed the country of the Moors, and, for the first time, entered the land of the Negroes. Dinis Diaz, who was selected for this enterprise by the Prince, sailed in 1446 with the resolution of beating all his predecessors. He passed the mouth of the river Senegal, and was surprised at finding that the people on the north bank were Moors, while to the south they were all blacks; of a tribe called Jaloffs. Diaz went as far as a point which he called Cabo Verde. In the following years several expeditions, under Lanzarote and others, went to Arguin and the Senegal; until, in 1455, an important voyage under Prince Henry's patronage was undertaken by a young Venetian named Alvise (Luigi) Cadamosto. . . . They sailed on March 22, 1455, and went first to Porto Santo and Madeira. From the Canary Islands they made sail for Cape Blanco, boldly stretching across the intervening sea and being for some time quite out of sight of land. Cadamosto had a good deal of intercourse with the Negroes to the south of the Senegal, and eventually reached the mouth of the Gambia whence he set out on his homeward voyage. The actual extent of the discoveries made during the life of Prince Henry was from Cape Bojador to beyond the mouth of the Gambia. But this was only a small part of the great service he performed, not only for his own country, but for the whole civilised world. He organised discovery, trained up a generation of able explorers, so that from his time progress was continuous and unceasing. . . . Prince Henry, who was to be known to all future generations as 'the Navigator,' died at the age of sixty-six at Sagres, on Thursday, the 13th of November, 1460."—C. R. Markham, *The Sea Fathers, ch.* 1.

Also in: R. H. Major, *Life of Prince Henry of Portugal, the Navigator.*

A. D. 1463-1498.—The Pope's gift of title to African discoveries.—Slow southward progress of exploration.—The rounding of the Cape of Good Hope.—Vasco da Gama's voyage.—"In order to secure his triumphs, Prince Henry procured a bull from Pope Eugenius IV., which guaranteed to the Portuguese all their discoveries between Cape Nun, in Morocco, and India. None of his commanders approached within six or eight degrees of the equator. . . . By the year 1472, St. Thomas, Annobon, and Prince's Islands were added to the Portuguese discoveries, and occupied by colonists; and at length the equator was crossed. Fernando Po having given his name to an island in the Bight of Biafra, acquired possession of 500 leagues of equatorial coast, whence the King of Portugal took the title of Lord of Guinea. The subsequent divisions of this territory into the Grain Coast, named from the cochineal thence obtained, and long thought to be the seed of a plant, Gold Coast, Ivory Coast, and Slave Coast,

indicate by their names the nature of the products of those lands, and the kind of traffic. Under King John II., after an inactive period of eight or ten years, Diego Cam (1484) pushed forward fearlessly to latitude 22° south, erecting at intervals on the shore, pillars of stone, which asserted the rights of his sovereign to the newly-found land. For the first time, perhaps, in history, men had now sailed under a new firmament. They lost sight of a part of the old celestial constellations, and were awe-struck with the splendours of the Southern Cross, and hosts of new stars. Each successive commander aimed at outdoing the deeds of his predecessor. Imaginary perils, which had frightened former sailors, spurred the Portuguese to greater daring. Bartholomew Diaz, in 1486, was sent in command of an expedition of three ships, with directions to sail till he reached the southernmost headland of Africa. Creeping on from cape to cape, he passed the furthest point touched by Diego Cam, and reached about 29° south latitude. Here driven out of his course by rough weather, he was dismayed on again making land to find the coast trending northward. He had doubled the Cape without knowing it, and only found it out on returning, disheartened by the results of his voyage. Raising the banner of St. Philip on the shore of Table Bay, Diaz named the headland the Cape of Tempests, which the king, with the passage to India in mind, changed to that of the Cape of Good Hope. By a curious coincidence, in the same year Covillan [see ABYSSINIA: 15–19TH CENTURIES] . . . learnt the fact that the Cape of Good Hope, the Lion of the Sea, or the Head of Africa, could be reached across the Indian Ocean."—J. Yeats, *Growth and Vicissitudes of Commerce, pt. 2, ch. 4.*—"Pedro de Covilho had sent word to King John II., from Cairo, by two Jews, Rabbi Abraham and Rabbi Joseph, that there was a south cape of Africa which could be doubled. They brought with them an Arabic map of the African coast. . . . Covilho had learned from the Arabian mariners, who were perfectly familiar with the east coast, that they had frequently been at the south of Africa, and that there was no difficulty in passing round the continent that way. . . . Vasco de Gama set sail July 9, 1497, with three ships and 160 men, having with him the Arab map. King John had employed his Jewish physicians, Roderigo and Joseph, to devise what help they could from the stars. They applied the astrolabe to marine use, and constructed tables. These were the same doctors who had told him that Columbus would certainly succeed in reaching India, and advised him to send out a secret expedition in anticipation, which was actually done, though it failed through want of resolution in its captain. Encountering the usual difficulties, tempestuous weather and a mutinous crew, who conspired to put him to death, De Gama succeeded, November 20, in doubling the Cape. On March 1 he met seven small Arab vessels, and was surprised to find that they used the compass, quadrants, sea-charts, and 'had divers maritime mysteries not short of the Portugals.' With joy he soon after recovered sight of the northern stars, for so long unseen. He now bore away to the north-east, and on May 19, 1498, reached Calicut, on the Malabar coast. The consequences of this voyage were to the last degree important. The commercial arrangements of Europe were completely dislocated; Venice was deprived of her mercantile supremacy [see VENICE: 15–17TH CENTURIES]; the hatred of Genoa was gratified; prosperity left the Italian towns; Egypt, hitherto supposed to possess a pre-eminent advantage as offering the best avenue to India, suddenly lost her position; the commercial monopolies so long in the hands of the European Jews were broken down. The discovery of America and passage of the Cape were the first steps of that prodigious maritime development soon exhibited by Western Europe. And since commercial prosperity is forthwith followed by the production of men and concentration of wealth, and, moreover, implies an energetic intellectual condition, it appeared before long that the three centres of population, of wealth, of intellect, were shifting westwardly. The front of Europe was suddenly changed; the British Islands, hitherto in a sequestered and eccentric position, were all at once put in the van of the new movement."—J. W. Draper, *Hist. of the Intellectual Development of Europe, ch.* 19.

ALSO IN: G. Correa, *The Three Voyages of Vasco da Gama (Hakluyt Soc.*, 1869).—J. Fiske, *The Discovery of America, ch.* 4 (*v.* 1).—G. M. Towle, *Voyages and Adventures of Vasco da Gama.*—See, also, SOUTH AFRICA: A. D. 1486–1806.

A. D. 1474-1476.—Interference in Castile.—Defeat at Toro. See SPAIN: A. D. 1368–1479.

A. D. 1490.—Alliance with Castile and Aragon in the conquest of Granada. See SPAIN: A. D. 1476–1492.

A. D. 1493.—The Pope's division of discoveries in the New World. See AMERICA: A. D. 1493.

A. D. 1494.—The Treaty of Tordesillas.—Amended partition of the New World with Spain. See AMERICA: A. D. 1494.

A. D. 1495.—Persecution and expulsion of Jews. See JEWS: 8–15TH CENTURIES.

A. D. 1498-1580.—Trade and settlements in the East Indies. See INDIA: A. D. 1498–1580.

A. D. 1500-1504.—Discovery, exploration and first settlement of Brazil. See AMERICA: A. D. 1500–1514; and 1503–1504.

A. D. 1501.—Early enterprise in the Newfoundland fisheries. See NEWFOUNDLAND: A. D. 1501–1578.

A. D. 1510-1549.—Colonization of Brazil. See BRAZIL: A. D. 1510–1661.

A. D. 1524.—Disputes with Spain in the division of the New World.—The Congress at Badajos. See AMERICA: A. D. 1519–1524.

A. D. 1579-1580.—Disastrous invasion of Morocco by Sebastian.—His death in battle.—Disputed succession to the throne.—The claim of Philip II. of Spain established by force of arms.—"Under a long succession of Kings who placed their glory in promoting the commerce of their subjects and extending their discoveries through the remotest regions of the globe, Portugal had attained a degree of importance among the surrounding nations, from which the narrow limits of the kingdom, and the neighbourhood of the Spanish monarchy, seemed for ever to exclude her. . . . John III., the last of those great monarchs under whose auspices the boundaries of the known world had been enlarged, was succeeded in the throne of Portugal

[1557] by his grandson Sebastian, a child of only three years old. As the royal infant advanced to manhood, his subjects might, without flattery, admire his sprightly wit, his manly form, his daring spirit, and his superior address, in all the accomplishments of a martial age. But the hopes which these splendid qualities inspired were clouded by an intemperate thirst of fame. . . . He had early cherished the frantic project of transporting a royal army to India, and of rivalling the exploits of Alexander; but from this design he was diverted, not by the difficulties that opposed it, nor by the remonstrances of his counsellors, but by the distractions of Africa, which promised to his ambition a nearer and fairer harvest of glory. On the death of Abdalla, King of Morocco, his son, Muley Mahomet, had seized upon the crown, in contempt to an established law of succession, that the kingdom should devolve to the brother of the deceased monarch. A civil war ensued, and Mahomet, defeated in several battles, was compelled to leave his uncle Muley Moluc, a prince of great abilities and virtues, in possession of the throne." Mahomet escaped to Lisbon, and Sebastian espoused his cause. He invaded Morocco [see MAROCCO: THE ARAB CONQUEST AND SINCE] with a force partly supplied by his uncle, Philip II., of Spain, and partly by the Prince of Orange, engaged the Moors rashly in battle (the battle of Alcazar, or the Three Kings, 1579), and perished on the field, his army being mostly destroyed or made captive. "An aged and feeble priest was the immediate heir to the unfortunate Sebastian; and the Cardinal Henry, the great uncle to the late monarch, ascended the vacant throne." He enjoyed his royal dignity little more than a twelvemonth, dying in 1580, leaving the crown in dispute among a crowd of claimants.—*Hist. of Spain, ch.* 22 (*v.* 2).—"The candidates were seven in number: the duchess of Braganza, the king of Spain, the duke of Savoy, Don Antonio, prior of Crato, the duke of Parma, Catherine of Medicis, and the sovereign pontiff. The four first were grand-children of Emanuel the Great, father of Henry. The duchess of Braganza was daughter of Prince Edward, Emanuel's second son; Philip was the son of the Empress Isabella, his eldest daughter; the duke of Savoy, of Beatrix, his younger daughter; and Don Antonio was a natural son of Lewis, who was a younger son of Emanuel, and brother to the present king [cardinal Henry]. The duke of Parma was great-grandson of Emanuel, by a daughter of the above-mentioned Prince Edward. The Queen-mother of France founded her claim on her supposed descent from Alphonso III., who died about 300 years before the present period; and the Pope pretended that Portugal was feudatory to the see of Rome, and belonged to him, since the male heirs in the direct line were extinct." The other candidates held small chances against the power and convenient neighborhood of Philip of Spain. "Philip's agents at the court of Lisbon allowed that if the duchess of Braganza's father had been alive, his title would have been indisputable; but they maintained that, since he had died without attaining possession of the throne, nothing but the degree of consanguinity to Emanuel ought to be regarded; and that, as the duchess and he were equal in that respect, the preference was due to a male before a female. And they farther insisted, that the law which excludes strangers from inheriting the crown was not applicable to him, since Portugal had formerly belonged to the kings of Castile." Promptly on the death of the cardinal-king Henry, the Spanish king sent an army of 35,000 men, under the famous duke of Alva, and a large fleet under the Marquis of Santa Croce, to take possession of what he claimed as his inheritance. Two battles sufficed for the subjugation of Portugal:—one fought on the Alcantara, August 25, 1580, and the other a little later on the Douro. The kingdom submitted, but with bitter feelings, which the conduct of Alva and his troops had intensified at every step of their advance. "The colonies in America, Africa, and the Indies, which belonged to the crown of Portugal, quickly followed the example of the mother country; nor did Philip find employment for his arms in any part of the Portuguese dominions but the Azores," which, supported by the French, were not subdued until the following year.—R. Watson, *Hist. of the Reign of Philip II., bk.* 16.

A. D. 1594-1602.—Beginning of the rivalry of the Dutch in East India trade. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1594–1620.

A. D. 1624-1661.—War with the Dutch.—Loss and recovery of parts of Brazil. See BRAZIL: A. D. 1510–1661.

A. D. 1637-1668.—Crisis of discontent with the Spanish rule.—A successful revolution.—National independence recovered.—The House of Braganza placed on the throne.—"A spirit of dissatisfaction had long been growing amongst the Portugueze. Their colonies were neglected; a great part of Brazil, and a yet larger portion of their Indian empire, had fallen into the hands of the Dutch; Ormus, and their other possessions in the Persian Gulph, had been conquered by the Persians; their intercourse with their remaining colonies was harassed and intercepted; their commerce with the independent Indian states, with China and with Japan, was here injured and there partially destroyed, by the enterprising merchants and mariners of Holland; whilst at home the privileges secured to them as the price of their submission, were hourly, if not flagrantly, violated by their Spanish masters. The illegal imposition of a new tax by the king's sole authority, in 1637, had provoked a partial revolt in the southern provinces, where the duke of Braganza, grandson of Catherine [whose right to the throne was forcibly put aside by Philip II. of Spain in 1580,—see, above: A. D. 1579–1580], was proclaimed king. He refused the proffered dignity, and assisted in quelling the rebellion. He was thanked by Philip and at once recompensed, and, as it was hoped, ensnared, by an appointment to be general-in-chief of Portugal. But the flame was smothered, not extinguished. . . . The vice-queen, Margaret, duchess-dowager of Mantua, a daughter of Philip II.'s youngest daughter, Catherine, saw the gathering tempest, and forewarned the court of Madrid of the impending danger. Her information was treated, like herself, with contempt by Olivarez. One measure, however, he took, probably in consequence; and that one finally decided the hesitating conspirators to delay no longer. He ordered a large body of troops to be raised in Portugal, the nobles to arm their vassals, and all, under the conduct of the duke of Braganza, to hasten into

Spain, in order to attend the king, who was about to march in person against the rebellious Catalans. Olivarez hoped thus at once to overwhelm Catalonia and Roussillon, and to take from Portugal the power of revolting, by securing the intended leader, and draining the country of the warlike portion of its population. The nobles perceived the object of this command, and resolved to avoid compliance by precipitating their measures. Upon the 12th of October, 1640, they assembled to the number of 40 at the house of Don Antonio d' Almeida. At this meeting they determined to recover their independence, and dispatched Don Pedro de Mendoza as their deputy, to offer the crown and their allegiance to the duke of Braganza, who had remained quietly upon his principal estate at Villa Viçosa. The duke hesitated, alarmed, perhaps, at the importance of the irrevocable step he was called upon to take. But his high-spirited duchess, a daughter of the Spanish duke of Medina-Sidonia, observing to him, that a wretched and dishonourable death certainly awaited him at Madrid; at Lisbon, as certainly glory, whether in life or death, decided his acceptance. Partisans were gained on all sides, especially in the municipality of Lisbon; and the secret was faithfully kept, for several weeks, by at least 500 persons of both sexes, and all ranks. During this interval, the duke of Braganza remained at Villa Viçosa, lest his appearance at Lisbon should excite suspicion; and it seems that, however clearly the vice-queen had perceived the threatening aspect of affairs, neither she nor her ministers entertained any apprehension of the plot actually organized. The 1st of December was the day appointed for the insurrection. Early in the morning the conspirators approached the palace in four well-armed bands," and easily mastered the guard. From the windows of the palace they "proclaimed liberty and John IV." to a great concourse of people who had speedily assembled. Finding Vasconcellos, the obnoxious secretary to the vice-queen, hidden in a closet, they slew him and flung his body into the street. The vice-queen, seeing herself helpless, submitted to the popular will and signed mandates addressed to the Spanish governors and other officers commanding castles and fortifications in Portugal, requiring their surrender. "The archbishop of Lisbon was next appointed royal-lieutenant. He immediately dispatched intelligence of the event to the new king, and sent messengers to every part of Portugal with orders for the proclamation of John IV., and the seizure of all Spaniards. . . . Obedience was prompt and general. . . . John was crowned on the 15th of December, and immediately abolished the heavy taxes imposed by the king of Spain, declaring that, for his own private expenses, he required nothing beyond his patrimonial estates. He summoned the Cortes to assemble in January, when the three estates of the kingdom solemnly confirmed his proclamation as king, or 'acclamation,' as the Portugueze term it. . . . In the islands, in the African settlements, with the single exception of Ceuta, which adhered to Spain, and in what remained of Brazil and India, King John was proclaimed, the moment intelligence of the revolution arrived, the Spaniards scarcely any where attempting to resist. . . . In Europe, the new king was readily acknowledged by all the states at war with the house of Austria." The first attempts made by the Spanish court to regain its lost authority in Portugal took chiefly the form of base conspiracies for the assassination of the new king. War ensued, but the "languid and desultory hostilities produced little effect beyond harassing the frontiers. Portugal was weak, and thought only of self-defence; Spain was chiefly intent upon chastizing the Catalans." The war was prolonged, in fact, until 1668, when it was terminated by a treaty which recognized the independence of Portugal, but ceded Ceuta to Spain. The only considerable battles of the long war were those of Estremos, or Ameixal, in 1663, and Villa Viçosa, 1665, in which the Portuguese were victors, and which were practically decisive of the war. — M. M. Busk, *Hist. of Spain and Portugal, bk.* 2, *ch.* 10–12.

Also in: J. Dunlap, *Memoirs of Spain*, 1621–1700, *v.* 1, *ch.* 12.

A. D. 1702.—Joins the Grand Alliance against France and Spain. See Spain: A. D. 1701–1702.

A. D. 1703.—The Methuen Treaty with England.—Portugal joined the Grand Alliance against France and Spain, in the War of the Spanish Succession, in 1703, and entered at that time into an important treaty with England. This is known as the Methuen Treaty—"called after the name of the ambassador who negotiated it—and that treaty, and its effect upon the commerce of England and the habits of her people lasted through five generations, even to the present time. The wines of Portugal were to be admitted upon the payment of a duty 33⅓ per cent. less than the duty paid upon French wines; and the woolen cloths of England, which had been prohibited in Portugal for twenty years, were to be admitted upon terms of proportionate advantage. Up to that time the Claret of France had been the beverage of the wine-drinkers of England. From 1703 Port established itself as what Defoe calls 'our general draught.' In all commercial negotiations with France the Methuen Treaty stood in the way; for the preferential duty was continued till 1831. France invariably pursued a system of retaliation. It was a point of patriotism for the Englishman to hold firm to his Port."—C. Knight, *Popular Hist. of Eng.*, *v.* 5, *ch.* 17.—See, also, Spain: A. D. 1703–1704.

A. D. 1713.—Possessions in South America confirmed. See Utrecht: A. D. 1712–1714.

A. D. 1757-1759.—Expulsion of the Jesuits and suppression of the order. See Jesuits: A. D. 1757–1773.

A. D. 1793.—Joined in the coalition against Revolutionary France. See France: A. D. 1793 (March—September).

A. D. 1807.—Napoleon's designs against the kingdom.—His delusive treaty for its partition with Spain.—French invasion and flight of the royal family to Brazil.—"One of the first steps taken by Napoleon, after his return to Paris, . . . [after the Peace of Tilsit—see Germany: A. D. 1807 (June—July)] was, in the month of August, to order the French and Spanish ambassadors conjointly, to declare to the prince-regent of Portugal, that he must concur in the continental system, viz. shut his ports against English commerce, confiscate all English property, and imprison all English subjects to be found within his dominions, or they were

instructed immediately to leave Lisbon. The prince and his ministers dared not openly resist the French emperor's will, even whilst the wiser part of the cabinet were convinced that the very existence of the country depended upon British commerce. In this extremity, and relying upon the friendly forbearance of England, they strove to pursue a middle course. Don John professed his readiness to exclude British ships of all descriptions from his ports, but declared that his religious principles would not allow him to seize the subjects and property of a friendly state in the midst of peace, and that prudence forbade his offending England until a Portugueze squadron, then at sea, should have returned safely home. . . . Napoleon punished this imperfect obedience, by seizing all Portugueze vessels in ports under his control, and ordering the French and Spanish legations to leave Lisbon. The Portugueze ambassadors were, at the same time, dismissed from Paris and Madrid. A French army was, by this time, assembled near the foot of the Pyrenees, bearing the singular title of army of observation of the Gironde; and General Junot . . . was appointed to its command. . . . Spain was endeavouring to share in the spoil, not to protect the victim. A treaty, the shameless iniquity of which can be paralleled only by the treaties between Austria, Russia, and Prussia for the partition of Poland, had been signed at Fontainebleau, on the 27th of October. . . . By this treaty Charles surrendered to Napoleon his infant grandson's kingdom of Etruria (King Louis I. had been dead some years), over which he had no right whatever, and bargained to receive for him in its stead the small northern provinces of Portugal, Entre Minho e Douro and Tras os Montes, under the name of the kingdom of Northern Lusitania, which kingdom the young monarch was to hold in vassalage of the crown of Spain. The much larger southern provinces, Alemtejo and Algarve, were to constitute the principality of the Algarves, for Godoy, under a similar tenure. And the middle provinces were to be occupied by Napoleon until a general peace, when, in exchange for Gibraltar, Trinidad, and any other Spanish possession conquered by England, they might be restored to the family of Braganza, upon like terms of dependence. The Portugueze colonies were to be equally divided between France and Spain. In execution of this nefarious treaty, 10,000 Spanish troops were to seize upon the northern, and 6,000 upon the southern state. . . . On the 18th of October, Junot, in obedience to his master's orders, crossed the Pyrenees, and, being kindly received by the Spaniards, began his march towards the Portugueze frontiers, whilst the Spanish troops were equally put in motion towards their respective destinations. . . . The object of so much haste was, to secure the persons of the royal family, whose removal to Brazil had not only been talked of from the beginning of these hostile discussions, but was now in preparation, and matter of public notoriety. . . . The reckless haste enjoined by the emperor, and which cost almost as many lives as a pitched battle, was very near attaining its end. . . . The resolution to abandon the contest being adopted, the prince and his ministers took every measure requisite to prevent a useless effusion of blood. A regency, consisting of five persons, the marquess of Abrantes being president, was appointed to conduct the government, and negotiate with Junot. On the 26th a proclamation was put forth, explaining to the people that, as Napoleon's enmity was rather to the sovereign than the nation, the prince-regent, in order to avert the calamities of war from his faithful subjects, would transfer the seat of government to Brazil, till the existing troubles should subside, and strictly charging the Portugueze, more especially the Lisbonians, to receive the French as friends. On the 27th the whole royal family proceeded to Belem, to embark for flight, on the spot whence, about three centuries back, Vasco de Gama had sailed upon his glorious enterprise. . . . The ships set sail and crossed the bar, almost as the French advance guard was entering Lisbon. Sir Sidney Smith escorted the royal family, with four men-of-war, safely to Rio Janeiro, the capital of Brazil, leaving the remainder of his squadron to blockade the mouth of the Tagus."—M. M. Busk, *Hist. of Spain and Portugal, bk.* 4, *ch.* 7.

Also in: C. A. Fyffe, *Hist. of Modern Europe, v.* 1, *ch.* 7.—Sir A. Alison, *Hist. of Europe*, 1800–1815, *ch.* 52.—H. Martineau, *Hist. of Eng.*, 1800–1815, *bk.* 2, *ch.* 1.—R. Southey, *Hist. of the Peninsular War, ch.* 2 (*v.* 1).—See, also, Brazil: A. D. 1808–1822.

A. D. 1808.—Rising against the French.—Arrival of British forces. See Spain: A. D. 1808 (May—September).

A. D. 1808.—Wellington's first campaign in the Peninsula.—The Convention of Cintra.—French evacuation of Portugal. See Spain: A. D. 1808–1809 (August—January).

A. D. 1809 (February—December).—Wellington's retreat and fresh advance.—The French checked.—Passage of the Douro.—Battle of Talavera. See Spain: A. D. 1809 (February—July); and (August—December).

A. D. 1809-1812.—Wellington's Lines of Torres Vedras.—French invasion and retreat. English advance into Spain. See Spain: A. D. 1809–1810 (October—September); and 1810–1812.

A. D. 1814.—End of the Peninsular War. See Spain: A. D. 1812–1814.

A. D. 1820-1824.—Revolution and Absolutist reaction.—Separation and independence of Brazil.—"Ever since 1807 Portugal had not known a court. On the first threat of French invasion the Regent had emigrated to the Brazils, and he had since lived and ruled entirely in the great Transatlantic colony. The ordinary conditions of other countries had been reversed. Portugal had virtually become a dependency of her own colony. The absence of the court was a sore trial to the pride of the Portuguese. An absent court had few supporters. It happened, too, that its ablest defender had lately left the country. . . . In April 1820 [Marshal] Beresford sailed for the Brazils. He did not return till the following October; and the revolution had been completed before his return. On the 24th of August the troops at Oporto determined on establishing a constitutional government, and appointed a provisional Junta with this object. The Regency which conducted the affairs of the country at Lisbon denounced the movement as a nefarious conspiracy. But, however nefarious the conspiracy might be, the defection of the army was so general that resistance became impossible. On the 1st of September the Regency

issued a proclamation promising to convene the Cortes. The promise, however, did not stop the progress of the insurrection. The Junta which had been constituted at Oporto marched at the head of the troops upon Lisbon. The troops at Lisbon and in the south of Portugal threw off their allegiance, and established a Junta of their own. The Junta at Lisbon were, for the moment, in favour of milder measures than the Junta of Oporto. But the advocates of the more extreme course won their ends. The Oporto troops, surrounding the two Juntas, which had been blended together, compelled them to adopt the Spanish constitution; in other words, to sanction the election of one deputy to the Cortes for every 30,000 persons inhabiting the country. . . . When the revolution of 1820 had occurred John VI., King of Portugal, was quietly ruling in his transatlantic dominions of Brazil. Portugal had been governed for thirteen years from Rio de Janeiro; and the absence of the Court from Lisbon had offended the Portuguese and prepared them for change. After the mischief had been done John VI. was persuaded to return to his native country, leaving his eldest son, Dom Pedro, Regent of Brazil in his absence. Before setting out on his journey he gave the prince public instructions for his guidance, which practically made Brazil independent of Portugal; and he added private directions to the prince, in case any emergency should arise which should make it impracticable to preserve Brazil for Portugal, to place the crown on his own head, and thus save the great Transatlantic territory for the House of Braganza. Leaving these parting injunctions with his son, John VI. returned to the old kingdom which he had deserted nearly fourteen years before. He reached Lisbon, and found the Constitutionalists in undisputed possession of power. He found also that the action of the Constitutionalists in Portugal was calculated to induce Brazil to throw off the authority of the mother country. The Cortes in Portugal insisted on the suppression of the supreme tribunals in Brazil, on the establishment of Provincial Juntas, and on the return of the Regent to Portugal. The Brazilians declined to adopt measures which they considered ruinous to their dignity, and persuaded the Regent to disobey the orders of the Cortes. A small body of Portuguese troops quartered in Brazil endeavoured to overawe the prince, but proved powerless to do so. In May 1822 the prince was persuaded to declare himself Perpetual Defender of the Brazils. In the following September the Brazilians induced him to raise their country to the dignity of an empire, and to declare himself its constitutional emperor. The news that the Brazilians had declared themselves an independent empire reached Europe at a critical period. Monarchs and diplomatists were busily deliberating at Verona on the affairs of Spain and of the Spanish colonies. No one, however, could avoid comparing the position of Portugal and Brazil with that of Spain and her dependencies. . . . The evident determination of France to interfere in Spain created anxiety in Portugal. The Portuguese Cortes apprehended that the logical consequence of French interference in the one country was French interference in the other. . . . The position of a French army on the Spanish frontier roused the dormant spirits of the Portuguese Absolutists. In February 1823 a vast insurrection against the Constitution broke out in Northern Portugal. The insurgents, who in the first instance obtained considerable success, were with difficulty defeated. But the revolt had been hardly quelled before the Absolutists recovered their flagging spirits. Every step taken by the Duc d'Angoulême in his progress from the Bidassoa to Madrid [see SPAIN: A. D. 1814–1827] raised their hopes of ultimate success. The king's second son, the notorious Dom Miguel, fled from his father's palace and threw in his lot with the insurgents. For a moment the king stood firm and denounced his son's proceedings. But the reaction which had set in was too strong to be resisted. The Cortes was closed, a new Ministry appointed, and autocracy re-established in Portugal. The re-establishment of autocracy in Portugal marked the commencement of a series of intrigues in which this country [England] was deeply interested. One party in the new Government, with M. de Palmella at its head, was disposed to incline to moderate measures and to listen to the advice which it received from the British Ministry and from the British Ambassador, Sir Edward Thornton. Another party, of which M. de Subsérra was the representative, was in favour of an intimate union with France, and ready to listen to the contrary counsels of M. de Neuville, the French Minister at Lisbon. M. de Palmella, despairing of founding a settled form of government amidst the disorders which surrounded him on every side, applied to the British Ministry for troops to give stability to the Administration. The demand arrived in London in July 1823. . . . The demand for troops was refused, but a British squadron was sent to the Tagus, with a view of affording the King of Portugal the moral support of the British nation and a secure asylum in the event of any danger to his person. Many months elapsed before the King of Portugal had occasion to avail himself of the possible asylum which was thus afforded to him. . . . The evident leanings of M. de Palmella towards moderate measures, however, alarmed the Portuguese Absolutists. Ever since the revolution of 1823 Dom Miguel had held the command of the army; and, on the night of the 29th of April, 1824, the prince suddenly ordered the arrest of the leading personages of the Government, and, under the pretext of suppressing an alleged conspiracy of Freemasons, called on the army to liberate their king, and to complete the triumph of the previous year. For nine days the king was a mere puppet in the hands of his son, and Dom Miguel was virtually master of Lisbon. On the 9th of May the king was persuaded by the foreign ministers in his capital to resume his authority; to retire on board the 'Windsor Castle,' a British man-of-war; to dismiss Dom Miguel from his command, and to order his attendance upon him. The prince, 'stricken with a sudden fatuity,' obeyed his father's commands, and was prevailed upon to go into voluntary exile. The revolution of 1824 terminated with his departure, and Portugal again enjoyed comparative tranquillity."—S. Walpole, *Hist. of Eng. from* 1815, *ch.* 9 (*v.* 2).

ALSO IN: H. M. Stephens, *The Story of Portugal, ch.* 18.—See, also, BRAZIL: A.D. 1808–1822.

A. D. 1822.—The independence of Brazil proclaimed and established. See BRAZIL: A. D. 1808–1822.

A. D. 1824-1889.—Return of John VI. to Brazil.—Abdication of the Portuguese throne by Dom Pedro, after granting a constitution.—Usurpation of Dom Miguel.—Civil war and factious conflicts.—Establishment of Parliamentary government, and Peace.—"At the close of 1824 the king returned to Brazil to spend his last days in peace. On reaching Rio de Janeiro, he recognized Dom Pedro as Emperor of Brazil, and on the 6th of March, 1826, John VI. died in the country of his choice. By his will, John VI. left the regency of Portugal to his daughter Isabel Maria, to the disgust of Dom Miguel, who had fully expected in spite of his conduct that Portugal would be in some manner bequeathed to him, and that Dom Pedro would be satisfied with the government of Brazil. The next twenty-five years are the saddest in the whole history of Portugal. The establishment of the system of parliamentary government, which now exists, was a long and difficult task. . . . The keynote of the whole series of disturbances is to be found in the pernicious influence of the army. . . . The army was disproportionately large for the size and revenue of the country; there was no foreign or colonial war to occupy its energies, and the soldiers would not return to the plough nor the officers retire into private life. The English Cabinet at this juncture determined to maintain peace and order, and in 1826, a division of 5,000 men was sent under the command of Lieutenant-General Sir William Clinton to garrison the chief towns. The accession of Pedro IV. to the throne was hailed with joy in Portugal, though looked on with suspicion in Brazil. He justified his reputation by drawing up a charter, containing the bases for a moderate parliamentary government of the English type, which he sent over to Portugal, by the English diplomatist, Lord Stuart de Rothesay. Then to please his Brazilian subjects, he abdicated the throne of Portugal in favour of his daughter, Donna Maria da Gloria, a child of seven years old, on condition that on attaining a suitable age she should marry her uncle, Dom Miguel, who was to swear to observe the new constitution. The Charter of 1826 was thankfully received by the moderate parliamentary party; Clinton's division was withdrawn; Palmella remained prime minister; and in the following year, 1827, Dom Pedro destroyed the effect of his wise measures by appointing Dom Miguel to be regent of Portugal in the name of the little queen. Dom Miguel was an ambitious prince, who believed that he ought to be king of Portugal; he was extremely popular with the old nobility, the clergy, and the army, with all who disliked liberal ideas, and with the beggars and the poor who were under the influence of the mendicant orders. He was declared Regent in July, 1827, and in May, 1828, he summoned a Cortes of the ancient type, such as had not met since 1697, which under the presidency of the Bishop of Viseu offered him the throne of Portugal. He accepted, and immediately exiled all the leaders of the parliamentary, or, as it is usually called, the Chartist, party, headed by Palmella, Saldanha, Villa Flor, and Sampaio. They naturally fled to England, where the young queen was stopping on her way to be educated at the court of Vienna, and found popular opinion strongly in their favour. But the Duke of Wellington and his Tory Cabinet refused to countenance or assist them. . . . Meanwhile the reign of Dom Miguel had become a Reign of Terror; arrests and executions were frequent; thousands were deported to Africa, and in 1830 it was estimated that 40,000 persons were in prison for political offences. He ruled in absolute contempt of all law, and at different times English, French, and American fleets entered the Tagus to demand reparation for damage done to commerce, or for the illegal arrest of foreigners. The result of this conduct was that the country was hopelessly ruined, and the chartist and radical parties, who respectively advocated the Charter of 1826 and the Constitution of 1822, agreed to sink their differences, and to oppose the bigoted tyrant. . . . Dom Pedro, who had devoted his life to the cause of parliamentary government, resigned his crown in 1831 [see BRAZIL: A. D. 1825–1865] to his infant son, and left Brazil to head the movement for his daughter's cause. . . . In July, 1832, the ex-emperor with an army of 7,500 men arrived at Oporto, where he was enthusiastically welcomed, and Dom Miguel then laid siege to the city. European opinion was divided between the two parties; partisans of freedom and of constitutional government called the Miguelites 'slaves of a tyrant,' while lovers of absolutism, alluding to the loans raised by the ex-emperor, used to speak of the 'stock-jobbing Pedroites.' The siege was long and protracted." The Miguelites finally sustained several heavy defeats, both on land and at sea, and Lisbon was triumphantly entered by the Chartists in July, 1833. "The year 1834 was one of unbroken success for the Chartists. England and France recognized Maria da Gloria as Queen of Portugal, and the ministry of Queen Isabella of Spain, knowing Dom Miguel to be a Carlist, sent two Spanish armies under Generals Rodil and Serrano to the help of Dom Pedro. . . . Finally the combined Spanish and Portuguese armies surrounded the remnant of the Miguelites at Evora Monte, and on the 26th of May, 1834, Dom Miguel surrendered. By the Convention of Evora Monte, Dom Miguel abandoned his claim to the throne of Portugal, and in consideration of a pension of £15,000 a year promised never again to set foot in the kingdom. . . . Dom Pedro, who had throughout the struggle been the heart and soul of his daughter's party, had thus the pleasure of seeing the country at peace, and a regular parliamentary system in operation, but he did not long survive, for on the 24th of September, 1834, he died at Queluz near Lisbon, of an illness brought on by his great labours and fatigues, leaving a name, which deserves all honour from Portuguese and Brazilians alike. Queen Maria da Gloria was only fifteen, when she thus lost the advantage of her father's wise counsel and steady help, yet it might have been expected that her reign would be calm and prosperous. But neither the queen, the nobility, nor the people, understood the principles of parliamentary government. . . . The whole reign was one of violent party struggles, for they hardly deserve to be called civil wars, so little did they involve, which present a striking contrast to the peaceable constitutional government that at present prevails. . . . In 1852 the Charter was revised to suit all parties; direct voting, one of the chief claims of the radicals, was allowed, and the era of civil war came to an end. Maria da

Gloria did not long survive this peaceful settlement, for she died on the 15th of November, 1853, and her husband the King-Consort, Ferdinand II, assumed the regency until his eldest son Pedro V. should come of age. The era of peaceful parliamentary government, which succeeded the stormy reign of Maria II., has been one of material prosperity for Portugal. . . . The whole country, and especially the city of Lisbon, was during this reign, on account of the neglect of all sanitary precautions, ravaged by cholera and yellow fever, and it was in the midst of one of these outbreaks, on the 11th of November, 1861, that Pedro V., who had refused to leave his pestilence-stricken capital, died of cholera, and was followed to the grave by two of his younger brothers, Dom Ferdinand and Dom John. At the time of Pedro's death, his next brother and heir, Dom Luis, was travelling on the continent, and his father, Ferdinand II., who long survived Queen Maria da Gloria . . . assumed the regency until his return; soon after which King Luis married Maria Pia, younger daughter of Victor Emmanuel, king of Italy. . . . The reign of King Luis was prosperous and peaceful, and the news of his death on October 9, 1889, was received with general regret. . . . Luis I. was succeeded on the throne by his elder son, Dom Carlos, or Charles I., a young man of twenty-six, who married in 1886, the Princess Marie Amélie de Bourbon, the eldest daughter of the Comte de Paris. His accession was immediately followed by the revolution of the 15th of November, 1889, in Brazil, by which his great uncle, Pedro II., Emperor of Brazil, was dethroned and a republican government established in that country."—H. M. Stephens, *The Story of Portugal, ch.* 18.—See BRAZIL: A. D. 1889–1891.

ALSO IN: W. Bollaert, *Wars of Succession in Portugal and Spain, v.* 1.

A. D. 1884–1889.—Territorial claims in Africa.—The Berlin Conference. See AFRICA: A. D. 1884–1891.

PORTUS AUGUSTI AND PORTUS TRAJANI. See OSTIA.

PORTUS CALE.—The ancient name of Oporto, whence came, also, the name of Portugal. See PORTUGAL: EARLY HISTORY.

PORTUS ITIUS.—The port on the French coast from which Cæsar sailed on both his expeditions to Britain. Boulogne, Ambleteuse, Witsand and Calais have all contended for the honor of representing it in modern geography; but the serious question seems to be between Boulogne and Witsand, or Wissant.—T. Lewin, *Invasion of Britain.*

ALSO IN: G. Long, *Decline of the Roman Republic, v.* 4, *app.* 1.—Napoleon III., *Hist. of Cæsar, bk.* 3, *ch.* 7.

PORTUS LEMANIS.—An important Roman port in Britain, at the place which still preserves its name—Lymne.—T. Wright, *Celt, Roman and Saxon, ch* 5.

PORTUS MAGNUS.—An important Roman port in Britain, the massive walls of which are still seen at Porchester (or Portchester).—T. Wright, *Celt, Roman and Saxon, ch.* 5.

POST.—POSTAGE.—POST-OFFICE.—"The little that is known of the post-system of the [Roman] empire is summed up in a few words in Becker's 'Handbuch,' iii. i. 304: 'The institution of Augustus, which became the basis of the later system known to us from the writings of the Jurists, consisted of a military service which forwarded official despatches from station to station by couriers, called in the earlier imperial period speculatories. (Liv. xxxi. 24.; Suet. Calig. 44.; Tac. Hist. ii. 73.) Personal conveyance was confined (as in the time of the republic) to officials: for this purpose the mutationes (posts) and mansiones (night quarters) were assigned, and even palatia erected at the latter for the use of governors and the emperor himself. Private individuals could take advantage of these state posts within the provinces by a special license (diploma) of the governor, and at a later period of the emperor only.' Under the republic senators and high personages could obtain the posts for their private use, as a matter of privilege."—C. Merivale, *Hist. of the Romans under the Empire, ch.* 34 (*v.* 4), *foot-note.*—"According to Professor Friedländer in his interesting work, 'Darstellungen aus der Sittengeschichte Roms,' great progress was made by the Romans, in the fourth and fifth centuries, in their method of postal communication. Their excellent roads enabled them to establish rapid mule and horse posts as well as carts, and it is even stated that special 'postal ships' (Post schiffe) were kept in readiness at the principal sea-ports. These advanced postal arrangements, like many other traces of Roman civilization, survived longest in Gaul; but even there the barbarism of the people, and the constant wars in which they were engaged, gradually extinguished, first the necessity, and then, as a natural consequence, the means of postal communication, until we find, at a much later period, all European countries alike, for lack of any organized system, making use of pilgrims, friars, pedlars, and others, to convey their correspondence from one place to another. The first attempt of any importance, to rescue postal communication from the well-nigh hopeless condition into which it had for centuries fallen, was made in Germany in 1380, by the order of Teutonic Knights, who established próperly equipped post-messengers for home and international service. An improvement and extension of this plan was carried out by Francis von Thaxis in the year 1516, when a postal line from Brussels to Vienna, viâ Kreuznach, was established. It is true that, shortly before this, there is some record of Louis XI. of France having started, for State postal purposes, what were termed cavaliers du roy; but these were only allowed to be used for private purposes by privileged individuals, part of whose privilege, by the way, consisted in paying to Louis an enormous fee. It is to Francis von Thaxis that must be accorded the title of the first postal reformer. So eager was his interest in the work he had undertaken, that, in order to gain the right of territorial transit through several of the small states of Germany where his plans were strongly opposed, he actually agreed for a time to carry the people's letters free of charge, an instance of generosity, for a parallel of which we look in vain in the history of the Post Office. The mantle of this reformer seems, strangely enough, to have fallen in turn upon many of his descendants, who not only in Germany, but also in Spain, Austria, Holland, and other countries, obtained concessions for carrying on the useful work started by Francis von Thaxis. One of the

Thaxis family, at a later date, was created a prince of Germany, and took the name of Thurm und Taxis; and from him is descended the princely line bearing that name which flourishes at the present day. Another member of the family was created a grandee of Spain, and has the honor of being immortalized by Schiller in his 'Don Carlos.' The first establishment of an organized system of postal communication in England is wrapt in some obscurity. During the reign of John post-messengers were, for the first time, employed by the king; these messengers were called nuncii; and in the time of Henry I. these nuncii were also found in the service of some of the barons. In Henry III.'s reign they had so far become a recognized institution of the State that they were clothed in the royal livery. Mr. Lewins, in his interesting work, 'Her Majesty's Mails,' states that several private letters are still in existence, dating back as far as the reign of Edward II., which bear the appearance of having been carried by the nuncii of that period, with 'Haste, post haste!' written across them. . . . Edward IV., towards the end of the fifteenth century, during the time that he was engaged in war with Scotland, had the stations for postal relays placed within a few miles of each other all the way from London to the royal camp, and by this means managed to get his despatches carried nearly a hundred miles a day. . . . No improvement is recorded in the postal service in this country from the period last referred to until the reign of Henry VIII. This king, we are told, appointed a 'master of the posts,' in the person of Sir Brian Tuke, who really seems to have made great efforts to exercise a proper control over the horse-posts, and to bring some sort of organization to bear on his department. Poor Tuke, however, was not rewarded with much success. . . . James I. established a regular post for inland letters, and Charles I., recognizing, no doubt, the financial importance of the Post Office, declared it in 1637, by royal proclamation, to be State property. It was, however, during the Protectorate, twenty years later, that the first act of Parliament relating to the formation of a State Post Office was passed. This statute was entitled, 'An Act for the settling of the postage of England, Scotland, and Ireland.'. . . The first trace which can be found of a regular tariff of postal charges is in the reign of Charles I., and even regarded by the light of to-day these charges cannot be held to be exorbitant; for example, a single letter from London, for any distance under eighty miles, was charged twopence; fourpence up to one hundred and forty miles; sixpence for any greater distance in England, and eightpence to all parts of Scotland."—*Postal Communication, Past and Present* (*National Rev.; copied in Littell's Living Age, July* 30, 1887).—"A penny post was established in London, in 1683, two years before the death of Charles II., for the conveyance of letters and parcels within the City, by Robert Murray, an upholsterer by trade, who, like a great many others, was dissatisfied with the Government, which, in its anxiety to provide for the postal requirements of the country, had entirely neglected the City and suburbs. The post, established by Murray at a vast expense, was ultimately handed over to a William Docwray, whose name is now well known in the annals of Post Office history. The arrangements of the new penny post were simple, and certainly liberal enough. All letters or parcels not exceeding a pound weight, or any sum of money not exceeding £10 in value, or parcel not worth more than £10, could be conveyed at a cost of one penny; or within a radius of ten miles from a given centre, for the charge of twopence. Several district offices were opened in various parts of London, and receiving houses were freely established in all the leading thoroughfares. . . . The deliveries in the City were from six to eight daily, while from three to four were found sufficient to supply the wants of the suburbs. The public appreciated and supported the new venture, and it soon became a great commercial success, useful to the citizens, and profitable to the proprietor. No sooner, however, did a knowledge of this fact reach the ears of those in authority over the General Post Office, than the Duke of York, acting under instructions, and by virtue of the settlement made to him, objected to its being continued, on the ground that it was an invasion of his legal rights. . . . The authorities . . . applied to the court of King's Bench, wherein it was decided that the new or so-called penny post was an infraction of the privileges of the authorities of the General Post Office, and the royal interest, and that consequently it, with all its organization, profits, and advantages, should be handed over to, and remain the property of, the royal establishment. . . . Post-paid envelopes were in use in France in the time of Louis XIV. Pelisson states that they originated in 1653 with M. de Velayer, who established, under royal authority, a private penny-post in Paris. He placed boxes at the corners of the principal streets to receive the letters, which were obliged to be enclosed in these envelopes. They were suggested to the Government by Mr. Charles Whiting in 1830, and the eminent publisher, the late Mr. Charles Knight, also proposed stamped covers for papers. Dr. T. E. Gray, of the British Museum, claimed the credit of suggesting that letters should be prepaid by the use of stamps as early as 1834."—W. Tegg, *Posts and Telegraphs, pp.* 21–23 *and* 100–101.—"On the morning of the 10th of January, 1840, the people of the United Kingdom rose in the possession of a new power—the power of sending by the post a letter not weighing more than half an ounce upon the prepayment of one penny, and this without any regard to the distance which the letter had to travel. . . . To the sagacity and the perseverance of one man, the author of this system, the high praise is due, not so much that he triumphed over the petty jealousies and selfish fears of the post-office authorities, but that he established his own convictions against the doubts of some of the ablest and most conscientious leaders of public opinion. . . . Mr. Rowland Hill in 1837 published his plan of a cheap and uniform postage. A Committee of the House of Commons was appointed in 1837, which continued its inquiries throughout the session of 1838, and arrived at the conviction that 'the mode recommended of charging and collecting postage, in a pamphlet published by Mr. Rowland Hill,' was feasible, and deserving of a trial under legislative sanction. . . . Lord Ashburton, although an advocate of Post-office Reform, held that the reduction to a penny would wholly destroy the revenue. Lord Lowther, the Postmaster-General, thought twopence the smallest

rate that would cover the expenses. Colonel Maberly, the secretary to the post office, considered Mr. Hill's plan a most preposterous one, and maintained that if the rates were to be reduced to a penny, the revenue would not recover itself for forty or fifty years. . . . Public opinion, however, had been brought so strongly to bear in favour of a penny rate, that the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Spring Rice, on the 5th of July, 1839, proposed a resolution, 'that it is expedient to reduce the postage on letters to one uniform rate of a penny postage, according to a certain amount of weight to be determined — that the parliamentary privilege of franking should be abolished, and that official franking be strictly limited — the House pledging itself to make good any deficiency that may occur in the revenue from such reduction of the postage.' A Bill was accordingly passed to this effect in the House of Commons, its operation being limited in its duration to one year, and the Treasury retaining the power of fixing the rates at first, although the ultimate reduction was to be to one penny. This experimental measure reduced all rates above fourpence to that sum, leaving those below fourpence unaltered. With this complication of charge the experiment could not have a fair trial, and accordingly on the 10th of January, 1840, the uniform half-ounce rate became by order of the Treasury one penny. . . . In 1840 the number of letters sent through the post had more than doubled, and the legislature had little hesitation in making the Act of 1839 permanent, instead of its duration being limited to the year which would expire in October. A stamped envelope, printed upon a peculiar paper, and bearing an elaborate design, was originally chosen as the mode of rendering prepayment convenient to the sender of a letter. A simpler plan soon superseded this attempt to enlist the Fine Arts in a plain business operation. The plan of prepaying letters by affixing a stamp bearing the head of the ruler of the country, came into use here in May, 1840 [see, also, ENGLAND: A. D. 1840]. The habit of prepayment by postage stamps has now become so universal throughout the world, that in 1861 the system was established in eighty different countries or colonies."—C. Knight, *Popular History of England, v.* 8, *ch.* 24.—The first postal system in the American colonies was privately established in New England in 1676, by John Heyward, under authority from the General Court of the colony of Massachusetts. "In 1683 the government of Penn established a postal system for the Colony of Pennsylvania. In 1700 Col. J. Hamilton organized 'his postal establishment for British America' including all the English colonies, but soon after disposed of his right to the English crown. In 1710 the English Parliament established by law the first governmental postal system with the general office at New York, which continued until in 1776 the Continental Congress adopted and set in action the postal system proposed by Franklin, who was appointed the first Postmaster General. The first law of the Federal Congress continued this system in operation as sufficient for the public wants, but the postal service was not finally settled until the act of 1792. This law (1792) fixed a tariff which with unimportant changes remained in force until the adoption of the system of Uniform Postage in the United States. Single, double and triple letters were charged 8, 16 and 24 cents respectively when sent to other countries, and four cents plus the internal postage when arriving from foreign countries. The internal postage between offices in the United States was 6, 8, 10, 15, 17, 20, 22 and 25 cents for distances of 30, 60, 100, 150, 200, 250, 350, or 400 miles respectively for single letters, and double, triple, etc., this for double, triple, etc. letters. A single letter was defined by the law to be a single sheet or piece of paper, a double letter, two sheets or pieces of paper, etc. . . . The earliest letters which we have seen, consist of single sheets of paper folded and addressed upon the sheet. An envelope would have subjected them to double postage."—J. K. Tiffany, *History of the Postage Stamps, introd.*— By an act of March 3, 1845, the postage rates in the United States were reduced to two — namely, 5 cents for 300 miles or under, and 10 cents for longer distances. Six years later (March 3, 1851) the minimum rate for half an ounce became 3 cents (if prepaid) with the distance covered by it extended to 3,000 miles; if not prepaid, 5 cents. For distances beyond 3,000 miles, these rates were doubled. In 1856 prepayment was made compulsory; and by an act signed March 3, 1863, the 3 cent rate for half-ounce letters was extended to all distances in the United States.—J. Rees, *Footprints of a Letter-Carrier, p.* 264.—In 1883 the rate in the United States was reduced to 2 cents for all distances, on letters not exceeding half an ounce. In 1885 the weight of a letter transmissible for 2 cents was increased to one ounce. The use of postage stamps was first introduced in the United States under an act of Congress passed in March, 1847. Stamped envelopes were first provided in 1853. The first issue of postal cards was on the 1st of May, 1873, under an act approved June 8, 1872. The registry system was adopted July 1, 1855. Free delivery of letters in the larger cities was first undertaken on the 1st of July 1863.—D. M. Dickinson, *Progress and the Post* (*North Am. Rev., Oct.*, 1889).

ALSO IN: *Annual Report of the Postmaster-General of the U. S.*, 1893, *pp.* 543–558 (*Description of all Postage Stamps and Postal Cards issued*).

POSTAL MONEY-ORDER SYSTEM, The.—The postal money-order system, though said to be older in practical existence, was regularly instituted and organized in England, in its present form, in 1859. It was adopted in the United States five years later, going into operation in November, 1864.—D. M. Dickinson, *Progress and the Post* (*North Am. Rev., Oct.*, 1889).

ALSO IN: *Appleton's Annual Cyclopædia*, 1887, *p.* 687.

POSTAL SAVINGS BANKS.—Postal savings banks were first brought into operation in England in 1861. "One shilling is the smallest sum that can be deposited. The Government has, however, . . . issued blank forms with spaces for twelve penny postage-stamps, and will receive one of these forms with twelve stamps affixed as a deposit. This plan was suggested by the desire to encourage habits of saving among children, and by the success of penny banks in connection with schools and mechanics' institutes. No one can deposit more than £30 in one year, or have to his credit more than £150 exclusive of interest. When the principal and interest together amount to £200, interest ceases until the amount has been reduced below £200.

Interest at two and a half per cent is paid, beginning the first of the month following the deposit and stopping the last of the month preceding the withdrawal, but no interest is paid on any sum less than a pound or not a multiple of a pound. The interest is added to the principal on the 31st of December of each year. . . . The English colonies . . . have established postal savings-banks of a similar character. . . . The Canadian system . . . went into operation in 1868. . . . Influenced by the success of the English system of postal savings-banks, the governments on the Continent of Europe have now nearly all made similar provisions for the investment of the surplus earnings of the people. The Italian system . . . went into operation February 29, 1876. . . . In France the proposal to establish postal savings-banks was frequently discussed, but not adopted until March 1881, although the ordinary savings-banks had for several years been allowed to use the post-offices as places for the receipt and repayment of deposits. . . . The Austrian postal savings-banks were first opened January 12, 1883. . . . The Belgian system has been [1885] in successful operation for more than fifteen years; that of the Netherlands was established some three years ago; while Sweden has just followed her neighbors, Denmark and Norway, in establishing similar institutions. In 1871 Postmaster-General Creswel recommended the establishment of postal savings depositories in connection with the United States post-offices, and two years later he discussed the subject very fully in his annual report. Several of his successors have renewed his recommendation;" but no action has been taken by Congress.—D. B. King, *Postal Savings-Banks* (*Popular Science Monthly, Dec.*, 1885).

POSTAL TELEGRAPH, The.—"The States of the continent of Europe were the first to appreciate the advantages of governmental control of the telegraph. . . . From the beginning they assumed the erection and management of the telegraph lines. It may be said that in taking control of the telegraphs the monarchial governments of the Old World were actuated as much by the desire to use them for the maintenance of authority as by the advantages which they offered for the service of the people. To a certain extent this is doubtless true, but it is none the less true that the people have reaped the most solid benefits, and that the tendency has been rather to liberalize government than to maintain arbitrary power. . . . The greatest progress and the best management have alike been shown in those countries where the forms of government are most liberal, as in Switzerland and Belgium. . . . In Great Britain the telegraph was at first controlled by private parties. . . . In July, 1868, an act was passed 'to enable Her Majesty's Postmaster-General to acquire, work, and maintain electric telegraphs.' . . . The rate for messages was fixed throughout the kingdom at one shilling for twenty words, excluding the address and signature. This rate covered delivery within one mile of the office of address, or within its postal delivery." The lines of the existing telegraph companies were purchased on terms which were commonly held to be exorbitant, and Parliament, changing its original intention, conferred on the post-office department a monopoly of the telegraphs. Thus "the British postal telegraph was from the first handicapped by an enormous interest charge, and to some extent by the odium which always attaches to a legal monopoly. But notwithstanding the exorbitant price paid for the telegraph, the investment has not proved an unprofitable one."—N. P. Hill, *Speech in the Senate of the U. S., Jan.* 14, 1884, *on a Bill to Establish Postal Telegraphs*, ("*Speeches and Papers*," *pp.* 209–215).

POSTAL UNION, The.—The Postal Union, which now embraces most of the civilized and semi-civilized countries of the world, was formed originally by a congress of delegates, representing the principal governments of Europe, and the United States of America, which assembled at Berne, Switzerland, in September, 1874. A treaty was concluded at that time, which established uniform rates of postage (25 centimes, or 5 cents, on half-ounce letters), between the countries becoming parties to it, and opening the opportunity for other states to join in the same arrangement. From year to year since, the Postal Union has been widened by the accession of new signatories to the treaty, until very few regions of the globe where any postal system exists lie now outside of it. The late accessions to the Postal Union have been North Borneo, the German East African Protectorate, and the British Australasian Colonies, in 1891; Natal and Bosnia-Herzegovina in 1892; the South African Republic (Transvaal) in 1893. By the action of an international postal congress, held at Vienna, in 1891, a kind of international clearing-house for the Postal Union was established at Berne, Switzerland, and the settlement of accounts between its members has been greatly facilitated thereby.

POSTUMIAN ROAD.—One of the great roads of the ancient Romans. It led from Genoa to Aquileia, by way of Placentia, Cremona and Verona.—T. Mommsen, *Hist. of Rome, bk.* 4, *ch.* 11.

POTESTAS.—The civil power with which a Roman magistrate was invested was technically termed potestas.—W. Ramsay, *Manual of Roman Antiq., ch.* 5.

POTESTAS TRIBUNITIA, The.—The powers and prerogatives of the ancient tribunitian office, without the office itself, being conferred upon Augustus and his successors, became the most important element, perhaps, of the finally compacted sovereignty of the Roman emperors.—C. Merivale, *Hist. of the Romans, ch.* 30.

POTIDÆA, Siege of.—The city of Potidæa, a Corinthian colony founded on the long peninsula of Pallene which projects from the Macedonian coast, but which had become subject to Athens, revolted from the latter B. C. 432, and was assisted by the Corinthians. This was among the quarrels which led up to the Peloponnesian War. The Athenians reduced the city and expelled the inhabitants after a siege of three years.—Thucydides, *History, bk.* 1–2.—See, also, GREECE: B. C. 432; and ATHENS: B. C. 430–429.

POTOMAC, Army of the: Its creation and its campaigns. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1861 (JULY—NOVEMBER); 1862 (MARCH—MAY), and after.

POTOSI, The Spanish province of.—Modern Bolivia. See ARGENTINE REPUBLIC: A. D. 1580–1777.

POTTAWATOMIES. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: ALGONQUIAN FAMILY, AND OJIBWAS.

POUNDAGE. See TUNNAGE AND POUNDAGE.

POWHATANS, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: POWHATAN CONFEDERACY.

POYNING'S ACTS. See IRELAND: A. D. 1494.

PRÆFECTS.—PREFECTS.—PRÉFÈTS. See ROME: B. C. 31-A. D. 14; and PRÆTORIAN PRÆFECTS.

PRÆMUNIRE, Statute of. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1306-1393.

PRÆNESTE, Sulla's capture of.—Præneste, the ancient city of the Latins, held against Sulla, in the first civil war, by young Marius, was surrendered after the battle at the Colline Gate of Rome. Sulla ordered the male inhabitants to be put to the sword and gave up the town to his soldiers for pillage.—W. Ihne, *Hist. of Rome, bk.* 7, *ch.* 19.

PRÆNOMEN.—NOMEN.—COGNOMEN. See GENS.

PRÆTOR. See ROME: B. C. 366.

PRÆTORIAN GUARDS.—PRÆTORIANS.—"The commander-in-chief of a Roman army was attended by a select detachment, which, under the name of 'Cohors Praetoria,' remained closely attached to his person in the field, ready to execute his orders, and to guard him from any sudden attack. . . . Augustus, following his usual line of policy, retained the ancient name of 'Praetoriae Cohortes,' while he entirely changed their character. He levied in Etruria, Umbria, ancient Latium, and the old Colonies, nine or ten Cohorts, consisting of a thousand men each, on whom he bestowed double pay and superior privileges. These formed a permanent corps, who acted as the Imperial Life Guards, ready to overawe the Senate, and to suppress any sudden popular commotion."—W. Ramsay, *Manual of Roman Antiq., ch.* 12.—The Prætorian Guard had been quartered, during the reign of Augustus, and during the early years of the reign of Tiberius, in small barracks at various points throughout the city, or in the neighboring towns. Sejanus, the intriguing favorite of Tiberius, being commander of the formidable corps, established it in one great permanent camp, "beyond the north-eastern angle of the city, and between the roads which sprang from the Viminal and Colline gates." This was done A. D. 23.—C. Merivale, *Hist. of the Romans, ch.* 45.—See, also, ROME: A. D. 14-37.

A. D. 41.—Their elevation to the throne. See ROME: A. D. 41.

A. D. 193.—Murder of Pertinax and sale of the empire. See ROME: A. D. 192-284.

A. D. 193.—Reconstitution by Severus.—Severus, whose first act on reaching Rome had been to disarm and disband the insolent Guard which murdered Pertinax and sold the empire to Julianus, had no thought of dispensing with the institution. There was soon in existence a new organization of Prætorians, increased to four times the ancient number and picked from all the legions of the frontiers.—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, ch.* 5.

A. D. 238.—Murder of Balbinus and Pupienus. See ROME: A. D. 192-284.

A. D. 312.—Abolition by Constantine.—"By the prudent measures of Diocletian, the numbers of the Prætorians were insensibly reduced, their privileges abolished, and their place supplied by two faithful legions of Illyricum, who, under the new titles of Jovians and Herculians, were appointed to perform the service of the imperial guards. . . . They were old corps stationed at Illyricum; and, according to the ancient establishment, they each consisted of 6,000 men. They had acquired much reputation by the use of the plumbatæ, or darts loaded with lead."—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, ch.* 13, *with foot-note.*—Restored and augmented by Maxentius, during his brief reign, the Prætorians were finally abolished and their fortified camp destroyed, by Constantine, after his victory in the civil war of A. D. 312.—*Same, ch.* 14.

PRÆTORIAN PRÆFECTS.—"As the government degenerated into military despotism, the Prætorian præfect, who in his origin had been a simple captain of the guards, was placed not only at the head of the army, but of the finances, and even of the law. In every department of administration he represented the person, and exercised the authority, of the emperor. The first præfect who enjoyed and abused this immense power was Plautianus, the favourite minister of Severus. . . . They [the Prætorian præfects] were deprived by Constantine of all military command as soon as they had ceased to lead into the field, under their immediate orders, the flower of the Roman troops; and at length, by a singular revolution, the captains of the guards were transformed into the civil magistrates of the provinces. According to the plan of government instituted by Diocletian, the four princes had each their Prætorian præfect; and, after the monarchy was once more united in the person of Constantine, he still continued to create the same number of four præfects, and intrusted to their care the same provinces which they already administered. 1. The Præfect of the East stretched his ample jurisdiction" from the Nile to the Phasis and from Thrace to Persia. "2. The important provinces of Pannonia, Dacia, Macedonia, and Greece, acknowledged the authority of the Præfect of Illyricum. 3. The power of the Præfect of Italy" extended to the Danube, and over the islands of the Mediterranean and part of Africa. "4. The Præfect of the Gauls comprehended under that plural denomination the kindred provinces of Britain and Spain, and . . . to the foot of Mount Atlas. . . . Rome and Constantinople were alone excepted from the jurisdiction of the Prætorian præfects. . . . A perfect equality was established between the dignity of the two municipal, and that of the four Prætorian præfects."—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, ch.* 5 *and* 17.—See, also, ROME: B. C. 31-A. D. 14.

PRÆTORIUM, The.—"In the very early days of Rome, before even Consuls had a being, the two chief magistrates of the republic bore the title of Praetors. Some remembrance of this fact lingering in the speech of the people gave always to the term Praetorium (the Praetor's house) a peculiar majesty, and caused it to be used as the equivalent of palace. So in the well-known passages of the New Testament, the palace of Pilate the Governor at Jerusalem, of

Herod the King at Caesarea, of Nero the Emperor at Rome, are all called the Praetorium. From the palace the troops who surrounded the person of the Emperor took their well-known name, 'the Praetorian Guard.'"—T. Hodgkin, *Italy and her Invaders, bk.* 1, *ch.* 3 (*v.* 1).

PRAGA, Battle of (1831). See POLAND: A. D. 1830–1832.

PRAGMATIC SANCTION.—"No two words convey less distinct meaning to English ears than those which form this title: nor are we at all prepared to furnish an equivalent. Perhaps 'a well considered Ordinance' may in some degree represent them: i. e. an Ordinance which has been fully discussed by men practised in State Affairs. But we are very far from either recommending or being satisfied with such a substitute. The title was used in the Lower [the Byzantine] Empire, and Ducange ad v. describes 'Pragmaticum Rescriptum seu Pragmatica Sanctio' to be that which 'ad hibitâ diligente causæ cognitione, ex omnium Procerum consensu in modum sententiæ lecto, a Principe conceditur.'" E. Smedley, *Hist. of France, pt.* 1, *ch.* 15, *foot-note.*—"Pragmatic Sanction being, in the Imperial Chancery and some others, the received title for Ordinances of a very irrevocable nature, which a sovereign makes, in affairs that belong wholly to himself, or what he reckons his own rights."—T. Carlyle, *Hist. of Fred'k II., bk.* 5, *ch.* 2.—"This word [pragmatic] is derived from the Greek 'pragma,' which means 'a rule.'"—E. de Bonnechose, *Hist. of France, v.* 1, *epoch* 2, *bk.* 1, *ch.* 5, *foot-note.*—The following are the more noted ordinances which have borne this name:

A. D. 1220 and 1232.—Of the Emperor Frederick II. See GERMANY: A. D. 1250–1272.

A. D. 1268 (?).—Of St. Louis. See FRANCE: A. D. 1268.

A. D. 1438.—Of Charles VII. of France, and its abrogation. See FRANCE: A. D. 1438; and 1515–1518.

A. D. 1547.—Of the Emperor Charles V. for the Netherlands. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1547.

A. D. 1718.—Of the Emperor Charles VI. See AUSTRIA: A. D. 1718–1738; and 1740 (OCTOBER).

PRAGUE: A. D. 1348-1409.—The University and the German secession. See EDUCATION, MEDIÆVAL: GERMANY; and BOHEMIA: A. D. 1405–1415.

A. D. 1620.—Battle of the White Mountain.—Abandonment of crown and capital by Frederick. See GERMANY: A. D. 1620.

A. D. 1631.—Occupied and plundered by the Saxons. See GERMANY: A. D. 1631–1632.

A. D. 1648—Surprise and capture of the Kleinsite by the Swedes.—Siege of the older part of the city.—The end of the Thirty Years War. See GERMANY: A. D. 1646–1648.

A. D. 1741.—Taken by the French, Saxons and Bavarians. See AUSTRIA: A. D. 1741 (AUGUST—NOVEMBER).

A. D. 1742.—The French blockaded in the city.—Retreat of Belleisle. See AUSTRIA: A. D. 1742 (JUNE—DECEMBER).

A. D. 1744.—Won and lost by Frederick the Great. See AUSTRIA: A. D. 1743–1744; and 1744–1745.

A. D. 1757.—Battle.—Prussian victory.—Siege.—Relief by Count Daun. See GERMANY: A. D. 1757 (APRIL—JUNE).

A. D. 1848.—Bombardment by the Austrians. See AUSTRIA: A. D. 1848–1849.

PRAGUE, Congress of. See GERMANY: A. D. 1813 (MAY—AUGUST).

PRAGUE, Treaty of (1634). See GERMANY: A. D. 1634–1639.....**Treaty of (1866).** See GERMANY: A. D. 1866.

PRAGUERIE.—The commotions produced by John Huss, at Prague, in the beginning of the 15th century, gave the name Praguerie, at that period, to all sorts of popular disturbances.

PRAIRIAL, The month. See FRANCE: A. D. 1793 (OCTOBER) THE NEW REPUBLICAN CALENDAR.

PRAIRIAL FIRST, The insurrection of. See FRANCE: A. D. 1795 (APRIL).

PRAIRIAL TWENTY-SECOND, Law of the. See FRANCE: A. D. 1794 (JUNE—JULY).

PRAIRIE GROVE, Battle of. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1862 (SEPTEMBER—DECEMBER: MISSOURI—ARKANSAS).

PRAKRITA. See SANSKRIT.

PRATO, The horrible sack of (1512). See FLORENCE: A. D. 1502–1569.

PRECIANI, The. See AQUITAINE: THE ANCIENT TRIBES.

PRECIEUSES. See RAMBOUILLET, HÔTEL DE.

PRECIOUS METALS, Production of. See MONEY AND BANKING: 16–17TH CENTURIES, and 1848–1893.

PRÉFECTS.—PRÉFÊTS.—PRÆFECTS. See ROME: B. C. 31–A. D. 14; and PRÆTORIAN PRÆFECTS.

PREMIER.—PRIME MINISTER. See CABINET, THE ENGLISH.

PREMISLAUS, King of Poland, A. D. 1289-1296.

PREMONSTRATENSIAN ORDER.—This was the most important branch of the Regular Canons of St. Augustine, founded by St. Norbert, a German nobleman, who died in 1134. It took its name from Pré-montre, in Picardy, where the first house was established.—E. L. Cutts, *Scenes and Characters of the Middle Ages, ch.* 3.

ALSO IN: J. Alzog, *Manual of Univ. Church Hist., sect.* 243 (*v.* 2).—See AUSTIN CANONS.

PRESBURG, OR PRESSBURG, Peace of (1805). See GERMANY: A. D. 1805–1806.

PRESBYTERIANS, English, in the Civil War. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1643 (JULY), and (JULY—SEPTEMBER); 1646 (MARCH); 1647 (APRIL—AUGUST); (AUGUST—DECEMBER); 1648..... **At the Restoration.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1658–1660; 1661; and 1662–1665.

In Colonial Massachusetts. See MASSACHUSETTS: A. D. 1646–1651.

Scotch-Irish. See SCOTCH-IRISH.

Scottish. See CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.

PRESCOTT, Colonel William, and the battle of Bunker Hill. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1775 (JUNE).

PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.—"The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America. He shall hold his office dur-

ing the term of four years, and, together with the Vice-President, chosen for the same term, be elected as follows: Each State shall appoint, in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct, a number of electors, equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress [and these electors, meeting in their respective States, shall vote for President and Vice-President, transmitting certified lists of their votes to the President of the Senate of the United States, who shall count them in the presence of the two Houses of Congress; and if no person is elected President by a majority of all the votes cast, then the House of Representatives shall elect a President from the three persons who received the highest numbers of the votes cast by the electors, the representation from each State having one vote in such election]. . . . No person except a natural born citizen, or a citizen of the United States at the time of the adoption of this Constitution, shall be eligible to the office of President; neither shall any person be eligible to that office who shall not have attained to the age of thirty-five years, and been fourteen years a resident within the United States. . . . The President shall be Commander-in-Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the militia of the several States, when called into the actual service of the United States; he may require the opinion, in writing, of the principal officer in each of the executive departments, upon any subject relating to the duties of their respective offices, and he shall have power to grant reprieves and pardons for offences against the United States, except in cases of impeachment. He shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two thirds of the Senators present concur; and he shall nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, judges of the Supreme Court, and all other officers of the United States whose appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by law; but the Congress may by law vest the appointment of such inferior officers as they think proper in the President alone, in the courts of law, or in the heads of departments. The President shall have power to fill up all vacancies that may happen during the recess of the Senate, by granting commissions which shall expire at the end of their next session. He shall from time to time give to the Congress information of the state of the Union, and recommend to their consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient; he may, on extraordinary occasions, convene both houses, or either of them, and in case of disagreement between them, with respect to the time of adjournment, he may adjourn them to such time as he shall think proper; he shall receive ambassadors and other public ministers; he shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed, and shall commission all the officers of the United States. The President, Vice-President, and all civil officers of the United States, shall be removed from office on impeachment for, and conviction of, treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors."—*Constitution of the U. S., art.* 2, *and art.* 12 *of amendments.*—The provisions of the Constitution regarding the Presidential succession, in case of the death or resignation of both President and Vice-President, are: 'In case of the removal of the President from office, or of his death, resignation, or inability to discharge the powers and duties of the said office, the same shall devolve on the Vice-President, and the Congress may by law provide for the case of removal, death, resignation, or inability both of the President and Vice-President, declaring what officer shall then act as President, and such officer shall act accordingly until the disability be removed or a President shall be elected.' (Article II, Section 6.) In pursuance of the power thus granted to it in the last half of this section, Congress in 1792 passed an act declaring that in case of the death, resignation, etc., of both the President and Vice-President, the succession should be first to the President of the Senate and then to the Speaker of the House. This order was changed by the act of 1886, which provided that the succession to the presidency should be as follows: 1. President. 2. Vice-President. 3. Secretary of State. 4. Secretary of the Treasury. 5. Secretary of War. 6. Attorney General. 7. Postmaster General. 8. Secretary of the Navy. 9. Secretary of the Interior. In all cases the remainder of the four-years' term shall be served out. This act also regulated the counting of the votes of the electors by Congress, and the determination of who were legally chosen electors.—*Statutes of the U. S. passed at* 1*st Sess. of* 49*th Cong., p.* 1.

ALSO IN: E. Stanwood, *Hist. of Presidential Elections, ch.* 27.—J. Story, *Commentaries on the Const. of the U. S., bk.* 3, *ch.* 36–37 (*v.* 3).—*The Federalist, nos.* 66–76.—J. Bryce, *The Am. Commonwealth, ch.* 5–8 (*v.* 1).

PRESIDIO. See TEXAS: A. D. 1819–1835

PRESS, The. See PRINTING.

PRESSBURG, OR PRESBURG, Treaty of (1805). See GERMANY: A. D. 1805–1806.

PRESS-GANG. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1812.

PRESTER JOHN, The Kingdom of.—"About the middle of the eleventh century stories began to be circulated in Europe as to a Christian nation of north-eastern Asia, whose sovereign was at the same time king and priest, and was known by the name of Prester John. Amid the mass of fables with which the subject is encumbered, it would seem to be certain that, in the very beginning of the century, the Khan of the Keraït, a tribe whose chief seat was at Karakorum, between Lake Baikal and the northern frontier of China, was converted to Nestorian Christianity — it is said, through the appearance of a saint to him when he had lost his way in hunting. By means of conversation with Christian merchants, he acquired some elementary knowledge of the faith, and, on the application of Ebed-Jesu, metropolitan of Maru, to the Nestorian patriarch Gregory, clergy were sent, who baptized the king and his subjects, to the number of 200,000. Ebed-Jesu consulted the patriarch how the fasts were to be kept, since the country did not afford any corn, or anything but flesh and milk; and the answer was, that, if no other Lenten provisions were to be had, milk should be the only diet for seasons of abstinence. The earliest western notice of this nation is given by Otho of Freising, from the relation of an Armenian bishop who visited the court of pope Eugenius III. This report is largely tinctured with fable, and deduces the Tartar chief's descent

from the Magi who visited the Saviour in His cradle. It would seem that the Nestorians of Syria, for the sake of vying with the boasts of the Latins, delighted in inventing tales as to the wealth, the splendour, and the happiness of their convert's kingdom; and to them is probably to be ascribed an extravagantly absurd letter, in which Prester John is made to dilate on the greatness and the riches of his dominions, the magnificence of his state and the beauty of his wives, and to offer the Byzantine emperor, Manuel, if he be of the true faith, the office of lord chamberlain in the court of Karakorum. In 1177 Alexander III. was induced by reports which a physician named Philip had brought back from Tartary, as to Prester John's desire to be received into communion with the pope, to address a letter to the king, recommending Philip as a religious instructor. But nothing is known as to the result of this; and in 1202 the Kerait kingdom was overthrown by the Tartar conqueror Genghis Khan. In explanation of the story as to the union of priesthood with royalty in Prester John, many theories have been proposed, of which two may be mentioned here: that it arose out of the fact of a Nestorian priest's having got possession of the kingdom on the death of a khan; or that, the Tartar prince's title being compounded of the Chinese 'wang' (king) and the Mongol 'khan,' the first of these words was confounded by the Nestorians of Syria with the name John, and the second with 'cohen' (a priest). . . . The identification of Prester John's kingdom with Abyssinia was a mistake of Portuguese explorers some centuries later."—J. C. Robertson, *Hist. of the Ch. Church, bk.* 6, *ch.* 11, *with foot-note* (*v.* 5).

ALSO IN: Col. H. Yule, *Note to 'The Book of Marco Polo,' v.* 1, *pp.* 204–209.

PRESTON, Battle of (1648). See ENGLAND: A. D. 1648 (APRIL—AUGUST).....**Battle of (1715).** See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1715.

PRESTON PANS, Battle of (1745). See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1745–1746.

PRESTONBURG, Battle of. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1862 (JANUARY—FEBRUARY: KENTUCKY—TENNESSEE).

PRETAXATION. See GERMANY: A. D. 1125–1152.

PRETENDERS, The Stuart. See JACOBITES.

PRICE'S RAID. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1864 (MARCH—OCTOBER: ARKANSAS—MISSOURI).

PRIDE'S PURGE. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1648 (NOVEMBER—DECEMBER).

PRIEST'S LANE, The. See GERMANY: A. D. 1631–1632.

PRIM, General, Assassination of. See SPAIN: A. D. 1866–1873.

PRIMATES.—METROPOLITANS.—PATRIARCHS.— In the early organization of the Christian Church, the bishops of every province found it necessary "to make one of themselves superior to all the rest, and invest him with certain powers and privileges for the good of the whole, whom they therefore named their primate, or metropolitan, that is, the principal bishop of the province. . . . Next in order to the metropolitans or primates were the patriarchs; or, as they were at first called, archbishops and exarchs of the diocese. For though now an archbishop and a metropolitan be generally taken for the same, to wit, the primate of a single province; yet anciently the name archbishop was a more extensive title, and scarce given to any but those whose jurisdiction extended over a whole imperial diocese, as the bishop of Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, &c."—J. Bingham, *Antiq. of the Christ. Ch., bk.* 2, *ch.* 16–17 (*v.* 1). — See, also, CHRISTIANITY: A. D. 312–337.

PRIME MINISTER, The English. See CABINET, THE ENGLISH.

PRINCE, Origin of the title. See PRINCEPS SENATUS.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.— "Prince Edward's Island, the smallest province of the Dominion [of Canada], originally called St. John's Island, until 1770 formed part of Nova Scotia. The first Governor was Walter Patterson. . . . .The first assembly met in 1773." In 1873 Prince Edward Island consented to be received into the Confederation of the Dominion of Canada — the latest of the provinces to accede to the Union, except Newfoundland, which still (1894) remains outside. — J. E. C. Munro, *The Constitution of Canada, ch.* 2.—See, also, CANADA: A. D. 1867; and 1869–1873.

PRINCE OF THE CAPTIVITY. See JEWS: A. D. 200–400.

PRINCE OF WALES. See WALES, PRINCE OF.

PRINCEPS SENATUS.—"As the title of imperator conferred the highest military rank upon Augustus and his successors, so did that of princeps senatus, or princeps (as it came to be expressed by an easy but material abridgment), convey the idea of the highest civil preeminence consistent with the forms of the old constitution. In ancient times this title had been appropriated to the first in succession of living censorii, men who had served the office of censor; and such were necessarily patricians and senators. The sole privilege it conferred was that of speaking first in the debates of the senate; a privilege however to which considerable importance might attach from the exceeding deference habitually paid to authority and example by the Roman assemblies. . . . The title of princeps was modest and constitutional; it was associated with the recollection of the best ages of the free state and the purest models of public virtue; it could not be considered beyond the deserts of one who was undoubtedly the foremost man of the nation. . . . The popularity which the assumption of this republican title conferred upon the early emperors may be inferred from the care with which it is noted, and its constitutional functions referred to by the writers of the Augustan age and that which succeeded it. But it was an easy and natural step in the progress of political ideas to drop the application of the title, and contract it from prince of the senate, to prince merely. The original character of the appellation was soon forgotten, and the proper limits of its privileges confounded in the more vague and general prerogative which the bare designation of first or premier seemed to imply."—C. Merivale, *Hist. of the Romans, ch.* 31.

ALSO IN: E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, ch.* 3, *note by Dr. W. Smith.*

PRINCETON, Battle of (1777). See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1776–1777 WASHINGTON'S RETREAT.

PRINCIPES. See LEGION, THE ROMAN.

PRINTING AND THE PRESS.

A. D. 1430-1456.—The invention of movable type.—Rival claims for Coster and Gutenberg.—The first Printed Book.—"Before arriving at the movable type placed side by side, and forming phrases, which appears to us to-day so simple and so ordinary, many years passed. It is certain that long before Gutenberg a means was found of cutting wood and metal in relief and reproducing by application the image traced. . . . Remembering that the numerous guilds of 'tailleurs d' images,' or sculptors in relief, had in the Middle Ages the specialty of carving ivories and of placing effigies on tombs, it can be admitted without much difficulty that these people one day found a means of multiplying the sketches of a figure often asked for, by modelling its contour in relief on ivory or wood, and afterwards taking a reproduction on paper or parchment by means of pressure. When and where was this discovery produced? We cannot possibly say; but it is certain that playing cards were produced by this means, and that from the year 1423 popular figures were cut in wood, as we know from the St. Christopher of that date belonging to Lord Spencer. . . . It is a recognised fact that the single sheet with a printed figure preceded the xylographic book, in which text and illustration were cut in the same block. This process did not appear much before the second quarter of the 15th century, and it was employed principally for popular works which were then the universal taste. The engraving also was nothing more than a kind of imposition palmed off as a manuscript; the vignettes were often covered with brilliant colours and gold, and the whole sold as of the best quality. . . . An attempt had been made to put some text at the foot of the St. Christopher of 1423, and the idea of giving more importance to the text was to the advantage of the booksellers. . . . At the epoch of the St. Christopher, in 1423, several works were in vogue in the universities, the schools, and with the public. . . . To find a means of multiplying these treatises at little cost was a fortune to the inventor. It is to be supposed that many artisans of the time attempted it; and without doubt it was the booksellers themselves, mostly mere dealers, who were tempted to the adventure by the sculptors and wood-cutters. But none had yet been so bold as to cut in relief a series of blocks with engravings and text to compose a complete work. That point was reached very quickly when some legend was engraved at the foot of a vignette, and it may be thought that the 'Donatus' [i. e. the Latin Syntax of Ælius Donatus] was the most ancient of books so obtained among the 'Incunabuli,' as we now call them, a word that signifies origin or cradle. The first books then were formed of sheets of paper or parchment, laboriously printed from xylographic blocks, that is to say wooden blocks on which a 'tailleur d' images' had left in relief the designs and the letters of the text. He had thus to trace his characters in reverse, so that they could be reproduced as written; he had to avoid faults, because a phrase once done, well or ill, lasted. It was doubtless this difficulty of correction that gave the idea of movable types. . . . This at least explains the legend of Laurent Coster, of Haarlem, who, according to Hadrian Junius, his compatriot, discovered by accident the secret of separate types while playing with his children. And if the legend of which we speak contains the least truth, it must be found in the sense above indicated, that is in the correction of faults, rather than in the innocent game of a merchant of Haarlem. . . . Movable type, the capital point of printing, the pivot of the art of the Book, developed itself little by little, according to needs, when there was occasion to correct an erroneous inscription; but, in any case, its origin is unknown. Doubtless to vary the text, means were found to replace entire phrases by other phrases, preserving the original figures; and thus the light dawned upon these craftsmen, occupied in the manufacture and sale of their books. According to Hadrian Junius, Laurent Janszoon Coster (the latter name signifying 'the discoverer') published one of the celebrated series of works under the general title of 'Speculum' which was then so popular, . . . the 'Speculum Humanæ Salvationis.' . . . Junius, as we see, attributes to Laurent Coster the first impression of the 'Speculum,' no longer the purely xylographic impression of the 'Donatus' from an engraved block, but that of the more advanced manner in movable types [probably between 1430 and 1440]. In point of fact, this book had at least four editions, similar in engravings and body of letters, but of different text. It must then be admitted that the fount was dispersed, and typography discovered. . . . All the xylographic works of the 15th century may be classed in two categories: the xylographs, rightly so called, or the block books, such as the 'Donatus,' and the books with movable types, like the 'Speculum,' of which we speak. . . . The movable types used, cut separately in wood, were not constituted to give an ideal impression. We can understand the cost that the execution of these characters must have occasioned, made as they were one by one, without the possibility of ever making them perfectly uniform. Progress was to substitute for this irregular process types that were similar, identical, easily produced, and used for a long time without breaking. Following on the essays of Laurent Coster, continuous researches bore on this point. . . . Here history is somewhat confused. Hadrian Junius positively accuses one of Laurent Coster's workmen of having stolen the secrets of his master and taken flight to Mayence, where he afterwards founded a printing office. According to Junius, the metal type was the discovery of the Dutchman, and the name of the thief was John. Who was this John? Was it John Gaensefleisch, called Gutenberg, or possibly John Fust? But it is not at all apparent that Gutenberg, a gentleman of Mayence, exiled from his country, was ever in the service of the Dutch inventor. As to Fust, we believe his only intervention in the association of printers of Mayence was as a money-lender, from which may be comprehended the unlikelihood of his having been with Coster, the more so as we find Gutenberg retired to Strasbourg, where he pursued his researches. There he was, as it were, out of his sphere, a ruined noble whose great knowledge was bent entirely on invention. Doubtless, like many others, he may have had in his hands one of the printed works of Laurent Coster, and conceived the idea of appropriating the infant

process. In 1439 he was associated with two artisans of the city of Strasbourg, ostensibly in the fabrication of mirrors, which may be otherwise understood as printing of 'Speculums,' the Latin word signifying the same thing. . . . Three problems presented themselves to him. He wanted types less fragile than wooden types and less costly than engraving. He wanted a press by the aid of which he could obtain a clear impression on parchment or paper. He desired also that the leaves of his books should not be anopistograph, or printed only on one side. . . . Until then, and even long after, the xylographs were printed 'au frotton,' or with a brush, rubbing the paper upon the forme coated with ink, thicker than ordinary ink. He dreamed of something better. In the course of his work John Gutenberg returned to Mayence. The idea of publishing a Bible, the Book of books, had taken possession of his heart. . . . The cutting of his types had ruined him. . . . In this unhappy situation, Gutenberg made the acquaintance of a financier of Mayence, named Fust, . . . who put a sum of 1,100 florins at his disposal to continue his experiments. Unfortunately this money disappeared, it melted away, and the results obtained were absolutely ludicrous. . . . About this time a third actor enters on the scene. Peter Schoeffer, of Gernsheim, a writer, introduced into the workshop of Gutenberg to design letters, benefited by the abortive experiments, and taking up the invention at its dead-lock, conducted it to success. John of Tritenheim, called Trithemius, the learned abbot of Spanheim, is the person who relates these facts; but as he got his information from Schoeffer himself, too much credence must not be given to his statements. Besides, Schoeffer was not at all an ordinary artisan. If we credit a Strasbourg manuscript written by his hand in 1449, he was a student of the 'most glorious university of Paris.'" How much Schoeffer contributed to the working out of the invention is a matter of conjecture; but in 1454 it was advanced to a state in which the first known application of it in practical use was made. This was in the printing of copies of the famous letters of indulgence which Pope Nicholas V. was then selling throughout Europe. Having the so far perfected invention in hand, Fust and Schoeffer (the latter now having married the former's granddaughter) wished to rid themselves of Gutenberg. "Fust had a most easy pretext, which was to demand purely and simply from his associate the sums advanced by him, and which had produced so little. Gutenberg had probably commenced his Bible, but, in face of the claims of Fust, he had to abandon it altogether, types, formes, and press. In November, 1455, he had retired to a little house outside the city, where he tried his best, by the aid of foreign help, to establish a workshop, and to preserve the most perfect secrecy. Relieved of his company, Fust and Schoeffer were able to take up the impression of the Bible and to complete it without him. . . . One thing is certain: that the Bible of Schoeffer, commenced by Gutenberg or not, put on sale by Fust and Schoeffer alone about the end of 1455 or beginning of 1456, proves to be the first completed book. . . . It is now called the Mazarine Bible, from the fact that the copy in the Mazarin Library was the first to give evidence concerning it. The book was put on sale at the end of 1455 or beginning of 1456, for a manuscript note of a vicar of St. Stephen at Mayence records that he finished the binding and illuminating of the first volume on St. Bartholomew's Day [June 13], 1456, and the second on the 15th of August. . . . All these remarks show that the printers did not proclaim themselves, and were making pseudo-manuscripts. . . . Many of the copies are illuminated with as much care and beauty as if they were the finest manuscripts. . . . Copies are by no means uncommon, most of the great libraries having one, and many are in private collections."— H. Bouchot, *The Printed Book, ch.* 1.—"The general consent of all nations in ascribing the honour of the invention of printing to Gutenberg seems at first sight a very strong argument in his favour; but if Gutenberg were not the first to invent and use movable types, but the clever man who brought to perfection what already existed in a crude state, we can quite imagine his fame to have spread everywhere as the real inventor. As a master in the art of printing, Gutenberg's name was known in Paris so early as 1472. . . . Mr. Hessels . . . believes that the Coster mentioned in the archives as living in Haarlem, 1436–83, was the inventor of types, and that, taken as a whole, the story as told by Junius is substantially correct. Personally I should like to wait for more evidence. There is no doubt that the back-bone of the Dutch claim lies in the pieces and fragments of old books discovered for the most part in the last few decades, and which give support to, at the same time that they receive support from, the Cologne Chronicler. . . . These now amount to forty-seven different works. Their number is being added to continually now that the attention of librarians has been strongly called to the importance of noting and preserving them. They have been catalogued with profound insight by Mr. Hessels, and for the first time classified by internal evidence into their various types and classes. But, it may well be asked, what evidence is there that all these books were not printed long after Gutenberg's press was at work? . . . The earliest book of Dutch printing bears date 1473, and not a single edition out of all the so-called Costeriana has any printer's name or place or date. To this the reply is, that these small pieces were school-books or absies and such-like works, in the production of which there was nothing to boast of, as there would be in a Bible. Such things were at all times 'sine ulla nota,' and certain to be destroyed when done with, so that the wonder would be to find them so dated, and the very fact of their bearing a date would go far to prove them not genuine. These fragments have been nearly all discovered in 15th-century books, printed mostly in various towns of Holland. . . . Mr. Hessels quotes forty-seven different books as 'Costeriana,' which include four editions of the Speculum, nineteen of Donatus, and seven of Doctrinale. The Donatuses are in five different types, probably from five different Dutch presses. Compared with the earliest dated books of 1473 and onwards, printed in Holland, they have nothing in common, while their brotherhood to the Dutch MSS. and block-books of about thirty years earlier is apparent. Just as astronomers have been unable to explain certain aberrations of the planets without surmising a missing link in the chain of their knowledge, so is it with

early typography. That such finished works as the first editions of the Bible and Psalter could be the legitimate predecessors of the Costeriana, the Bruges, the Westminster press, and others, I cannot reconcile with the internal evidence of their workmanship. But admit the existence of an earlier and much ruder school of typography, and all is plain and harmonious."—W. Blades, *Books in Chains, and other Bibliographical Papers, pp.* 149–158.

Also in: J. H. Hessels, *Gutenberg: was he the Inventor of Printing?*—C. H. Timperley, *Encyclopædia of Literary and Typographical Anecdote, pp.* 101–120.—H. N. Humphreys, *Hist. of the Art of Printing, ch.* 3–4.

A. D. 1457-1489.—Progress and diffusion of the art.—After the Mazarine Bible, "then follows the Kalendar for the year 1457, most probably printed at the end of 1456. Then again the printed dates, August 14, 1457 and 1459, with place (Mentz) in the colophons of the Psalter issued by Fust and Schoeffer; the printed year 1460 (with Mentz added) in the Catholicon [a Latin Grammar and Dictionary], &c. &c. So that, with the exception of 1458, there is no interruption in Mentz printing from the moment that we see it begin there. As regards the printed psalter, its printers are mentioned distinctly in the book itself; but the other books just mentioned are assumed to have been issued by the same two Mentz printing-offices which are supposed to be already at work there in 1454, though the 1460 Catholicon and some of the other works are ascribed by some to other printers. By the side of these dates, we find already a Bible completed in 1460 by Mentelin at Strassburg, according to a MS. note in the copy preserved at Freiburg. . . . Assuming then, for a moment, that Mentz is the starting-point, we see printing spread to Strassburg in 1460; to Bamberg in 1461; to Subiaco in 1465; in 1466 (perhaps already in 1463) it is established at Cologne; in 1467 at Eltville, Rome; in 1468 at Augsburg, Basle, Marienthal; in 1469 at Venice; 1470 at Nuremberg, Verona, Foligno, Trevi, Savigliano, Paris; 1471 at Spire, Bologna, Ferrara, Florence, Milan, Naples, Pavia, Treviso; 1472 at Esslingen, Cremona, Mantua, Padua, Parma, Monreale, Fivizano, Verona; 1473 at Laugingen, Ulm (perhaps here earlier), Merseburg, Alost, Utrecht, Lyons, Brescia, Messina; 1474 at Louvain, Genoa, Como, Savona, Turin, Vicenza; 1475 at Lubeck, Breslau, Blaubeuren, Burgdorf, Modena, Reggio, Cagli, Caselle or Casale, Saragossa; 1476 at Rostock, Bruges (here earlier ?), Brussels; 1477 at Reichenstein, Deventer, Gouda, Delft, Westminster; 1478 at Oxford, St. Maartensdyk, Colle, Schussenried, Eichstadt; 1479 at Erfurt, Würzburg, Nymegen, Zwolle, Poitiers; 1480 at London [?], Oudenaarde, Hasselt, Reggio; 1481 at Passau, Leipzig, Magdeburg, Treves, Urach; 1482 at Reutlingen, Memmingen, Metz, Antwerp; 1483 at Leiden, Kuilenburg, Ghent, Haarlem; 1484 at Bois-le-Duc, Siena; 1485 at Heidelberg, Regensburg; 1486 at Munster, Stuttgart; 1487 at Ingolstadt; 1488 at Stendal; 1489 at Hagenau, &c."—J. H. Hessels, *Haarlem the Birth-place of Printing, not Mentz, ch.* 4.

A. D. 1469-1515.—The early Venetian printers.—The Aldine Press.—"One of the famous first race of German printers, John of Spires, arrived at Venice in the year 1469, and immediately brought his art into full play; producing within the first three months his fine edition of the 'Letters of Cicero,' a masterpiece of early printing. . . . The success of John of Spires as a printer was at once recognized by the Venetian Republic; and Pasquale Malipiero, the reigning Doge, granted a patent conferring upon him the sole right of printing books within the territory of Venice. . . . But the enterprising printer did not live to enjoy the privilege," and it was not continued to any of his family. "On the withdrawal of the monopoly several new printers set up their Presses in the city, among whom was the celebrated Jenson, the ingenious Frenchman who was sent by Charles VII. to acquire the art at Mayence. . . . John Emeric, of Udenheim, was another of the German printers who immediately succeeded John and Vindelin of Spires; and still more successful, though somewhat later in the field, was Erard Ratdolt. . . . He [Ratdolt] is said to have been the first to adopt a regular form of Title at all approaching our modern conception of a Book-Title; and he also took the lead in the production of those beautifully-engraved initials for which the books printed in Italy towards the close of the 15th century are famous. His most splendid work is undoubtedly the 'Elements of Euclid, with the Commentaries of Campanus.' . . . Nicholas Jenson was the most renowned of those who followed the earliest German printers in Venice, until his works were partially eclipsed by those of the Aldi. . . . In 1470 he [Jenson] had . . . completed his preparations, and the first four works which issued from his Venetian press appeared in that year. . . . These works were printed with Roman characters of his own engraving, more perfect in form than those of any previous printer. His types are in fact the direct parents of the letters now in general use, which only differ from them in certain small details dependent solely on fashion. . . . This celebrated printer died in September of the year 1481. . . . Andrea Torresani and others continued Jenson's Association, making use of the same types. Torresani was eventually succeeded in the same establishment by the celebrated Aldo Manuccio, who, having married his daughter, adopted the important vocation of printer, and became the first of those famous 'Aldi,' as they are commonly termed, whose fame has not only absorbed that of all the earlier Venetian printers, but that of the early printers of every other Italian seat of the art. . . . It was Manuccio who, among many other advances in this art, first invented the semi-cursive style of character now known as 'Italic'; and it is said that it was founded upon a close imitation of the careful handwriting of Petrarch, which, in fact, it closely resembles. This new type was used for a small octavo edition of 'Virgil,' issued in 1501, on the appearance of which he obtained from Pope Leo X. a letter of privilege, entitling him to the sole use of the new type which he had invented." The list of the productions of the elder Aldus and his son Paul "comprises nearly all the great works of antiquity, and of the best Italian authors of their own time. From their learning and general accomplishments, the Aldi might have occupied a brilliant position as scholars and authors, but preferred the useful labour of giving correctly to the world the valuable works of others. The Greek editions of the elder Aldus form the basis of his true glory, especially the

'Aristotle,' printed in 1495, a work of almost inconceivable labour and perseverance."—H. N. Humphreys, *Hist. of the Art of Printing, ch.* 8. —"Aldus and his studio and all his precious manuscripts disappeared during the troubled years of the great Continental war in which all the world was against Venice [see VENICE: A. D. 1508–1509]. In 1510, 1511, and 1512, scarcely any book proceeded from his press. . . . After the war Aldus returned to his work with renewed fervour. 'It is difficult,' says Renouard, 'to form an idea of the passion with which he devoted himself to the reproduction of the great works of ancient literature. If he heard of the existence anywhere of a manuscript unpublished, or which could throw a light upon an existing text, he never rested till he had it in his possession. He did not shrink from long journeys, great expenditure, applications of all kinds.' . . . It is not in this way however that the publisher, that much questioned and severely criticised middleman, makes a fortune. And Aldus died poor. His privileges did not stand him in much stead, copyright, especially when not in books but in new forms of type, being non-existent in his day. In France and Germany, and still nearer home, his beautiful Italic was robbed from him, copied on all sides, notwithstanding the protection granted by the Pope and other princes as well as by the Venetian Signoria. His fine editions were printed from, and made the foundation of foreign issues which replaced his own. How far his princely patrons stood by him to repair his losses there seems no information. His father-in-law, Andrea of Asola, a printer who was not so fine a scholar, but perhaps more able to cope with the world, did come to his aid, and his son Paolo Manutio, and his grandson Aldo il Giovane, as he is called, succeeded him in turn."—Mrs. Oliphant, *The Makers of Venice, pt.* 4, *ch.* 3.—Aldus died in 1515. His son Paul left Venice for Rome in 1562.

A. D. 1476-1491.—Introduction in England. —The Caxton Press.—"It was probably at the press of Colard Mansion, in a little room over the porch of St. Donat's at Bruges, that William Caxton learned the art which he was the first to introduce into England. A Kentish boy by birth, but apprenticed to a London mercer, Caxton had already spent thirty years of his manhood in Flanders as Governor of the English gild of Merchant Adventurers there, when we find him engaged as copyist in the service of Edward's sister, Duchess Margaret of Burgundy. But the tedious process of copying was soon thrown aside for the new art which Colard Mansion had introduced into Bruges. . . . The printing-press was the precious freight he brought back to England in 1476 after an absence of five-and-thirty years. Through the next fifteen, at an age when other men look for ease and retirement, we see him plunging with characteristic energy into his new occupation. His 'red pale' or heraldic shield marked with a red bar down the middle invited buyers to the press he established in the Almonry at Westminster, a little enclosure containing a chapel and almshouses near the west front of the church, where the alms of the abbey were distributed to the poor. . . . Caxton was a practical man of business, . . . no rival of the Venetian Aldi or of the classical printers of Rome, but resolved to get a living from his trade, supplying priests with service books and preachers with sermons, furnishing the clerk with his 'Golden Legend' and knight and baron with 'joyous and pleasant histories of chivalry.' But while careful to win his daily bread, he found time to do much for what of higher literature lay fairly to hand. He printed all the English poetry of any moment which was then in existence. His reverence for that 'worshipful man, Geoffrey Chaucer,' who 'ought to be eternally remembered,' is shown not merely by his edition of the 'Canterbury Tales,' but by his reprint of them when a purer text of the poem offered itself. The poems of Lydgate and Gower were added to those of Chaucer. The Chronicle of Brut and Higden's 'Polychronicon' were the only available works of an historical character then existing in the English tongue, and Caxton not only printed them but himself continued the latter up to his own time. A translation of Boethius, a version of the Eneid from the French, and a tract or two of Cicero, were the stray first-fruits of the classical press in England. Busy as was Caxton's printing-press, he was even busier as a translator than as a printer. More than four thousand of his printed pages are from works of his own rendering. The need of these translations shows the popular drift of literature at the time; but keen as the demand seems to have been, there is nothing mechanical in the temper with which Caxton prepared to meet it. A natural, simple-hearted taste and enthusiasm, especially for the style and forms of language, breaks out in his curious prefaces. . . . But the work of translation involved a choice of English which made Caxton's work important in the history of our language. He stood between two schools of translation, that of French affectation and English pedantry. It was a moment when the character of our literary tongue was being settled, and it is curious to see in his own words the struggle over it which was going on in Caxton's time. 'Some honest and great clerks have been with me and desired me to write the most curious terms that I could find;' on the other hand, 'some gentlemen of late blamed me, saying that in my translations I had over many curious terms which could not be understood of common people, and desired me to use old and homely terms in my translations.' 'Fain would I please every man,' comments the good-humoured printer, but his sturdy sense saved him alike from the temptations of the court and the schools. His own taste pointed to English, but 'to the common terms that be daily used' rather than to the English of his antiquarian advisers. 'I took an old book and read therein, and certainly the English was so rude and broad I could not well understand it,' while the Old-English charters which the Abbot of Westminster lent as models from the archives of his house seemed 'more like to Dutch than to English.' To adopt current phraseology however was by no means easy at a time when even the speech of common talk was in a state of rapid flux. . . . Coupling this with his long absence in Flanders we can hardly wonder at the confession he makes over his first translation, that 'when all these things came to fore me, after that I had made and written a five or six quires, I fell in despair of this work, and purposed never to have continued therein, and the quires laid apart, and in two years after laboured no

more in this work.' He was still however busy translating when he died [in 1491]. All difficulties in fact were lightened by the general interest which his labours aroused. When the length of the 'Golden Legend' makes him 'half desperate to have accomplished it' and ready to 'lay it apart,' the Earl of Arundel solicits him in no wise to leave it and promises a yearly fee of a buck in summer and a doe in winter, once it were done. 'Many noble and divers gentle men of this realm came and demanded many and often times wherefore I have not made and imprinted the noble history of the San Graal.' . . . Caxton profited in fact by the wide literary interest which was a mark of the time."—J. R. Green, *Hist. of the English People, bk.* 5, *ch.* 1 (*v.* 2).—"Contemporary with Caxton were the printers Lettou and Machlinia, . . . who carried on business in the city of London, where they established a press in 1480. Machlinia had previously worked under Caxton. . . . Wynkyn de Worde . . . in all probability . . . was one of Caxton's assistants or workmen, when the latter was living at Bruges, but without doubt he was employed in his office at Westminster until 1491, when he commenced business on his own account, having in his possession a considerable quantity of Caxton's type. Wynkyn de Worde, who was one of the founders of the Stationers' Company, died in 1534, after having printed no less than 410 books known to bibliographers, the earliest of which bearing a date is the 'Liber Festivalis,' 4to, 1493."—J. H. Slater, *Book Collecting, ch.* 9.

Also in: C. Knight, *William Caxton.*—C. H. Timperley, *Encyclop. of Literary and Typographical Anecdote, pp.* 138–194.—T. C. Hansard, *Hist. and Process of Printing* ("*The Five Black Arts,*" *ch.* 1).—*Gentleman's Magazine Library: Bibliographical Notes, and Literary Curiosities.*

A. D. 1496-1598.—The Estienne or Stephanus Press in Paris.—"With the names of Aldus and Elzevir we are all acquainted; the name of Estienne, or Stephanus, has a less familiar sound to English ears, though the family of Parisian printers was as famous in its day as the great houses of Venice and Leyden. The most brilliant member of it was the second Henry, whose story forms a melancholy episode in French literary history of the 16th century. . . . The Estiennes are said to have come of a noble Provençal family, but nothing is exactly known of their descent. The art of printing was not much more than fifty years old when Henry Estienne, having learnt his trade in Germany, came to Paris, and set up his press [about 1496] in the Rue Saint Jean de Beauvais, opposite the school of Canon Law. There for some twenty years he laboured diligently, bringing out in that time no less than 120 volumes, chiefly folios. The greater number of these are theological and scholastic works; among the few modern authors on the list is the name of Erasmus. Henry Estienne died in 1520 leaving three sons. Robert, the second of them, was born probably in 1503. The boys all being minors, the business passed into the hands of their mother, who in the following year married Simon de Colines, her late husband's foreman, and perhaps partner. . . . Robert worked with De Colines for five or six years before he went into business on his own account in the same street." It was he who first gave celebrity to the name and the press. "The spell of the Renaissance had early fallen upon the young printer, and it held him captive almost till the end of his life." He married "the daughter of the learned Flemish printer Jodocus Badius, notable for her culture and her beauty. Latin was the ordinary language of the household. The children learned it in infancy from hearing it constantly spoken. . . . At one time ten foreign scholars lived in Estienne's house to assist him in selecting and revising his manuscripts and in correcting his proofs. . . . Both Francis [King Francis I.] and his sister Marguerite of Navarre had a great regard for Robert, and often visited the workshop; to that royal patronage the printer was more than once indebted for his liberty and his life." His danger came from the bigoted Sorbonne, with whom he brought himself into collision by printing the Bible with as careful a correction of the text as he had performed in the case of the Latin classics. After the death of Francis I., the peril of the printer's situation became more serious, and in 1550 he fled to Geneva, renouncing the Roman Catholic faith. He died there in 1559.—H. C. Macdowall, *An old French Printer* (*Macmillan's Mag., Nov.* 1892). —The second Henry Estienne, son of Robert, either did not accompany his father to Geneva, or soon returned to Paris, and founded anew the Press of his family, bringing to it even more learning than his father, with equal laboriousness and zeal. He died at Lyons in 1598.—E. Greswell, *A View of the Early Parisian Greek Press.*

A. D. 1535-1709.—Introduction in America. —The first Spanish printing in Mexico.—The early Massachusetts Press. — Restrictions upon its freedom.—"The art of printing was first introduced into Spanish America, as early as the middle of the 16th century. The historians whose works I have consulted are all silent as to the time when it was first practiced on the American continent; . . . but it is certain that printing was executed, both in Mexico and Peru, long before it made its appearance in the British North American colonies. [The precise date of the introduction of printing into Mexico was for a long time in doubt. . . . When Mr. Thomas wrote his 'History of Printing in America,' early works on America were rare, and it is probable that there was not one in the country printed in either America or Europe in the 16th century, except the copy of Molina's dictionary; now many of the period may be found in our great private libraries. The dictionary of Molina, in Mexican and Spanish, printed in Mexico, in 1571, in folio, was, by many, asserted and believed to be the earliest book printed in America. . . . No one here had seen an earlier book until the 'Doctrina Christiana,' printed in the house of Juan Cromberger, in the city of Mexico, in the year 1544, was discovered. Copies of this rare work were found in two well known private libraries in New York and Providence. For a long time the honor was awarded to this as the earliest book printed in America. But there is now strong evidence that printing was really introduced in Mexico nine years before that time, and positive evidence, by existing books, that a press was established in 1540. Readers familiar with early books relating to Mexico have seen mention of a book printed there as early as 1535, . . . the 'Spiritual Ladder' of St John Climacus. . . . It seems that no copy of the 'Spiritual

Ladder' has ever been seen in recent times, and the quoted testimonials are the only ones yet found which refer to it.— *Note by Hon. John R. Bartlett, app. A., giving a 'List of Books printed in Mexico between the years* 1540 *and* 1560 *inclusive.'*] . . . In January, 1639, printing was first performed in that part of North America which extends from the Gulf of Mexico to the Frozen ocean. For this press our country is chiefly indebted to the Rev. Mr. Glover, a nonconformist minister, who possessed a considerable estate. . . . Another press, with types, and another printer, were, in 1660, sent over from England by the corporation for propagating the gospel among the Indians in New England. This press, &c., was designed solely for the purpose of printing the Bible, and other books, in the Indian language. On their arrival they were carried to Cambridge, and employed in the printing house already established in that place. . . . The fathers of Massachusetts kept a watchful eye on the press; and in neither a religious nor civil point of view were they disposed to give it much liberty. . . . In 1662, the government of Massachusetts appointed licensers of the press; and afterward, in 1664, passed a law that 'no printing should be allowed in any town within the jurisdiction, except in Cambridge'; nor should any thing be printed there but what the government permitted through the agency of those persons who were empowered for the purpose. . . . In a short time, this law was so far repealed as to permit the use of a press at Boston. . . . It does not appear that the press, in Massachusetts, was free from legal restraints till about the year 1755 [see below: A. D. 1704–1729]. . . . Except in Massachusetts, no presses were set up in the colonies till near the close of the 17th century. Printing then [1686] was performed in Pennsylvania [by William Bradford], 'near Philadelphia' [at Shackamaxon, now Kensington], and afterward in that city, by the same press which, in a few years subsequent, was removed to New York [see below: A. D. 1685–1693; also, PENNSYLVANIA: A. D. 1692–1696]. The use of types commenced in Virginia about 1681; in 1682 the press was prohibited. In 1709 a press was established at New London, in Connecticut."— I. Thomas, *Hist. of Printing in Am., 2d ed.* (*Trans. and Coll. of the Am. Antiq. Soc., v.* 5), *v.* 1, *pp.* 1–17.

ALSO IN: J. L. Bishop, *Hist. of Am. Manufactures, v.* 1, *ch.* 7.

A. D. 1612-1650.—Origin of printed newspapers.—The newspaper defined.—Its earliest appearances in Germany and Italy.—"Lally-Tollendal, in his 'Life of Queen Elizabeth,' in the 'Biographie Universelle' (vol. xiii, published in 1815, p. 56) . . . remarks that 'as far as the publication of an official journal is concerned, France can claim the priority by more than half a century; for in the Royal Library at Paris there is a bulletin of the campaign of Louis XII. in Italy in 1509.' He then gives the title of this 'bulletin,' from which it clearly appears that it is not a political journal, but an isolated piece of news — a kind of publication of which there are hundreds in existence of a date anterior to 1588 [formerly supposed to be the date of the first English newspaper — see below: A. D. 1622-1702], and of which there is no doubt that thousands were issued. There is, for instance, in the British Museum a French pamphlet of six printed leaves, containing an account of the surrender of Granada to Ferdinand and Isabella on the 'first of January last past' (le premier jour de janvier dernierement passé), in the year 1492; and there are also the three editions of the celebrated letter of Columbus, giving the first account of the discovery of America, all printed at Rome in 1493. Nay, one of the very earliest productions of the German press was an official manifesto of Diether, Archbishop of Cologne, against Count Adolph of Nassau, very satisfactorily proved to have been printed at Mentz in 1462. There is among the German bibliographers a technical name for this class of printed documents, which are called 'Relations.' In fact, in order to arrive at a satisfactory conclusion with regard to the origin of newspapers, it is requisite, in the first place, to settle with some approach to precision what a newspaper is. Four classes of publications succeeded to each other from the 15th to the 19th century, to which the term has by different writers been applied: 1st. Accounts of individual public transactions of recent occurrence. 2nd. Accounts in one publication of several public transactions of recent occurrence, only connected together by having taken place about the same period, so as at one time to form the 'news of the day.' 3rd. Accounts similar to those of the second class, but issued in a numbered series. 4th. Accounts similar to those of the second class, but issued not only in a numbered series, but at stated intervals. The notices of the surrender of Granada and the discovery of America belong to the first class, and so also do the last dying speeches, which are in our own time cried about the streets. These surely are not newspapers. The Times and Daily News [London] belong to the fourth class, and these, of course, are newspapers. . . . Are not, in fact, all the essentials of a newspaper comprised in the definition of the second class, which it may be as well to repeat: 'Accounts in one publication of several public transactions of recent occurrence, only connected together by having taken place about the same period, so as at one time to form the news of the day'? Let us take an instance. There is preserved in the British Museum a collection of several volumes of interesting publications issued in Italy between 1640 and 1650, and containing the news of the times. They are of a small folio size, and consist in general of four pages, but sometimes of six, sometimes only of two. There is a series for the month of December, 1644, consisting entirely of the news from Rome. The first line of the first page runs thus:—'Di Roma,' with the date, first of the 3rd, then of the 10th, then the 17th, then the 24th, and lastly the 31st of December, showing that a number was published every week, most probably on the arrival of the post from Rome. The place of publication was Florence, and the same publishers who issued this collection of the news from Rome, sent forth in the same month of December, 1644, two other similar gazettes, at similar intervals, one of the news from Genoa, the other of the news from Germany and abroad. That this interesting series of publications, which is well worthy of a minute examination and a detailed description, is in reality a series of newspapers, will, I believe, be questioned by very few; but each individual number presents no mark by which, if separately met with, it could be known to form part of a set. . . . The

most minute researches on the history of newspapers in Germany are, as already mentioned, those of Prutz, who has collected notices of a large number of the 'relations,' though much remains to be gleaned. There are, for instance, in Van Heusde's Catalogue of the Library at Utrecht (Utrecht, 1835, folio), the titles of nearly a hundred of them, all as early as the sixteenth century; and the British Museum possesses a considerable quantity, all of recent acquisition. Prutz has no notice of the two that have been mentioned, and, like all preceding writers, he draws no distinction between the publications of the first class and the second. The view that he takes is, that no publication which does not answer to the definition of what I have termed the fourth class is entitled to the name of a newspaper. There was in the possession of Professor Grellman a publication called an 'Aviso,' numbered as '14,' and published in 1612, which has been considered by many German writers as their earliest newspaper, but Prutz denies that honour to it, on the ground of there being no proof that it was published at stated intervals. In the year 1615 Egenolph Emmel, of Frankfort-on-the-Main, issued a weekly intelligencer, numbered in a series, and this, according to Prutz, is the proper claimant. Its history has been traced with some minuteness in a separate dissertation by Schwarzkopf, who has also the credit of having published in 1795 the first general essay on newspapers of any value, and to have followed up the subject in a series of articles in the Allgemeine Litterarische Anzeiger. . . . The claims of Italy have yet to be considered. Prutz dismisses them very summarily, because, as he says, the Venetian gazettes of the sixteenth century, said to be preserved at Florence, are in manuscript, and it is essential to the definition of a newspaper that it should be printed. These Venetian gazettes have never, so far as I am aware, been described at all; they may be mere 'news-letters,' or they may be something closely approaching to the modern newspaper. But I am strongly inclined to believe that something of the second class of Italian origin will turn up in the great libraries of Europe when further research is devoted to the subject. . . . The existence of these 'gazettes' in so many languages furnishes strong ground for supposing that the popularity of newspapers originated in Italy."—T. Watts, *The fabricated "Earliest English Newspaper"* (*Gentleman's Mag.*, 1850, *reprinted in the Gentleman's Magazine Library; Bibliographical Notes, pp.* 146–150).

A. D. 1617-1680.—The Elzevirs.—"Just as the house of Aldus waned and expired, that of the great Dutch printers, the Elzevirs, began obscurely enough at Leyden in 1583. The Elzevirs were not, like Aldus, ripe scholars and men of devotion to learning. Aldus laboured for the love of noble studies; the Elzevirs were acute, and too often 'smart' men of business. The founder of the family was Louis (born at Louvain, 1540, died 1617). But it was in the second and third generations that Bonaventura and Abraham Elzevir began to publish at Leyden their editions in small duodecimo. Like Aldus, these Elzevirs aimed at producing books at once handy, cheap, correct, and beautiful in execution. Their adventure was a complete success. The Elzevirs did not, like Aldus, surround themselves with the most learned scholars of their time. Their famous literary adviser, Heinsius, was full of literary jealousies, and kept students of his own calibre at a distance. The classical editions of the Elzevirs, beautiful, but too small in type for modern eyes, are anything but exquisitely correct. . . . The ordinary marks of the Elzevirs were the sphere, the old hermit, the Athena, the eagle, and the burning faggot. But all little old books marked with spheres are not Elzevirs, as many booksellers suppose. Other printers also stole the designs for the tops of chapters, the Aegipan, the Siren, the head of Medusa, the crossed sceptres, and the rest. In some cases the Elzevirs published their books, especially when they were piracies, anonymously. When they published for the Jansenists, they allowed their clients to put fantastic pseudonyms on the title pages. But, except in four cases, they had only two pseudonyms used on the titles of books published by and for themselves. These disguises are 'Jean Sambix' for Jean and Daniel Elzevir, at Leyden, and for the Elzevirs of Amsterdam, 'Jacques le Jeune.' The last of the great representatives of the house, Daniel, died at Amsterdam, 1680. Abraham, an unworthy scion, struggled on at Leyden till 1712. The family still prospers, but no longer prints, in Holland."—A. Lang, *The Library, ch.* 3.—"Though Elzevirs have been more fashionable than at present, they are still regarded by novelists as the great prize of the book collector. You read in novels about 'priceless little Elzevirs,' about books 'as rare as an old Elzevir.' I have met, in the works of a lady novelist (but not elsewhere) with an Elzevir 'Theocritus.' The late Mr. Hepworth Dixon introduced into one of his romances a romantic Elzevir Greek Testament, 'worth its weight in gold.' Casual remarks of this kind encourage a popular delusion that all Elzevirs are pearls of considerable price."—The same, *Books and Bookmen, ch.* 6.

Also in: J. H. Slater, *Book Collecting, ch.* 8.

A. D. 1622-1702.—The first printed Newspaper and the first daily Newspaper in England.—"Up to 1839 (when Mr. Watts, of the British Museum, exposed the forgery) the world was led to believe that the first English newspaper appeared in 1588." Mr. Watts "ascertained that 'The English Mercurie,' which Mr. George Chalmers first discovered on the shelves of the British Museum, and which was said to have been 'imprinted in London by her highness's printer, 1588,' was a forgery, for which the second Earl of Hardwicke appears to be answerable." As to the actual date of the appearance of the first printed newspaper in England, "Mr. Knight Hunt, in his 'Fourth Estate,' speaks confidently. . . . 'There is now no reason to doubt,' he says, 'that the puny ancestor of the myriads of broad sheets of our time was published in the metropolis in 1622; and that the most prominent of the ingenious speculators who offered the novelty to the world, was one Nathaniel Butter.' As the printing press had then been at work in England for a century and a half, Caxton having established himself in Westminster Abbey in 1471, and as manuscript news-letters had been current for many years previous to 1622, one cannot help wondering that the inventive wits of that age should have been so slow in finding out this excellent mode of turning Faust's invention to profitable account. Butter's journal was called —'The

Weekly Newes,' a name which still survives, although the original possessor of that title has long since gone the way of all newspapers. The first number in the British Museum collection bears date the 23rd of May, 1622, and contains 'news from Italy, Germanie,' &c. The last number made its appearance on the 9th of January, 1640; a memorable year, in which the Short Parliament, dismissed by King Charles 'in a huff,' after a session of three weeks, was succeeded by the Long Parliament, which unlucky Charles could not manage quite so easily. . . . It was nearly a century after 'The Weekly Newes' made its first appearance, before a daily newspaper was attempted. When weekly papers had become firmly established, some of the more enterprising printers began to publish their sheets twice, and ultimately three times a week. Thus at the beginning of last century we find several papers informing the public that they are 'published every Tuesday, Thursday, and Saturday morning.' One of the most respectable looking was entitled 'The New State of Europe,' or a 'True Account of Public Transactions and Learning.' It consisted of two pages of thin, coarse paper . . . and contained altogether about as much matter as there is in a single column of the 'Times' of 1855. The custom at that period was to publish the newspaper on a folio or quarto sheet, two pages of which were left blank to be used for correspondence. This is expressly stated in a standing advertisement in the 'New State of Europe,' in which the names of certain booksellers are given 'where any person may have this paper with a blank half sheet to write their own private affairs.' . . . The first number of the 'Daily Courant' [the first daily newspaper in England] was published on the 11th of March, 1702, just three days after the accession of Queen Anne. . . . As regards the form and size of the new journal, the 'author' condescends to give the following information, with a growling remark at the impertinence of the 'Postboys,' 'Postmen,' 'Mercuries,' and 'Intelligencers' of that day:—'This "Courant" (as the title shows) will be published Daily, being designed to give all the Material News as soon as every Post arrives, and is confined to half the compass to save the Publick at least half the Impertinences of ordinary Newspapers.' In addition to the Prospectus we have quoted, the first number of the 'Daily Courant' contains only nine paragraphs, five of which were translated from the 'Harlem Courant,' three from the 'Paris Gazette,' and one from the 'Amsterdam Courant.' They all relate to the war of the Spanish Succession then waging, or to the attempts making by diplomats to settle the affairs of the Continent at some kind of Vienna or Utrecht Conference. After adhering for several weeks to the strict rule of giving only one page of news, and those entirely foreign, the 'Courant' begins to show certain symptoms of improvement. The number for April 22, contains two pages of news and advertisements. . . . The alteration in the getting-up of the 'Courant' was owing to a change of proprietorship. The paper had now come into the hands of 'Sam Buckley, at the Dolphin, Little Britain.' . . . Mr. Samuel Buckley, who continued to publish and conduct the 'Daily Courant' for many years, was a notable man among London publishers, as we find from various references to him in the fugitive literature of that age."—*The London Daily Press* (*Westminster Rev.*, *October*, 1855).

A. D. 1631.—The first printed Newspaper in France.—Dr. Renaudot and his "Gazette."—"The first Frenchman to found a printed newspaper was Dr. Théophraste Renaudot, who obtained the King's privilege for the 'Gazette de France' in 1631. . . . He was a shrewd man, born at London in 1567, brought up in Paris, but graduate of the Faculty of Montpellier. In 1612, being then twenty-six, he returned to the capital, and somehow got appointed at once doctor to the King. But there was no salary attached to this post, which was in his case purely honorary, and so Renaudot opened a school, though the fact that he, a mere provincial doctor, had obtained a medical appointment at court, was very sore to the Paris Faculty of Medicine, who began to annoy him from that moment. Renaudot, however, was a man far ahead of his contemporaries in sagacity, patience, learning and humanity. Petty spite did not disturb him, or at least it did not deter him from executing any of the numerous plans he had in mind for the welfare of his contemporaries. . . . This extraordinary man not only inaugurated in France an Estate, Professional and Servants' Agency, as well as an office for private sales and exchanges, but further laid the basis of the Poste Restante, Parcels Delivery, Post-Office Directory, Tourist's Guide and Money Order Office; besides affording an outlet to troubled spirits like those who correspond through the agony column of 'The Times.' It is not surprising that his office in the Rue de la Calandre should soon have been all too small for its multifarious duties and that his original staff of six clerks should, in less than three months, have swelled to fifty. Richelieu, in sheer admiration at the man, sent for him and thanked him for the services he was rendering the King's subjects. He also offered him money to extend his offices, and this Renaudot accepted, but only as a loan. It was his custom to levy a commission of six deniers per livre (franc) on the sales he effected, and by means of these and other receipts he soon repaid the Cardinal every penny that had been advanced to him. But he did more than this. Finding that his registers were not always convenient modes of reference, by reason of the excessive crowds which pressed round them, he brought out a printed advertiser, which is almost the exact prototype of a journal at present well known in London. It was called 'Feuille du Bureau d'Adresses,' and appeared every Saturday, at the price of 1 sou. Opinions differ as to whether this paper preceded the 'Gazette de France,' or was issued simultaneously with it. Probably it was first published in manuscript form, but came out in print at least six months before the 'Gazette,' for a number bearing the date of June 14th, 1631, shows a periodical in full organisation and containing indirect references to advertisements which must have appeared several weeks before. At all events this 'Feuille' was purely an advertisement sheet—a forerunner of the 'Petites Affiches' which were reinvented in 1746—it was in no sense a newspaper. . . . It is clear that from the moment he started his 'Feuille du Bureau d'Adresses,' Renaudot must have conceived the possibility of founding a news-sheet. . . . The manuscript News Letters had attained, by the year 1630, to such a pitch

of perfection, and found such a ready sale, that the notion of further popularising them by printing must have suggested itself to more than one man before it was actually put into practice. But the great bar was this, that nothing could be printed without the King's privilege, and this privilege was not lightly granted. . . . Renaudot, who had no wish to publish tattle, had no reason to fear censorship. He addressed himself tc Richelieu, and craved leave to start a printed newspaper under royal patronage. The politic Cardinal was quite shrewd enough to see how useful might be to him an organ which would set information before the public in the manner he desired, and in that manner alone; so he granted all Renaudot wished, in the form of 'letters patent,' securing him an entire monopoly of printing newspapers, and moreover he conferred on his protégé the pompous title of Historiographer of France. The first number of the 'Gazette de France' appeared on Friday, May 30, 1631. Its size was four quarto pages, and its price one sol parisis, i. e. ½d., worth about 1½d. modern money. . . . The first number contained no preface or address, nothing in the way of a leading article, but plunged at once in medias res, and gave news from nineteen foreign towns or countries, but oddly enough, not a line of French intelligence. . . . The bulk of the matter inserted was furnished direct by Richelieu from the Foreign Office, and several of the paragraphs were written in his own hand. . . . The publication of the 'Gazette' was continued uninterruptedly from week to week, but the press of matter was so great that Renaudot took to issuing a Supplement with the last number of every month. In this he condensed the reports of the preceding numbers, corrected errors, added fresh news, and answered his detractors. . . . At the end of the year 1631 he suppressed his monthly Supplement, increased the 'Gazette' to eight pages, and announced that for the future he would issue Supplements as they were needed. It seems they were needed pretty often, for towards the beginning of the year 1633 Renaudot published Supplements, under the title of 'Ordinaries and Extraordinaries,' as often as twice, and even three times in one week. In fact whenever a budget of news arrived which would nowadays justify a special edition, the indefatigable editor set his criers afoot with a fresh printed sheet, shouting, 'Buy the "Extraordinary," containing the account of the superb burial of the King of Denmark!' or, 'Buy and read of the capture of the beautiful island of Curaçoa in the Indies by the Dutch from the Spaniards!' Renaudot understood the noble art of puffing. He dressed his criers in red, and gave them a trumpet apiece to go and bray the praises of the 'Gazette' on the off days, when the paper did not appear. . . . On the death of Renaudot, he was succeeded by his sons Eusèbe and Isaac, who in their turn bequeathed the 'Gazette' to Eusèbe junior, son of the elder brother, who took orders and consequently left no progeny. After this the 'Gazette' became Government property. . . . In 1762 the 'Gazette' was annexed to the Foreign Office Department. . . . The 'Gazette de France' continued to appear under royal patronage until May 1st, 1792, when its official ties were snapped and it came out as a private and republican journal with the date 'Fourth Year of Freedom.' The 'Gazette' has flourished with more or less brilliancy ever since, and has been for the last fifty years a legitimist organ, read chiefly in the provinces."—*The French Press* (*Cornhill Mag., June*, 1873).

A. D. 1637.—Archbishop Laud's Star-Chamber restriction of printing.—On the 11th of July, 1637, "Archbishop Laud procured a decree to be passed in the star chamber, by which it was ordered, that the master printers should be reduced to twenty in number; and that if any other should secretly, or openly, pursue the trade of printing, he should be set in the pillory, or whipped through the streets, and suffer such other punishment as the court should inflict upon him; that none of the master printers should print any book or books of divinity, law, physic, philosophy, or poetry, till the said books, together with the titles, epistles, prefaces, tables, or commendatory verses, should be lawfully licensed, on pain of losing the exercise of his art, and being proceeded against in the star chamber, &c.; that no person should reprint any book without a new license; that every merchant, bookseller, &c., who should import any book or books, should present a catalogue of them to the archbishop or bishop, &c., before they were delivered, or exposed to sale, who should view them, with power to seize those that were schismatical; and, that no merchant, &c., should print or cause to be printed abroad, any book, or books, which either entirely or for the most part, were written in the English tongue, nor knowingly import any such books, upon pain of being proceeded against in the star chamber, or high commission court. . . . That there should be four founders of letters for printing, and no more. That the archbishop of Canterbury, or the bishop of London, with six other high commissioners, shall supply the places of those four as they shall become void. That no master founder shall keep above two apprentices at one time. That all journeymen founders be employed by the masters of the trade; and that all the idle journeymen be compelled to work upon pain of imprisonment, and such other punishment as the court shall think fit. That no master founder of letters shall employ any other person in any work belonging to casting and founding of letters than freemen and apprentices to the trade, save only in putting off the knots of metal hanging at the end of the letters when they are first cast; in which work every master founder may employ one boy only, not bound to the trade."—C. H. Timperley, *Encyclopædia of Literary and Typographical Anecdote, p.* 490.

A. D. 1647.—Renewed ordinance, in England, against the printers.—"An ordinance of parliament passed the house of lords on this day [September 30, 1647], that no person shall make, write, print, sell, publish or utter, or cause to be made, &c., any book, pamphlet, treatise, ballad, libel, sheet, or sheets of news whatsoever (except the same be licensed by both or either house of parliament,) under the penalty of 40s. and an imprisonment not exceeding forty days, if he can not pay it: if a printer, he is to pay a fine of only 20s., or suffer twenty days' imprisonment, and likewise to have his press and implements of printing broken in pieces. The bookseller, or stationer, to pay 10s., or suffer ten days' imprisonment,—and, lastly, the hawker, pedlar, or ballad-singer, to forfeit all his printed

papers exposed to sale, and to be whipped as a common rogue in the parish where he shall be apprehended. Early in the following year, the committee of estates in Scotland passed an act prohibiting the printing under the pain of death, any book, declaration, or writing, until these were first submitted to their revisal. . . . One of the consequences of these persecutions was the raising up of a new class of publishers, those who became noted for what was called 'unlawful and unlicensed books.' Sparkes, the publisher of Prynne's Histriomastix, was of this class. The presbyterian party in parliament, who thus found the press closed on them, vehemently cried out for its freedom; and it was imagined, that when they ascended into power, the odious office of a licenser of the press would have been abolished; but these pretended friends of freedom, on the contrary, discovered themselves as tenderly alive to the office as the old government, and maintained it with the extremest vigour. Both in England and Scotland, during the civil wars, the party in power endeavoured to crush by every means the freedom of the press."—C. H. Timperley, *Encyclopædia of Literary and Typographical Anecdote, p.* 506.

A. D. 1654-1694.—Freedom of the press under Cromwell.—Censorship under the restored Stuarts.—Roger L'Estrange and the first news reporters.—"During the Protectorate of Cromwell the newspaper press knew . . . what it was to enjoy the luxury of freedom. The natural result was that a very great increase took place in the number of new political journals. Most of them, however, had only a very brief existence. Many of their number could not boast of a longer life than six or seven months—nay, many of them not so much as even that term of life. But, as might have been expected, from what was known of the antecedents of Charles II., the freedom of the press, which previously existed, came to an immediate end on his ascending the throne. Hardly had he done so, than an edict was issued, prohibiting the publication of any journal except the London Gazette, which was originally printed at Oxford, and called the Oxford Gazette,—the Court being then resident there on account of the plague raging in London at the time, 1665, when it was commenced, and for some time afterwards. This was an act of pure despotism. But Government at this time reserved to itself the right—a right which there was none to dispute—to publish a broad sheet in connexion with the London Gazette, whenever they might deem it expedient, which should contain either foreign or domestic matters of interest,—of the knowledge of which some of the King's subjects might wish to be put in early possession. . . . The newspapers of the seventeenth century were permitted, until the time of Charles II., to be published without being licensed by the Government of the day; but in the reign of that despotic sovereign, a law was passed [1662] prohibiting the publication of any newspaper without being duly licensed. . . . Sir John Birkenhead, . . . one of the three men whom Disraeli the elder called the fathers of the English press, was appointed to the office of Licenser of the Press. But he was soon succeeded by Sir Roger l'Estrange."—J. Grant, *The Newspaper Press, v.* 1, *ch.* 2.—Roger L'Estrange "is remarkable for having been the writer of the best newspapers which appeared before the age of Queen Anne, and, at the same time, a most bitter enemy to the freedom of the press. He was appointed licenser or censor in 1663, and in the same year was given authority to publish all newspapers, periodicals, and pamphlets, not exceeding two sheets in size. He appears to have looked upon his newspaper as a noxious thing, suffered to exist only that an income might be created for him in return for the labour of purging the press. Yet he spared no pains to make his Public Intelligencer readable, and if we may trust his letters now preserved at the State Paper Office, expended in the first year more than £500 on 'spyes for collecting intelligence.' Three years afterwards he estimated the profits at £400 a year. . . . He sent paid correspondents, or 'spyes' as they were called, to all parts of the country, and even induced some respectable persons, under promise of concealing their names, to contribute occasional paragraphs; these persons were for the most part repaid by sending to them their newspapers and letters free of postage. Another set of 'spyes' was employed in picking up the news of the town on Paul's Walk or in the taverns and coffee-houses. L'Estrange printed about sixteen reams of his Intelligencer weekly, which were for the most part sold by the mercury-women who cried them about the streets. One Mrs. Andrews is said to have taken more than one-third of the whole quantity printed. . . . Advantage was taken of a slip in the weekly intelligence to deprive L'Estrange of his monopoly in favour of the new Oxford Gazette, published in the winter of 1665 and transferred to London in the ensuing spring. The Gazette was placed under the control of Williamson, then a rising under-Secretary of State, under whose austere influence nothing was suffered to appear which could excite or even amuse the public. . . . L'Estrange has not been a favourite with historians, and we confess that his harsh measures towards the press are apt to raise a feeling of repugnance. . . . But he was certainly an enthusiastic and industrious writer, who raised the tone of the press, even while taking pains to fetter its liberty. When he lost his monopoly, that era of desolation began which Macaulay has so forcibly described. The newspapers became completely sterile, omitting events even of such importance as the trial of the seven bishops, and were supplanted in popular favour by the manuscript news-letters, which were, in fact, the only journals of importance. On the day after the abdication of James II. three fresh newspapers appeared, and many more burst out after the appearance of the official journal under the style of the Orange Gazette. But it was not until 1694 that the king was induced to abolish the censorship and to permit free trade in news; 'he doubted much,' says Hume, 'of the salutary effects of such unlimited freedom.' The newspapers increased and multiplied exceedingly for the eighteen years between the abolition of the office of licenser and the passing of the Stamp Act, in 1712, by which a halfpenny tax was laid on every half-sheet of intelligence."—*Early English Newspapers* (*Cornhill Mag., July,* 1868).

A. D. 1685-1693.—William Bradford and his Press in Philadelphia and New York.—William Bradford, a young printer, of the Society of Friends, came to Philadelphia in the autumn

of 1685, and established himself in business. "His first publication was 'Kalendarium Pennsilvaniense, or America's Messenger; Being an Almanack for the Year of Grace 1686.' This brought him a summons before the Governor and Council, for referring to the Proprietary, in the table of chronology, as 'Lord Penn;' and, on his appearance, he was ordered to blot out the objectionable title, and forbidden to print anything without license from the Provincial Council. In 1687 he was cautioned by the Philadelphia meeting not to print anything touching the Quakers without its approval. Two years later he was again called before the Governor, and Council — this time for printing the charter of the province. The spirited report, in his own handwriting, of his examination on this occasion, is now preserved in the collection of the New York Historical Society. Disappointed at the non-fulfilment of Penn's promise of the government printing and the failure of his scheme for printing an English Bible, which, although indorsed by the meeting, found few subscribers, and harassed by both the civil and religious authorities, Bradford determined to leave the province," which he did, with his family, sailing to England in 1689. He was induced, however, by promises of increased business and a yearly salary of £40, to return. In 1692, having become one of the supporters of George Keith, and having printed Keith's "Appeal" (see PENNSYLVANIA: A. D. 1692–1696), he was arrested and imprisoned. This occurred in August, and his trial followed in December. The jury disagreed, and he was held for appearance at the next court. "In the meantime the dissensions in the province aroused by the Keithian schism had led to the abrogation of Penn's charter by the crown, and the appointment of Benjamin Fletcher to be Royal Governor of Pennsylvania as well as New-York." This change led to the dropping of proceedings against Bradford, and to his removal from Philadelphia to New York, whither he seems to have been invited. His removal was undoubtedly prompted by a resolution which the Provincial Council of New York adopted on the 23d of March, 1693: "That if a Printer will come and settle in the city of New York for the printing of our Acts of Assembly and Publick Papers, he shall be allowed the sum of £40 current money of New York per annum for his salary and have the benefit of his printing besides what serves the publick." "Bradford's first warrant for his salary as 'Printer to King William and Queen Mary, at the City of New York,' was dated October 12, 1693, and was for six months, due on the 10th preceding," showing that he had established himself in the colony more hospitable to his art as early as the 10th of April, 1693. "What was the first product of his press is a matter of doubt. It may have been, as Dr. Moore suggests, the 'Journal of the Late Actions of the French at Canada,' or 'New England's Spirit of Persecution Transmitted to Pennsilvania'"— which was a report of his own trial at Philadelphia — or it may have been an Act of the New York Assembly — one of three which his press produced early that year, but the priority among which is uncertain. — C. R. Hildeburn, *Printing in New York in the 17th Cent'y (Memorial Hist. of the City of New York, v. 1, ch. 15.)*

ALSO IN: I. Thomas, *Hist. of Printing in Am., 2d ed., v. 1.*

A. D. 1695.—Expiration of the Censorship law in England. — Quick multiplication of Newspapers.—"While the Licensing Act was in force there was no newspaper in England except the 'London Gazette,' which was edited by a clerk in the office of the Secretary of State, and which contained nothing but what the Secretary of State wished the nation to know. There were indeed many periodical papers: but none of those papers could be called a newspaper. Welwood, a zealous Whig, published a journal called the Observator: but his Observator, like the Observator which Lestrange had formerly edited, contained, not the news, but merely dissertations on politics. A crazy bookseller, named John Dunton, published the Athenian Mercury: but the Athenian Mercury merely discussed questions of natural philosophy, of casuistry and of gallantry. A fellow of the Royal Society, named John Houghton, published what he called a Collection for the Improvement of Industry and Trade: but his Collection contained little more than the prices of stocks, explanations of the modes of doing business in the City, puffs of new projects, and advertisements of books, quack medicines, chocolate, Spa water, civet cats, surgeons wanting ships, valets wanting masters, and ladies wanting husbands. If ever he printed any political news, he transcribed it from the Gazette. The Gazette was so partial and so meagre a chronicle of events that, though it had no competitors, it had but a small circulation. . . . But the deficiencies of the Gazette were to a certain extent supplied in London by the coffeehouses, and in the country by the newsletters. On the third of May 1695 the law which had subjected the press to a censorship expired. Within a fortnight, a stanch old Whig, named Harris, who had, in the days of the Exclusion Bill, attempted to set up a newspaper entitled Intelligence Domestic and Foreign, and who had been speedily forced to relinquish that design, announced that the Intelligence Domestic and Foreign, suppressed fourteen years before by tyranny, would again appear. Ten days later was printed the first number of the English Courant. Then came the Packet Boat from Holland and Flanders, the Pegasus, the London Newsletter, the London Post, the Flying Post, the Old Postmaster, the Postboy, and the Postman. The history of the newspapers of England from that time to the present day is a most interesting and instructive part of the history of the country. At first they were small and mean-looking. . . . Only two numbers came out in a week; and a number contained little more matter than may be found in a single column of a daily paper of our time."—Lord Macaulay, *Hist. of England, ch.* 21.

A. D. 1704-1729.—The first Newspapers in America.—"There was not a newspaper published in the English colonies, throughout the extensive continent of North America, until the 24th of April, 1704. John Campbell, a Scotchman, who was a bookseller and postmaster in Boston, was the first who began and established a publication of this kind. It was entitled 'The Boston News-Letter.'. . . It is printed on half a sheet of pot paper, with a small pica type, folio. The first page is filled with an extract from 'The London Flying Post,' respecting the pretender. . . . The queen's speech to both houses of parliament on that occasion, a few

articles under the Boston head, four short paragraphs of marine intelligence from New York, Philadelphia, and New London, and one advertisement, form its whole contents. The advertisement is from Campbell, the proprietor of the paper." In 1719, a rival paper was started in Boston, called the "Gazette," and in 1721, a third, founded by James Franklin, took the name of "The New England Courant." Meantime there had appeared at Philadelphia, on the 22nd of December, 1719,—only one day later than the second of the Boston newspapers—"The American Weekly Mercury," printed by Andrew Bradford, son of William Bradford. The same printer, Andrew Bradford, removing to New York, brought out "The New York Gazette," the first newspaper printed in that city, in October, 1725. —I. Thomas, *Hist. of Printing in Am., v.* 2, *p.* 12, *and after.*—"In 1740, the number of newspapers in the English colonies on the continent had increased to eleven, of which one appeared in South Carolina, one in Virginia, three in Pennsylvania—one of them being in German—one in New York, and the remaining five in Boston. . . . The New England 'Courant,' the fourth American periodical, was, in August 1721, established by James Franklin as an organ of independent opinion. Its temporary success was advanced by Benjamin, his brother and apprentice, a boy of fifteen, who wrote for its columns, worked in composing the types as well as printing off the sheets, and, as carrier, distributed the papers to the customers. The sheet satirized hypocrisy, and spoke of religious knaves as of all knaves the worst. This was described as tending 'to abuse the ministers of religion in a manner which was intolerable.'. . . In July 1722, a resolve passed the council, appointing a censor for the press of James Franklin; but the house refused its concurrence. The ministers persevered; and, in January 1723, a committee of inquiry was raised by the legislature. Benjamin, being examined, escaped with an admonition; James, the publisher, refusing to discover the author of the offence, was kept in jail for a month; his paper was censured as reflecting injuriously on the reverend ministers of the gospel; and, by vote of the house and council, he was forbidden to print it, 'except it be first supervised.' Vexed at the arbitrary proceedings, Benjamin Franklin, then but seventeen years old, in October 1723, sailed clandestinely for New York. Finding there no employment, he crossed to Amboy; went on foot to the Delaware; for want of a wind, rowed in a boat from Burlington to Philadelphia; and bearing marks of his labor at the oar, weary, hungry, having for his whole stock of cash a single dollar, the runaway apprentice—the pupil of the free schools of Boston, rich in the boundless hope of youth and the unconscious power of modest genius—stepped on shore to seek food and occupation. On the deep foundations of sobriety, frugality and industry, the young journeyman built his fortunes and fame; and he soon came to have a printing-office of his own. . . . The assembly of Pennsylvania chose him its printer. He planned a newspaper [the 'Pennsylvania Gazette']; and, when [1729] he became its proprietor and editor, he defended freedom of thought and speech, and the inalienable power of the people."—G. Bancroft, *Hist. of the U. S. of Am., pt.* 3, *ch.* 15 (*v.* 2).

Also in: J. Parton, *Life of Franklin, pt.* 1–2 (*v.* 1).—B. Franklin, *Life by Himself, ed. by J. Bigelow, pt.* 1.

A. D. 1709-1752.—The Periodicals of the Essayists.—The "Tatler," "Spectator," and their successors.—"In the spring of 1709, Steele [Sir Richard] formed a literary project, of which he was far indeed from foreseeing the consequences. Periodical papers had during many years been published in London. Most of these were political; but in some of them questions of morality, taste, and love-casuistry had been discussed. The literary merit of these works was small indeed; and even their names are now known only to the curious. Steele had been appointed gazetteer by Sunderland, at the request, it is said, of Addison; and thus had access to foreign intelligence earlier and more authentic than was in those times within the reach of an ordinary news-writer. This circumstance seems to have suggested to him the scheme of publishing a periodical paper on a new plan. It was to appear on the days on which the post left London for the country, which were, in that generation, the Tuesdays, Thursdays, and Saturdays. It was to contain the foreign news, accounts of theatrical representations, and the literary gossip of Will's and of the Grecian. It was also to contain remarks on the fashionable topics of the day, compliments to beauties, pasquinades on noted sharpers, and criticisms on popular preachers. The aim of Steele does not appear to have been at first higher than this. . . . Isaac Bickerstaff, Esquire, Astrologer, was an imaginary person, almost as well known in that age as Mr. Paul Pry or Mr. Pickwick in ours. Swift had assumed the name of Bickerstaff in a satirical pamphlet against Partridge, the almanac-maker. Partridge had been fool enough to publish a furious reply. Bickerstaff had rejoined in a second pamphlet still more diverting than the first. All the wits had combined to keep up the joke, and the town was long in convulsions of laughter. Steele determined to employ the name which this controversy had made popular; and, in April, 1709, it was announced that Isaac Bickerstaff, Esquire, Astrologer, was about to publish a paper called the 'Tatler.' Addison had not been consulted about this scheme; but as soon as he heard of it, he determined to give it his assistance. The effect of that assistance cannot be better described than in Steele's own words. 'I fared,' he said, 'like a distressed prince who calls in a powerful neighbour to his aid. I was undone by my auxiliary. When I had once called him in, I could not subsist without dependence on him.' 'The paper,' he says elsewhere, 'was advanced indeed. It was raised to a greater thing than I intended it.'"—Lord Macaulay *Life and Writings of Addison* (*Essays*). —"Steele, on the 12th of April 1709, issued the first number of the 'Tatler.'. . . This famous newspaper, printed in one folio sheet of 'tobacco paper' with 'scurvy letter,' ran to 271 numbers, and abruptly ceased to appear in January 1711. It enjoyed an unprecedented success, for, indeed, nothing that approached it had ever before been issued from the periodical press in England. The division of its contents was thus arranged by the editor: 'All accounts of gallantry, pleasure, and entertainment shall be under the article of White's Chocolate House; poetry under that of Will's Coffee-House; learning under the title

of Grecian; foreign and domestic news you will have from St. James's Coffee-House; and what else I shall on any other subject offer shall be dated from my own apartment.' The political news gradually ceased to appear. . . . Of the 271 'Tatlers,' 188 were written by Steele, 42 by Addison, and 36 by both conjointly. Three were from the pen of John Hughes. . . . These, at least, are the numbers usually given, but the evidence on which they are based is slight. It rests mainly upon the indications given by Steele to Tickell when the latter was preparing his edition of Addison's Works. The conjecture may be hazarded that there were not a few Tatlers written by Addison which he was not anxious to claim as his particular property. . . . Addison, . . . remained Steele's firm friend, and less than two months after the cessation of the 'Tatler' there appeared the first number of a still more famous common enterprise, the 'Spectator,' on the 1st of March 1711. It was announced to appear daily, and was to be composed of the reflections and actions of the members of an imaginary club, formed around 'Mr. Spectator.' In this club the most familiar figure is the Worcestershire Knight, Sir Roger de Coverley, the peculiar property of Addison. . . . The 'Spectator' continued to appear daily until December 1712. It consisted of 555 numbers, of which Addison wrote 274, Steele 236, Hughes 19, and Pope 1 (The Messiah, 'Spectator' 378). Another contributor was Eustace Budgell (1685–1736), Addison's cousin. . . . The 'Spectator' enjoyed so very unequivocal a success that it has puzzled historians to account for its discontinuance. In No. 517 Addison killed Sir Roger de Coverley 'that nobody else might murder him.' This shows a voluntary intention to stop the publication, which the Stamp Act itself had not been able to do by force."—E. Gosse, *A Hist. of Eighteenth Century Literature, ch.* 6.—"After this, in 1713, came the 'Guardian'; and in 1714 an eighth volume of the 'Spectator' was issued by Addison alone. He was also the sole author of the 'Freeholder,' 1715, which contains the admirable sketch of the 'Tory Foxhunter.' Steele, on his side, followed up the 'Guardian' by the 'Lover,' the 'Reader,' and half-a-dozen abortive efforts; but his real successes, as well as those of Addison, were in the three great collections for which they worked together. . . . Between the 'Guardian' of 1713 and the 'Rambler' of 1750–2 there were a number of periodical essayists of varying merit. It is scarcely necessary to recall the names of these now forgotten 'Intelligencers,' 'Moderators,' 'Remembrancers,' and the like, the bulk of which were political. Fielding places one of them, the 'Freethinker' of Philips, nearly on a level with 'those great originals the "Tatlers" and the "Spectators;"' but the initial chapters to the different books of 'Tom Jones' attract us more forcibly to the author's own 'Champion,' written in conjunction with the Ralph who 'makes night hideous' in the 'Dunciad.'. . . Another of Fielding's enterprises in the 'Spectator' vein was the 'Covent Garden Journal,' 1752. . . . Concurrently with the 'Covent Garden Journal' appeared the final volume of Johnson's 'Rambler,' a work upon the cardinal defect of which its author laid his finger, when, in later life, he declared it to be 'too wordy.' Lady Mary said in her smart way that the 'Rambler' followed the 'Spectator' as a packhorse would do a hunter. . . . In the twenty-nine papers which Johnson wrote for Hawkesworth's 'Adventurer,' the 'Rambler' style is maintained. In the 'Idler,' however, which belongs to a later date, when its author's mind was unclouded, and he was comparatively free from the daily pressure of necessity, he adopts a simpler and less polysyllabic style."—A. Dobson, *Eighteenth Century Essays, introd.*

A. D. 1712.—The first Stamp Tax on Newspapers in England.—The first stamp tax on newspapers in England went into effect on the 12th day of August, 1712. "An act had passed the legislature, that 'for every pamphlet or paper contained in half a sheet, or lesser piece of paper so printed, the sum of one halfpenny sterling: and for every such pamphlet or paper being larger than half a sheet, and not exceeding one whole sheet, so printed, a duty after the rate of one penny sterling for every sheet printed thereof.' This act, which was to curb the licentiousness of the press, was to be in force for the space of thirty-two years, to be reckoned from the 10th day of June, 1712. Addison, in the 'Spectator' of this day, says, 'this is the day on which many eminent authors will probably publish their last works. I am afraid that few of our weekly historians, who are men that above all others delight in war, will be able to subsist under the weight of a stamp duty in an approaching peace. In short, the necessity of carrying a stamp, and the impracticability of notifying a bloody battle, will, I am afraid, both concur to the sinking of these thin folios which have every other day related to us the history of Europe for several years last past. A facetious friend of mine, who loves a pun, calls this present mortality among authors, "the fall of the leaf."' On this tax Dean Swift thus humorously alludes in his Journal to Stella, as follows (August 7):—'Do you know that all Grub-street is dead and gone last week? No more Ghosts or murders now for love or money. I plied it close the last fortnight, and published at least seven papers of my own, besides some of other people's; but now every single half-sheet pays a halfpenny to the queen. The 'Observator' is fallen; the 'Medleys' are jumbled together with the 'Flying Post'; the 'Examiner' is deadly sick; the 'Spectator' keeps up and doubles its price; I know not how long it will hold. Have you seen the red stamp the papers are marked with? Methinks the stamping is worth a halfpenny.' The stamp mark upon the newspapers was a rose and thistle joined by the stalks, and enclosing between the Irish shamrock, the whole three were surmounted by a crown. . . . It is curious to observe what an effect this trifling impost had upon the circulation of the most favourite papers. Many were entirely discontinued, and several of those which survived were generally united into one publication. The bill operated in a directly contrary manner to what the ministers had anticipated; for the opposition, who had more leisure, and perhaps more acrimony of feeling, were unanimous in the support of their cause. The adherents of ministers, who were by no means behind the opposition in their proficiency in the topic of defamation, were, it seems, not so strenuously supported; and the measure thus chiefly destroyed those whom it was Bolinbroke's interest to protect. For some reason, which we have not been able to trace, the

stamp-duties were removed shortly after their imposition, and were not again enforced until 1725. In order to understand how so small a duty as one halfpenny should operate so strongly upon these periodical publications, we must look at the price at which they were vended at that period. The majority of them were published at a penny, many at a halfpenny, and some were even published so low as a farthing."—C. H. Timperley, *Encyclopædia of Literary and Typographical Anecdote, pp.* 601–602.

A. D. 1723.—End of Newspaper monopoly in France.—"Until Louis XVI. was dethroned, Paris was officially supposed to possess but three periodicals: the 'Gazette de France' for politics, 'Le Journal des Savants' for literature and science, and the 'Mercure de France' for politics, literature, and social matters mingled. For a time these monopolies were respected, but only for a very short time. . . . During the Regency of the Duke of Orleans (1715–23), the 'Gazette de France,' 'Mercure,' and 'Journal des Savants' combined to bring an action for infringement against all the papers then existing, but they were non-suited on a technical objection; and this was their last attempt at asserting their prerogative."—*The French Press* (*Cornhill Mag., Oct.*, 1873).

A. D. 1734.—Zenger's trial in New York.—Determination of the freedom of the Press. See New York: A. D. 1720–1734.

A. D. 1771.—Freedom of Parliamentary reporting won in England. See England: A. D. 1771.

A. D. 1777.—The first Daily Newspaper in France.—"In 1777 there appeared the 'Journal de Paris,' which only deserves notice from its being the first daily paper issued in France."—*Westminster Rev., July*, 1860, *p.* 219.

A. D. 1784-1813.—The earliest daily Newspapers in the United States.—"The first daily newspaper published in the United States was the 'American Daily Advertiser.' It was issued in Philadelphia in 1784, by Benjamin Franklin Bache, afterwards of the Aurora. When the seat of national government was in Philadelphia, it shared the confidence and support of Jefferson with the 'National Gazette.' It was strong in its opposition to the Federal section of the administration of Washington, and to all the measures originating with Hamilton. Zachariah Poulson became its proprietor and publisher in 1802, and it was known as 'Poulson's Advertiser,' and we believe he continued its publisher till October 28, 1839, when the establishment was sold to Brace and Newbold, the publishers of a new paper called the 'North American.' The name after that was the 'North American and Daily Advertiser.' . . . The 'New York Daily Advertiser,' the second real journal in the United States, was published in 1785. It was commenced on the 1st of March by Francis Childs & Co. . . . On the 29th of July, 1786, the 'Pittsburg (Penn.) Gazette,' the first newspaper printed west of the Alleghany Mountains, appeared, and in 1796 the 'Post' was issued. . . . 'The United States Gazette' was started in New York in 1789 by John Fenno, of Boston. Its original name was 'Gazette of the United States.' It was first issued in New York, because the seat of the national government was then in that city. When Congress removed to Philadelphia in 1790, the 'Gazette' went with that body. In 1792 it was the special organ of Alexander Hamilton. . . . Noah Webster, the lexicographer of America, was a lawyer in 1793, and had an office in Hartford, Connecticut. Washington's administration was then violently assailed by the 'Aurora,' 'National Gazette,' and other organs of the Republican Party, and by the partisans of France. Jefferson was organizing the opposition elements, and Hamilton was endeavoring to strengthen the Federal party. Newspapers were established on each side as the chief means of accomplishing the objects each party had in view. Noah Webster was considered, in this state of affairs, the man to aid the Federalists journalistically in New York. He was, therefore, induced to remove to that city and take charge of a Federal organ. On the 9th of December, 1793, he issued the first number of a daily paper, which was named the 'Minerva.' According to its imprint, it appeared 'every day, Sundays excepted, at four o'clock, or earlier if the arrival of the mail will permit.' . . . With the 'Minerva' was connected a semi-weekly paper called the 'Herald.' . . . The names of 'Minerva' and 'Herald' were shortly changed to those of 'Commercial Advertiser' and 'New York Spectator,' and these names have continued. . . . The 'Commercial Advertiser' is the oldest daily newspaper in the metropolis. Of the hundreds of daily papers started in New York, from the time of Bradford's Gazette in 1725 to the 'Journal of Commerce' in 1827, there are now [1872] only two survivors—the 'Evening Post' and the 'Commercial Advertiser.' . . . The first prominent daily paper issued in New England was the Boston Daily Advertiser, the publication of which was commenced on the 3d of March, 1813. There was a daily paper begun in that city on the 6th of October, 1796, by Alexander Martin, and edited by John O'Ley Burk, one of the 'United Irishmen.' It lived about six months. It was called the Polar Star and Boston Daily Advertiser. Another was attempted on the 1st of January, 1798, by Caleb P. Wayne, who was afterwards editor of the United States Gazette of Philadelphia. This second daily paper of Boston was named the Federal Gazette and Daily Advertiser. It lived three months. The third attempt at a daily paper in the capital of Massachusetts was a success. It was published by William W. Clapp, afterwards of the Saturday Evening Gazette, and edited by Horatio Biglow."—F. Hudson, *Journalism in the United States, pp.* 175–194, *and* 378.

A. D. 1785-1812.—The founding of "The Times," in London.—The beginning of "leading articles."—The newspaper afterwards famous as "The Times" was started, in 1785, under the name of the "Daily Universal Register," and did not adopt the title of "The Times" until the 1st of January, 1788.—J. Grant, *The Newspaper Press, v.* 1, *ch.* 16.—"All the newspapers that can be said to have been distinguished in any way till the appearance of the 'Times' were distinguished by some freak of cleverness. . . . The 'Times' took up a line of its own from the first day of its existence. The proprietors staked their fortunes upon the general character of their paper, upon the promptitude and accuracy of its intelligence, upon its policy, upon the frank and independent spirit of its comments on public men. . . . The chief proprietor of the 'Times' was John Walter—a man who knew nothing or next to nothing of

newspaper work, but who knew precisely what the public wanted in a newspaper, and possessed, with this instinct and intelligence, the determination and enterprise which constitute the character of a successful man of business. He saw how a newspaper ought to be conducted, and he thought he saw how, by the development of a new idea in printing, he could produce the 'Times' a good deal cheaper than any of its contemporaries. The whole English language, according to Mr. Walter, consisted of about 90,000 words; but by separating the particles and omitting the obsolete words, technical terms, and common terminations, Mr. Walter believed it to be possible to reduce the stock in common use to about 50,000, and a large proportion of these words, with all the common terminations, he proposed to have cast separately, so that the compositor, with a slip of MS. before him to set in type, might pick up words or even phrases instead of picking up one by one every letter of every word in his copy, and thus, of course, save a good deal of time. The idea was impracticable, utterly impracticable, because the number of words required to carry out the system must in itself be so great that no case of type that a printer could stand before would hold them all, even if the printer 'learn his boxes' with a case of some 4,000 or 5,000 compartments before him; but it took a good many years, a good many experiments, and the expenditure of some thousands of pounds to convince Mr. Walter that the failure was not due to the perversity of his printers but to the practical difficulties which surrounded his conception. John Walter was far more successful in the general conduct of the 'Times' as a newspaper than he was in the management of the 'Times' printing office. He set all the printers in London by the ears with his whim about logographic printing. But he had a very clear conception of what a national newspaper ought to be, and with the assistance of a miscellaneous group of men, who, as they are sketched for us by Henry Crabb Robinson, were apparently far more picturesque than practical, John Walter made the 'Times' what the 'Times' has been for nearly a century, pre-eminently and distinctly a national newspaper. The 'Times,' in its original shape, consisted merely of the day's news, a few advertisements, some market quotations, perhaps a notice of a new book, a few scraps of gossip, and in the session, a Parliamentary report. The 'Morning Chronicle' had the credit . . . of inventing the leading article, as it had the credit of inventing Parliamentary reporting. The 'Morning Chronicle,' on the 12th of May, 1791, published a paragraph, announcing that 'the great and firm body of the Whigs of England, true to their principles, had decided on the dispute between Mr. Fox and Mr. Burke, in favor of Mr. Fox, as the representative of the pure doctrines of Whiggery,' and that in consequence of this resolution Mr. Burke would retire from Parliament. It was very short, but this paragraph is the nearest approximation that is to be found in the newspapers of that time to a leading article, and appearing as it did in the part of the 'Morning Chronicle' where a year or two afterwards the leading articles were printed, Mr. Wingrove Cooke cites it as the germ of the leaders which, when they became general, gave a distinctive colour and authority to newspapers as independent organs of opinion and criticism. The idea soon became popular; and in the 'Morning Post' and the 'Courier' the leading article, developed as it was by Coleridge and Macintosh into a work of art, often rivalling in argument, wit, and eloquence the best speeches in Parliament, became the object of quite as much interest as the Parliamentary reports themselves. The 'Times,' knowing how to appropriate one by one all the specialties of its contemporaries, and to improve upon what it appropriated, was one of the first newspapers to adopt the idea of leading articles, and in adopting that idea, to improve upon it by stamping its articles with a spirit of frankness and independence which was all its own. . . . The reign of John Walter, practically the founder of the 'Times,' ended in the year 1812, and upon his death his son, the second John Walter, took possession of Printing House Square, and, acting in the spirit of his father, with ampler means, soon made the 'Times' the power in the State that it has been from that day to this."—C. Pebody, *English Journalism, pp.* 92–99.

A. D. 1817.—The trials of William Hone. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1816–1820.

A. D. 1830-1833.—The first Penny Papers in the United States.—"The Penny Press of America dates from 1833. There were small and cheap papers published in Boston and Philadelphia before and about that time. The Bostonian was one. The Cent, in Philadelphia, was another. The latter was issued by Christopher C. Cornwall in 1830. These and all similar adventures were not permanent. Most of them were issued by printers when they had nothing else to do. Still they belonged to the class of cheap papers. The idea came from the Illustrated Penny Magazine, issued in London in 1830. . . . The Morning Post was the first penny paper of any pretensions in the United States. It was started on New-Year's Day, 1833, as a two-cent paper, by Dr. Horatio David Shepard, with Horace Greeley and Francis V. Story as partners, printers, and publishers. . . . After one week's trial, with the exhaustion of the capital, the original idea of Dr. Shepard, his dream of the previous year 1832 was attempted, and the price reduced to one cent; but it was too late. . . . This experiment, however, was the seed of the Cheap Press. It had taken root. On Tuesday, the 3d of September, in the same year 1833, the first number of the Sun was issued by Benjamin H. Day."—F. Hudson, *Journalism in the United States, pp.* 416–417.

A. D. 1853-1870.—Extinction of taxes on Newspapers in England.—The beginning of Penny Papers.—Rise of the provincial daily press.—"In 1853 the advertisement duty was repealed; in 1855 the obligatory newspaper stamp was abolished, and in 1861, with the repeal of the paper duty, the last check upon the unrestrained journalism was taken away. As a matter of course, the resulting increase in the number of newspapers has been very great as well as the resulting diminution in their price. . . . When it was seen that the trammels of journalism were about to be loosed the penny paper came into existence. The 'Daily Telegraph,' the first newspaper published at that price, was established in June, 1855, and is now one of the most successful of English journals."—T. G. Bowles, *Newspapers* (*Fortnightly Rev.*,

July 1, 1884).—"With the entire freedom from taxation began the modern era of the daily press. At this time [1861] London had nine or ten daily newspapers, with the 'Times' in the lead. Of these, six or seven still survive, and are holding their own with competitors of more recent origin. Up to the time of the abolition of the stamp duties, London was the only city which had a daily press; but between 1855 and 1870 a large number of newspapers published in the provincial cities, which had hitherto been issued in weekly or bi-weekly form, made their appearance as daily journals. With only one or two exceptions, all the prosperous provincial morning papers of to-day were originally weeklies, and as such had long occupied the ground they now hold as dailies."—E. Porritt, *The Englishman at Home, ch.* 13.

A. D. 1874-1894.—Surviving Press Censorship in Germany.—"It would be wrong to speak of the Newspaper Press of Germany as the fourth estate. In the land which gave Gutenberg and the art of printing to the world, the Press has not yet established a claim to a title so imposing. To the growth and power of a Free Press are needed liberal laws and institutions, with freedom of political opinion and civil action for the subject. Hitherto these fundamental conditions have been absent. During the last fifty years little has been done to liberate the newspaper, to give it free play, to unmuzzle it. It is the misfortune of the German Press that the special laws for the regulation of newspapers and serial publications have been evolved from a system of legislation which was devised in times of great political unrest and agitation. . . . Liberty of the Press has been one of the leading political watchwords of the reform party during the last three-quarters of a century. Yet though the Press does not stand where it stood at the beginning of the century, when even visiting cards could not be printed without the solemn assent of the public censor, and when objectionable prints were summarily suppressed at the mere beck of a Minister or his subordinate, little ground has been won since the severer features of the measures passed in 1854 for the repression of democratic excesses were abandoned. The constitution of Prussia says that 'Every Prussian has the right to express his opinion freely by word, writing, print, or pictorial representation' (Article 27). But this right is superseded by the provision of the imperial constitution (Article 41, Section 16) which reserves to the Empire the regulation of the Press, and by a measure of May 7th, 1874, which gives to this provision concrete form. This is the Press Law of Germany to-day. The law does, indeed, concede, in principle at least, the freedom of the Press (Pressfreiheit), and it abolishes the formal censorship. But a severe form of control is still exercised by the police, whose authority over the Press is greater in reality than it seems to be from the letter of the statute. It is no longer necessary, as it once was, and still is in Russia, to obtain sanction for the issue of each number before it is sent into the world, but it is the legal duty of a publisher to lay a copy of his journal before the police authority directly it reaches the press. This an informal censor revises, and in the event of any article being obnoxious he may order the immediate confiscation of the whole issue, or a court of law, which in such matters works very speedily, may do so for him. As the police and judicial authorities have wide discretion in the determination of editorial culpability, this power of confiscation is felt to be a harsh one. While the Socialist Law existed the powers of the police were far more extensive than now, and that they were also real is proved by the wholesale extermination of newspapers of Socialistic tendencies which took place between the years 1878 and 1890. Since that law disappeared, however, Socialist journals have sprung up again in abundance, though the experience gained by their conductors in the unhappy past does not enable them to steer clear of friction with the authorities. The police, too, regulates the public sale of newspapers and decides whether they shall be cried in the street or not. In Berlin special editions cannot be published without the prior sanction of this authority. . . . So frequent are prosecutions of editors that many newspapers are compelled to maintain on their staffs batches of Sitzredakteure, or 'sitting editors,' whose special function is to serve in prison (colloquially sitzen=sit) the terms of detention that may be awarded for the too liberal exercise of the critical faculty. . . . Some measure of the public depreciation of newspapers is due to the fact that they are largely in Hebrew hands. In the large towns the Press is, indeed, essentially a Jewish institution."—W. H. Dawson, *Germany and the Germans, pt.* 2, *ch.* 19 (*v.*1).

American Periodicals founded before 1870 and existing in 1894.—The following is a carefully prepared chronological list of important newspapers and other periodicals, still published (1894) in the United States and Canada, which have existed for a quarter of a century or more, having been founded before 1870. The * before a title indicates that the information given has been obtained directly from the publisher. For some of the periodicals not so marked, the dates of beginning have been taken from their own files. In other cases, where publishers have neglected to answer a request for information, the facts have been borrowed from Rowell's American Newspaper Directory:

1764. *Connecticut Courant (Hartford), *w.*; added Courant, *d.*, 1836.
*Quebec Gazette (French and English), *w.*; ran many years as *tri-w.*, in Eng.; discontinued for about 16 years; now resumed as Quebec Gazette in connection with Quebec Morning Chronicle (founded 1847).

1766 or 1767. *Connecticut Herald and Post Boy (New Haven); various names; now Connecticut Herald and Weekly Journal.

1768. *Essex Gazette; changes of name and place; suspended; revived at Salem, Mass., as Salem Mercury, 1786; became *semi-w.*, 1796; became Salem Daily Gazette, 1892.

1770. Worcester Spy, *w.*; added *d.*, 1845.

1771. *Pennsylvania Packet and General Advertiser (Philadelphia), *w.*; became Pennsylvania Packet and American Daily Advertiser, *d.*, 1784; consolidated with North American (founded 1839), 1839; consolidated with United States Gazette (established 1789, see 1789, Gazette of the U. S.), as North American and United States Gazette, 1847; became North American, 1876.

1773. * Maryland Journal and Baltimore Advertiser; merged in Baltimore American, 1799.
1778. * Gazette (Montreal), *w.*; now *d.* and *w.*; since 1870 absorbed Telegraph and Daily News.
1785. * Falmouth (Me.) Gazette and Weekly Advertiser; Cumberland Gazette, 1786; Gazette of Maine, 1790; Eastern Herald, 1792; Eastern Herald and Gazette of Maine, 1796; Jenks' Portland Gazette, 1798; Portland Gazette and Maine Advertiser, 1805; Portland Advertiser, *semi-w.*, 1823; *d.*, 1831.
* Journal (Poughkeepsie, N. Y.); established to take the place of New York Journal, published at Poughkeepsie, 1778–1783; consolidated with Eagle (founded 1828—see 1828, Dutchess Intelligencer), as Journal and Eagle; became Eagle after a few years.
1786. Hampshire Gazette (Northampton, Mass.).
Pittsburgh Commercial Gazette.
1789. * Gazette of the United States (New York); removed to Philadelphia, 1790; *d.*, 1793; became The Union, or United States Gazette and True American; merged in North American, 1847.
Berkshire County Eagle (Pittsfield, Mass.), *w.*
1793. Gazette (Cincinnati), *w.*; added *d.*, Commercial Gazette, 1841.
Minerva (New York), *d.*, and Herald, *semi-w.*; became Commercial Advertiser, and New York Spectator.
Newburyport (Mass.) Herald.
Utica Gazette; consolidated with Herald (founded 1847), as Morning Herald and Gazette.
1794. Rutland (Vt.) Herald.
1796. * Sentinel of Freedom (Newark), *w.*; added Newark Daily Advertiser, *d.*, 1832.
1800. * Salem Register, *w.*; then *semi-w.*; now *w.*
1801. New York Evening Post.
Ægis and Gazette (Worcester), *w.*; added Evening Gazette, 1843.
1803. Charleston News and Courier.
Portland (Me.) Eastern Argus.
1804. Pittsburgh Post.
1805. Missionary Herald (Boston), *m.*
* Quebec Mercury, *tri-w.*; became *d.* about 1860.
1806. * Precurser (Montpelier), *w.*; became Vermont Watchman, 1807, *w.*
1807. * New Bedford (Mass.) Mercury, *w.*; added *d.*, 1831.
1808. * Cooperstown (N. Y.) Federalist; became Freeman's Journal, *w.*, 1820.
Le Canadien (Montreal).
St. Louis Republic, *w.*; added *d.*, 1835.
1809. * New Hampshire Patriot (Concord, N. H.); consolidated with People (founded 1868) as People and Patriot, 1878, *d.* and *w.*
Montreal Herald.
1810. Kingston (Ont.) News, *w.*; added *d.*, 1851.
1811. * Buffalo Gazette, *w.*; became Niagara Patriot, *w.*, 1818; became Buffalo Patriot, *w.*, July 10, 1821; added Buffalo Commercial Advertiser, *d.*, 1835.
* Western Intelligencer; Western Intelligencer and Columbus Gazette, 1814; became Ohio State Journal, 1825; *d.*, 1839.
1812. * Columbian Weekly Register (New Haven); added Evening Register, *d.*, 1848.
1813. Albany Argus.
Boston Advertiser.
Acadian Recorder (Halifax).
1815. North American Review (New York), *m.*
1816. * Boston Recorder; merged in Congregationalist, *w.*, 1867.
Knoxville Tribune, *w.*; added *d.*, 1865.
Rochester Union and Advertiser, *w.*; added *d.*, 1826.
1817. * Hartford Times, *w.*; added *d.*, 1841.
1819. * Cleveland Herald; consolidated with Evening News (founded 1868), 1885. See 1848, Cleveland Leader.
Arkansas Gazette (Little Rock).
* Oswego Palladium, *w.*; added *d.* about 1860.
1820. Nova Scotian (Halifax), *w.*; added Chronicle, 3 times a *w.*, 1845; added Morning Chronicle, 1865.
* Manufacturers' and Farmers' Journal (Providence), *semi-w.*; added Daily Journal, 1829.
1821. * Christian Register (Boston), *w.*
Indianapolis Sentinel.
Mobile Register.
1822. Broome Republican (Binghamton, N. Y.), *w.*; added Republican, *d.*, 1849.
* Old Colony Memorial (Plymouth, Mass.), *w.*; has absorbed Plymouth Rock, and Old Colony Sentinel.
1823. Auburn (N. Y.) News and Democrat, *w.*; added Bulletin, *d.*, 1870.
* Zion's Herald (Boston), *w.*
* New Hampshire Statesman (Concord), *w.*; consolidated with Independent Democrat (founded 1845), as Independent Statesman, 1871; added *d.*, Concord Evening Monitor, 1864.
* Western Censor and Emigrant's Guide (Indianapolis); became Indianapolis Journal, *w.*, and *semi-w.* during session of the Legislature; became *w.* and *d.*, 1850.
* Observer (New York), *w.*
* Register (New York), *w.*; became Examiner, 1855.
Poughkeepsie News-Telegraph, *w.*; added News-Press, *d.*, 1852.
1824. * Springfield (Mass.) Republican, *w.*; added *d.*, 1844.
1825. Kennebec Journal, *w.*; added *d.*, 1870.
* Rome (N. Y.) Republican, *w.*; became Telegram; became Sentinel, 1837; added *d.*, 1852–1860; added *d.*, 1881.
1826. Detroit Free Press, *w.*; added *d.*, 1835.
* Lowell Courier, *w.*; added *d.*, 1845; *w.* now called Lowell Weekly Journal.
* La Minerve (Montreal), *d.* and *w.*
Christian Advocate (New York), *w.*
Journal of the Franklin Institute (Phila.), *m.*
* St. Lawrence Republican (Potsdam, N. Y.) *w.*; removed to Canton, N. Y., 1827; removed to Ogdensburg, 1830, and consolidated with St. Lawrence Gazette (founded 1815); purchased by Ogdensburg Journal (founded 1855), *d.*, 1858; both papers continue.

Rochester Democrat; consolidated with Chronicle (founded 1868) as Democrat and Chronicle.

1827. * Youth's Companion (Boston), *w.*
* Independent News Letter (Cleveland); became Advertiser, 1832; became Plain Dealer, 1842.
Columbus (O.) Press.
New York Journal of Commerce.

1828. * Orleans Republican (Albion, N. Y.), *w.*
Burlington (Vt.) Free Press, *w.*; added *d.*, 1844.
Montgomery (Ala.) Advertiser.
* Dutchess Intelligencer (Poughkeepsie, N. Y.); consolidated with Dutchess Republican, as Poughkeepsie Eagle, *w.*, 1833; consolidated with Poughkeepsie Journal (see 1785, Journal), as Journal and Eagle, 1844; now Eagle; added *d.*, 1860.

1829. * Auburn (N. Y.) Journal, *w.*; added Daily Advertiser, 1844.
* Northwestern Journal (Detroit), *w.*; *semi-w.*, then 3 times a *w.*, 1835; became Daily Advertiser, 1836; consolidated with Tribune (founded 1849), as Advertiser and Tribune, 1862; consolidated with Daily Post (founded 1866), as Post and Tribune, 1877; became Tribune, 1885.
* Elmira Gazette, *w.*, added *d.*, 1860.
Philadelphia Inquirer.
* Providence Daily Journal.
* Syracuse Standard; successor to Onondaga Standard.

1830. * Albany Evening Journal.
* Boston Transcript.
Louisville Journal; consolidated with Courier (founded 1843) and Democrat (founded 1844), under name of Louisville Courier-Journal, 1868.
* Evangelist (New York), *w.*
* Sunday School Journal (Philadelphia), *w.*; merged in Sunday School Times, 1859.

1831. Orleans American (Albion, N. Y.), *w.*
* Boston Daily Post.
Presbyterian (Philadelphia), *w.*
Illinois State Journal (Springfield), *w.*; added *d.*, 1848.

1832. * Patriot (Montpelier, Vt.); consolidated with Argus (founded 1851, Bellows Falls), as Argus and Patriot, *w.*, 1862.
* Herald (New Haven), *d.*; various names; became Journal and Courier, 1849.
Morning Journal and Courier (New Haven).

1833. * Catholic Intelligencer (Boston), *w.*; successor to Jesuit; became Pilot, 1836.
* Boston Mercantile Journal; now Boston Journal.
* The Sun (New York).

1834. Bangor Whig and Courier.
* Western Christian Advocate (Cincinnati), *w.*
* British Whig (Kingston, Ont.), *d.*, 1849.
* New Yorker Staats-Zeitung, *w.*; added *d.*, 1845.
Anzeiger des Westens (St. Louis).

1835. * New York Herald.
Schenectady Reflector, *w.*; added Evening Star, 1855.
Troy Morning Telegram.

1836. * Miner's Express, *w.*; merged in Dubuque Herald (founded 1853), now *d.* and *w.*
* Public Ledger and Daily Transcript (Philadelphia).
* Illinois State Register (Vandalia), *w.*; absorbed People's Advocate, 1836; removed to Springfield, 1839; absorbed Illinois Republican, 1839; added *d.*, 1848.
* Toledo Blade, *w.*; added *d.*, 1848.

1837. * Sun (Baltimore), *d.* and *w.*
Buffalo Demokrat und Weltbürger.
Burlington (Ia.) Gazette.
* Cincinnati Times, *d.* and *w.*; *d.* consolidated with Star (founded 1872), *d.* and *w.*, as Cincinnati Times-Star, 1880.
Southern Christian Advocate (Columbia, S. C.), *w.*
Jackson (Miss.) Clarion, *w.*
* Milwaukee Sentinel, *w.*; absorbed Gazette and became Sentinel-Gazette, 1846; dropped "Gazette," 1851; *d.* 1844.
* New Orleans Picayune.

1838. Bangor Commercial.
* Philadelphia Demokrat.
* St. Louis Evening Gazette; became Evening Mirror, 1847; became New Era, 1848; became Intelligencer, 1849; became Evening News, 1857; consolidated with Dispatch, 1867; consolidated with Evening Post, as Post Dispatch, 1878.

1839. * Iowa Patriot (Burlington), *w.*; became Hawkeye and Iowa Patriot; has been, at various times, *semi-w.*, and *d.*; now Burlington Hawkeye, *d.* and *w.*
* Christliche Apologete (Cincinnati), *w.*
* Madison Express, *w.*; became Wisconsin Express, 1848; *d.*, 1851; consolidated with a new paper, Statesman, as Palladium, *d.* and *w.*, 1852; became Wisconsin State Journal, 1852.
Freeman's Journal and Catholic Register (New York), *w.*
* North American (Philadelphia); absorbed Pennsylvania Packet (see 1771, Pennsylvania Packet), 1839.
Western State Journal (Syracuse), *w.*; became Syracuse Journal, 1844; added *d.*, 1846; absorbed Evening Chronicle, 1856; added *semi-w.*, 1893.

1840. Chicago Tribune.
* Appeal (Memphis); consolidated with Avalanche (founded 1857), as Appeal-Avalanche, 1890 (?); consolidated with Commercial (founded 1889), as Commercial Appeal, 1894.
* Union and Evangelist (Uniontown, Penn.); became Evangelist and Observer at Pittsburgh; succeeded by Cumberland Presbyterian, about 1846, at Uniontown; removed to Brownsville; then to Waynesburg; to Alton, Ill., in 1868; and to Nashville, Tenn., in 1874; here consolidated with Banner of Peace (founded, Princeton, Ky., 1840; removed to Lebanon, Tenn., 1843; then to Nashville).
* Roman Citizen, *w.*; became Rome Semi-Weekly Citizen, 1888.

1841. * Brooklyn Eagle.
* Prairie Farmer (Chicago), *w.*
* New York Tribune.

* Pittsburgh Chronicle; consolidated with Pittsburgh Telegraph (founded 1873), as Pittsburgh Chronicle Telegraph, 1884.
Reading Eagle, *w.*; added *d.*, 1868.
1842. * Daily Mercantile Courier and Democratic Economist (Buffalo); became Daily Courier and Economist, 1843; became Buffalo Courier, *d.*, 1845.
* Cincinnati Enquirer, *d.* and *semi-w.*
* Galveston News.
Rural New Yorker (New York), *w.*
* Preacher (Pittsburgh), *w.*; became United Presbyterian, 1854.
1843. * Albany Daily Knickerbocker; consolidated with Press (founded 1877), as Daily Press and Knickerbocker, 1877.
* Steuben Courier (Bath, N. Y.).
1844. Chicago Evening Journal.
* Woechentlicher Seebote (Milwaukee); became Der Seebote, *d.* and *w.*
* American Baptist (New York); became Baptist Weekly; has absorbed Gospel Age; became Christian Inquirer, *w.*, 1888.
* Churchman (New York), *w.*
* New Yorker Demokrat; New Yorker Journal, 1862; consolidated as New Yorker Zeitung, 1878.
Eclectic Magazine of Foreign Literature (New York), *m.*
Ledger (New York), *w.*
Oswego Times.
* Globe (Toronto).
1845. * Binghamton Democrat, *w.*; added *d.*, 1864.
* Buffalo Morning Express.
* Independent Democrat (Concord, N. H.). See 1823, N. H. Statesman.
Montreal Witness, *w.*; added *d.*, 1860.
Scientific American (New York), *w.*
* St. Joseph (Mo.) Gazette, *d.* and *w.*
1846. * Boston Herald, *d.* and *w.*
* Evening News (Hamilton, Ont.), *d.* and *w.*; successor to Journal and Express, *semi-w.*; became Banner and Railway Chronicle, 1852 or 1853; became Evening Times, 1858.
* Hamilton (Ont.) Spectator, *semi-w.*; added *d.*, 1852.
Keokuk (Ia.) Gate City.
* Bankers' Magazine (New York), *m.*
* Newport (R. I.) Daily News.
Pittsburgh Dispatch.
1847. * Albany Morning Express.
New England Historical and Genealogical Register (Boston), *quarterly.*
Boston Traveller.
Illinois Staats-Zeitung (Chicago).
* Lewiston (Me.) Weekly Journal; added Evening Journal, 1861.
London (Ont.) Free Press, *w.*; added *d.*, 1859.
* Evening Wisconsin (Milwaukee).
Iron Age (New York), *w.*
Toledo Commercial.
Utica Morning Herald; consolidated with Gazette (founded 1793), as Morning Herald and Gazette.
1848. * Massachusetts Teacher; afterwards, with College Courant (founded 1866, New Haven), Rhode Island Schoolmaster (founded 1855), and Connecticut School Journal, formed Journal of Education (founded 1875, Boston).
* Williamsburg Times; became Brooklyn Daily Times, 1854.
* Cleveland Leader, *d.*; added, by purchase, Evening News (founded 1868), 1869; purchased Cleveland Herald (founded 1819), and consolidated it with Evening News, as News and Herald, 1885.
Des Moines Leader.
* Independent (New York), *w.*
1849. * Congregationalist (Boston), *w.*; absorbed Boston Recorder (founded 1816), 1867.
* Detroit Tribune; consolidated with Post, 1877. See 1829, Northwestern Journal.
* Irish American (New York), *w.*
* Water Cure Journal (New York); became Herald of Health, 1863; became Journal of Hygiene and Herald of Health, *m.*, 1893.
* St. Paul Pioneer, *w.*; *d.*, 1854; consolidated with St. Paul Press (founded 1860), *d.*, as Pioneer Press, 1875.
Wilkesbarre Leader, *w.*; added *d.*, 1879.
1850. * Buffalo Christian Advocate, *w.*
Kansas City (Mo.) Times.
Mirror and American (Manchester, N. H.).
Harper's New Monthly Magazine (New York).
* Oregonian (Portland), *w.*; added *d.*, 1861.
Richmond Dispatch.
* Deseret News (Salt Lake City), *w.*; added *semi-w.*, 1865; added *d.*, 1867.
* Morning News (Savannah, Ga.), *d.* and *w.*; absorbed Savannah Republican (founded 1802), and Savannah Daily Advertiser (founded 1866), 1874.
* Watertown (N. Y.) Weekly Reformer; added Daily Times, 1860.
1851. La Crosse Morning Chronicle.
* Union Democrat (Manchester, N. H.), *w.*; added Manchester Union, *d.*, 1863.
* Argus (Bellows Falls); consolidated with Patriot, at Montpelier, under name of Argus and Patriot, *w.*, 1862.
* New York Times, *d.* and *w.*
* Rochester Beobachter, *w.*; 3 *times a week*, 1855; *d.*, 1863; consolidated with Abendpost (founded 1880), as Rochester Abendpost und Beobachter, *d.* and *w.*, 1881.
St. Joseph (Mo.) Herald.
* Troy (N. Y.) Times, *d.*
1852. Wächter am Erie (Cleveland).
St. Louis Globe-Democrat.
Wheeling Intelligencer (Wheeling, West Virginia).
1853. Elmira Advertiser.
Frank Leslie's Illustrated Weekly (New York).
Richmond Anzeiger.
San Francisco Evening Post.
Toledo Express.
Washington Evening Star.
* Record of the Times (Wilkesbarre), *w.*; added Wilkesbarre Record, *d.*, 1873.
1854. * Deutsche Zeitung (Charleston, S. C.), *semi-w.* and *w.*; suspended during four years of Civil War.
Chicago Times, *d.* and *w.*
* American Israelite (Cincinnati), *w.*
* Kansas City (Mo.) Journal, *w.*; added *d.*, 1864.

La Crosse Republican and Leader.
Herold (Milwaukee).
* Nebraska City News.
* Anzeiger des Nordens (Rochester); became Rochester Volksblatt, *w.*, 1859, added *d.*, 1863.

1855. * Ogdensburg Journal, *d.*; purchased St. Lawrence Republican (founded 1826), *w.*, 1858.

1856. * Albany Times; absorbed Evening Courier, 1861; consolidated with Evening Union (founded 1882), as Albany Times-Union, *d.* and *w.*, 1891.
* Buffalo Allgemeine Zeitung, *w.*; succeeded by Buffalo Freie Presse, *d.* 3 months, then *semi-w.*; *d.*, 1872.
* Iowa State Register (Des Moines), *w.*; added *d.*, 1861.
Dubuque Times.
* Western Railroad Gazette (Chicago), *w.*; became Railroad Gazette; removed to New York, 1871.
San Francisco Call.
* Scranton Republican, *w.*; added *d.*, 1867.

1857. Baltimore News.
Atlantic Monthly (Boston).
* Banner of Light (Boston), *w.*
Leavenworth Times.
New Haven Union.
Harper's Weekly (New York).
* Jewish Messenger (New York), *w.*
* Scottish American (New York), *w.*
Philadelphia Press.
Courrier du Canada (Quebec).
Westliche Post (St. Louis).
Syracuse Courier.

1858. Hartford Evening Post; Connecticut Post, *w.*
Nebraska Press (Nebraska City), *d.* and *w.*
Rochester Post-Express.

1859. * Boston Commercial Bulletin, *w.*
* Rocky Mountain News (Denver), *w.*; added *d.*, 1860.
Kansas City (Mo.) Post (German).
* Sunday School Times (Philadelphia), *w.*; succeeded Sunday School Journal (founded 1830); absorbed Sunday School Workman (founded 1870), 1871; absorbed National Sunday School Teacher (founded 1866), 1882.
St. John (New Brunswick) Globe.

1860. World (New York).

1861. Commonwealth (Boston), *w.*

1862. * New Yorker Journal. See 1844, New Yorker Demokrat.
* Maine State Press (Portland), *w.*; Portland Press, *d.*
Raleigh News and Observer.
St. John (New Brunswick) Telegraph, *w.*; added *d.*, 1869.

1863. * Brooklyn Daily Union; consolidated with Brooklyn Daily Standard (founded 1884), as Brooklyn Standard Union, 1887.
London (Ont.) Advertiser.
* New Orleans Times; consolidated with Democrat (founded 1876), as New Orleans Times-Democrat, 1881, all *d.* and *w.*
Army and Navy Journal (New York), *w.*
Portland (Oregon) Evening Telegram.
Providence Evening Bulletin.
* Sioux City Journal, *w.*; added *d.*, 1870.
* Wheeling Register.

1864. * Concord (N. H.) Evening Monitor, *d.*; issued in connection with Independent Statesman (see 1823, N. H. Statesman).
Reading Post (Ger.), *w.*; added *d.*, 1867.
* Springfield (Mass.) Union.

1865. Albany Evening Post.
* Skandinaven (Chicago), *w.*; *d.*, 1871.
Halifax Morning Chronicle.
Florida Times-Union (Jacksonville).
Memphis Public Ledger.
* Catholic World (New York City), *m.*
* Commercial and Financial Chronicle (New York), *w.*; absorbed Hunt's Merchants' Magazine, 1870.
Nation (New York), *w.*
Norfolk Virginian.
* Daily Herald (Omaha, Neb.); consolidated with Evening World (founded 1885), as World-Herald, 1889.
* Index (Petersburg, Va.); consolidated with Appeal (successor to Express, founded in 1848), as Index-Appeal, 1873.
Philadelphia Abend Post.
San Antonio Express.
* San Francisco Chronicle.
* Union (Schenectady), *d.*, and *w.*

1866. * Denver Tribune; consolidated with Denver Republican (founded 1878), under name of Tribune-Republican, 1884; became Denver Republican, *d.* and *w.*
* Christian at Work (New York), *w.*; became Christian Work, 1894; has absorbed The Continent, The Manhattan Magazine, Every Thursday, and others.
Engineering and Mining Journal (New York), *w.*
Sanitarian (New York), *m.*

1867. * Advance (Chicago), *w.*
* Evening Journal (Jersey City).
* Nebraska Commonwealth (Lincoln), *w.*; became Nebraska State Journal, *w.*, 1869; added *d.*, 1870.
* Democrat (Madison, Wis.), *d.* and *w.*
Minneapolis Tribune.
* Le Monde (Montreal).
Engineering News (New York), *w.*
Harper's Bazaar (New York), *w.*
American Naturalist (Phila.), *m.*
* L' Evenement (Quebec).
* Seattle Intelligencer, *w.*; *d.*, 1876; consolidated with Post (founded 1878), *d.*, under name of Post-Intelligencer, 1881.
Vicksburg Commercial Herald, *w.*; added *d.*, 1869.
Wilmington (N. C.) Messenger.
* Morning Star (Wilmington, N. C.).

1868. Atlanta Constitution.
* Buffalo Volksfreund, *d.* and *w.*
* People (Concord, N. H.). See 1809, New Hampshire Patriot.
Lippincott's Magazine (Phila.), *m.*
* St. Paul Dispatch.
* San Diego Union, *w.*; added *d.*, 1871.
Troy Press.

1869. * Evening Star (Montreal); became Montreal Evening Star, then Montreal Daily Star; added Family Herald and Weekly Star, *w.*
* Christian Union (New York), *w.*; became The Outlook, 1893.
Manufacturer and Builder (New York), *m.*
* Ottawa Free Press, *d.* and *w.*
Scranton Times, *d.* and *w.*

PRIOR.—PRIORY. See MONASTERY.

PRIORIES, Alien.—"These were cells of foreign abbeys, founded upon estates which English proprietors had given to the foreign houses."—E. L. Cutts, *Scenes and Characters of the Middle Ages, ch.* 4.

PRIORS OF THE FLORENTINE GUILDS. See FLORENCE: A. D. 1250–1293.

PRISAGE. See TUNNAGE AND POUNDAGE.

PRISON-SHIPS, British, at New York. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1776–1777 PRISONERS AND EXCHANGES.

PRISONS AND PRISON-PENS, Confederate.—Libby.—Belle Isle.—Andersonville.—"The Libby, which is best known, though also used as a place of confinement for private soldiers, is generally understood to be the officers' prison. It is a row of brick buildings, three stories high, situated on the canal [in Richmond, Va.], and overlooking the James river, and was formerly a tobacco warehouse. . . . The rooms are 100 feet long by 40 feet broad. In six of these rooms, 1,200 United States officers, of all grades, from the Brigadier-General to the Second-Lieutenant, were confined for many months, and this was all the space that was allowed them in which to cook, eat, wash, sleep, and take exercise. . . . Ten feet by two were all that could be claimed by each man. . . . Their blankets, which averaged one to a man, and sometimes less, had not been issued by the rebels, but had been procured in different ways; sometimes by purchase, sometimes through the Sanitary Commission. . . . The prison did not seem to be under any general and uniform army regulations, but the captives were subject to the caprices of Major Turner, the officer in charge, and Richard Turner, inspector of the prison. It was among the rules that no one should go within three feet of the windows, a rule which seems to be general in all Southern prisons of this character. . . . Often by accident, or unconsciously, an officer would go near a window, and be instantly shot at without warning. . . . The daily ration in the officers' quarter of Libby Prison was a small loaf of bread about the size of a man's fist, made of Indian meal. Sometimes it was made from wheat flour, but of variable quality. It weighed a little over half a pound. With it was given a piece of beef weighing two ounces. . . . Belle Isle [where private soldiers were confined] is a small island in the James river opposite the Tredegar Iron-works, and in full sight from the Libby windows. . . . The portion on which the prisoners are confined is low, sandy, and barren, without a tree to cast a shadow, and poured upon by the burning rays of a Southern sun. Here is an enclosure, variously estimated to be from three to six acres in extent, surrounded by an earthwork about three feet high, with a ditch on either side. . . . The interior has something of the look of an encampment, a number of Sibley tents being set in rows, with 'streets' between. These tents, rotten, torn, full of holes, —poor shelter at any rate, —accommodated only a small proportion of the number who were confined within these low earth walls. The number varied at different periods, but from 10,000 to 12,000 men have been imprisoned in this small space at one time, turned into the enclosure like so many cattle, to find what resting place they could. . . . Thousands had no tents, and no shelter of any kind. . . . They were fed as the swine are fed. A chunk of corn-bread, 12 or 14 ounces in weight, half-baked, full of cracks as if baked in the sun, musty in taste, containing whole grains of corn, fragments of cob, and pieces of husks; meat often tainted, suspiciously like mule-meat, and a mere mouthful at that; two or three spoonfuls of rotten beans; soup thin and briny, often with worms floating on the surface. None of these were given together, and the whole ration was never one-half the quantity necessary for the support of a healthy man."—V. Mott, and others, *Report of U. S. Sanitary Commission Com. of Inquiry on the Sufferings of Prisoners of War in the hands of the Rebel Authorities, ch.* 2–3.—The little hamlet of Anderson, so named, in 1853, after John W. Anderson, of Savannah, but called Andersonville by the Post Office Department, is situated in the heart of the richest portion of the cotton and corn-growing region of Georgia, on the Southwestern Railroad, 62 miles south from Macon and 9 miles north of Americus. "Here, on the 27th day of November, 1863, W. S. Winder, a captain in the rebel army, and who was selected for the purpose, came and located the grounds, for a 'Confederate States Military Prison.' . . . When the site was definitely established, it was found to be covered with a thick growth of pines and oaks. . . . The trees were leveled to the ground, and the space was cleared. . . . No buildings, barracks, houses, or huts of any kind were built. The canopy of the sky was the only covering." In March, 1864, John H. Winder, father of the W. S. Winder mentioned above, became commandant of the post, and with him came Henry Wirz, as superintendent of the prison. "From Colonel Chandler's Inspection Report [the report of a Confederate official] dated August 5th, 1864, I quote the following: 'A railing around the inside of the stockade, and about 20 feet from it, constitutes the 'dead line,' beyond which prisoners are not allowed to pass. A small stream passes from west to east through the inclosure, about 150 yards from its southern limit, and furnishes the only water for washing accessible to the prisoners. Bordering this stream, about three quarters of an acre in the centre of the inclosure are so marshy as to be at present unfit for occupation, reducing the available present area to about 23½ acres, which gives somewhat less than six square feet to each prisoner'; and, he remarks, 'even this is being constantly reduced by the additions to their number.' . . . Dr. Joseph Jones, Professor of Chemistry in the Medical College of Georgia, . . . went to Andersonville under the direction of the surgeon general of the Confederacy, pursuant to an order dated Richmond, Virginia, August 6th, 1864. . . . Dr. Jones proceeds to give a table illustrating the mean strength of prisoners confined in the stockade. . . . His table . . . shows the following as the mean result: March, 7,500; April, 10,000; May, 15,000; June, 22,291; July, 29,030; August, 32,899. He says: 'Within the circumscribed area of the stockade the Federal prisoners were compelled to perform all the offices of life, cooking, washing, urinating, defecation, exercise, and sleeping.' . . . 'The low grounds bordering the stream were covered with human excrement and filth of all kinds, which in many cases appeared to be alive with working maggots. An indescribable sickening stench arose from the fermenting mass of human dung and filth.' And

again: 'There were nearly 5,000 seriously-ill Federals in the stockade and Confederate States Military Prison Hospital, and the deaths exceeded 100 per day. . . . I visited 2,000 sick within the stockade, lying under some long sheds which they had built at the northern portion for themselves. At this time only one medical officer was in attendance.'" At the close of the war, Wirz was tried before a military commission, over which General Lew. Wallace presided, was condemned, and was hanged at Andersonville, November 10, 1865. — A. Spencer, *Narrative of Andersonville, ch.* 1, 4, 5, 13, 15. — On the part of the Confederate authorities, Gen. Robert E. Lee, writing to Dr. Carter, of Philadelphia, April 17, 1867, said: "Sufficient information has been officially published, I think, to show that whatever sufferings the Federal prisoners at the South underwent were incident to their position as prisoners, and produced by the destitute condition of the country, arising from the operations of war. The laws of the Confederate Congress and the orders of the War Department directed that the rations furnished prisoners of war should be the same in quantity and quality as those furnished enlisted men in the army of the Confederacy, and that the hospitals for prisoners should be placed on the same footing as other Confederate States hospitals in all respects. It was the desire of the Confederate authorities to effect a continuous and speedy exchange of prisoners of war; for it was their true policy to do so, as their retention was not only a calamity to them, but a heavy expenditure of their scanty means of subsistence, and a privation of the services of a veteran army." — *Southern Hist. Soc. Papers, v.* 1, *p.* 122. — In his book on "The War between the States," Alexander H. Stephens wrote as follows: "Large numbers of them [Federal prisoners] were taken to Southwestern Georgia in 1864, because it was a section most remote and secure from the invading Federal armies, and because, too, it was a country of all others then within the Confederate limits not thus threatened with an invasion, most abundant with food, and all resources at command for the health and comfort of prisoners. They were put in one stockade for the want of men to guard more than one. The section of country, moreover, was not regarded as more unhealthy, or more subject to malarious influences than any in the central part of the State. The official order for the erection of the stockade enjoined that it should be in 'a healthy locality, plenty of pure water, a running stream, and, if possible, shade trees, and in the immediate neighborhood of grist and saw mills.' The very selection of the locality, so far from being, as you suppose, made with cruel designs against the prisoners, was governed by the most humane considerations. Your question might, with much more point, be retorted by asking, Why were Southern prisoners taken in the dead of winter with their thin clothing to Camp Douglas, Rock Island, and Johnson's Island — icy regions of the North — where it is a notorious fact that many of them actually froze to death? As far as mortuary returns afford evidence of the general treatment of prisoners on both sides, the figures show nothing to the disadvantage of the Confederates, notwithstanding their limited supplies of all kinds, and notwithstanding all that has been said of the horrible sacrifice of life at Andersonville. It now appears that a larger number of Confederates died in Northern, than of Federals in Southern prisons, or stockades. The report of Mr. Stanton, as Secretary of War, on the 19th of July, 1866, exhibits the fact that, of the Federal prisoners in Confederate hands during the war, only 22,576 died; while of the Confederate prisoners in Federal hands 26,436 died." — Alex. H. Stephens, *The War between the States, v.* 2, *col.* 22. — These statistics differ seriously from the following. "There can be no accurate count of the mortality in rebel prisons. The report made by the War Department to the 40th Congress shows that about 188,000 Union soldiers were captured by the Confederates; that half of them were paroled, and half confined in prison; of this number 36,000 died in captivity. The Union armies, on the other hand, captured 476,000 Confederates; of these 227,000 were retained as prisoners, and 30,000 died. While the percentage of mortality in Northern prisons was 13 in the hundred, that in rebel prisons was 38." — J. G. Nicolay and J. Hay, *Abraham Lincoln, v.* 7, *ch.* 16. — *Rept. of Special Com. on Treatment of Prisoners* (*H. R. Rept. No.* 45, 40*th Cong.*, 3*d Sess.*). — *Trial of Henry Wirz.* — *Southern Hist. Soc. Papers, v.* 1.

Also in: J. McElroy, *Andersonville.* — F. F. Cavada, *Libby Life.* — A. B. Isham, H. M. Davidson and H. B. Furness, *Prisoners of War and Military Prisons.*

PRIVATE WARFARE, The Right of. See Landfriede.

PRIVATEERING, American, in the War of 1812. — "The war [of 1812–14] lasted about three years, and the result was, as near as I have been able to ascertain, a loss to Great Britain of about 2,000 ships and vessels of every description, including men-of-war and merchantmen. . . . I have found it difficult to ascertain the exact number of our own vessels taken and destroyed by the English; but, from the best information I can obtain, I should judge they would not amount to more than 500 sail. It must be recollected that the most of our losses occurred during the first six months of the war. After that period, we had very few vessels afloat, except privateers and letters-of-marque." — G. Coggeshall, *Hist. of Am. Privateers,* 1812–14, *pp.* 394–395.

PRIVATEERS. — LETTERS OF MARQUE. — "Until lately all maritime states have . . . been in the habit of using privateers, which are vessels belonging to private owners, and sailing under a commission of war [such commissions being denominated letters of marque and reprisal] empowering the person to whom it is granted to carry on all forms of hostility which are permissible at sea by the usages of war. . . . Universally as privateers were formerly employed, the right to use them has now almost disappeared from the world. It formed part of the Declaration adopted at the Congress of Paris in 1856 with reference to Maritime Law that 'privateering is and remains abolished'; and all civilised states have since become signataries of the Declaration, except the United States, Spain, and Mexico. For the future privateers can only be employed by signataries of the Declaration of Paris during war with one of the last-mentioned states."—W. E. Hall, *Treatise on International Law, pt.* 3, *ch.* 7, *sect.* 180.— "There is a distinction between a privateer and

a letter of marque in this, that the former are always equipped for the sole purpose of war, while the latter may be a merchantman, uniting the purposes of commerce to those of capture. In popular language, however, all private vessels commissioned for hostile purposes, upon the enemy's property, are called letters of marque." —F. H. Upton, *The Law of Nations affecting Commerce during War, p.* 186.—See, also, DECLARATION OF PARIS.

PRIVILEGE OF UNION AND GENERAL PRIVILEGE OF ARAGON. See CORTES, THE EARLY SPANISH.

PRIVILEGIUM MAJUS, THE. See AUSTRIA: A. D. 1330-1364.

PRIVY COUNCIL, THE.—"It was in the reign of Henry VI. that the King's Council first assumed the name of the 'Privy Council,' and it was also during the minority of this King that a select Council was gradually emerging from out of the larger body of the Privy Council, which ultimately resulted in the institution of our modern Cabinet [see CABINET, THE ENGLISH]. From the accession of Henry VII. to the reign of Charles I. the Privy Council was wholly subservient to the royal will, and the instrument of unconstitutional and arbitrary proceedings. The first act of the Long Parliament was to deprive the Council of most of its judicial power, leaving, however, its constitution and political functions unchanged. Since the Revolution of 1688 the Privy Council has dwindled into comparative insignificance, when contrasted with its original authoritative position. Its judicial functions are now restrained within very narrow limits. The only relic of its ancient authority in criminal matters is its power of taking examinations, and issuing commitments for treason. It still, however, continues to exercise an original jurisdiction in advising the Crown concerning the grant of charters, and it has exclusively assumed the appellate jurisdiction over the colonies and dependencies of the Crown, which formerly appertained to the Council in Parliament. Theoretically, the Privy Council still retains its ancient supremacy, and in a constitutional point of view is presumed to be the only legal and responsible Council of the Crown. . . . As her Majesty can only act through her privy councillors, or upon their advice, all the higher and more formal acts of administration must proceed from the authority of the Sovereign in Council, and their performance be directed by orders issued by the Sovereign at a meeting of the Privy Council specially convened for that purpose. No rule can be laid down defining those political acts of the Crown which may be performed upon the advice of particular ministers, or those which must be exercised only 'in Council'—the distinction depends partly on usage and partly on the wording of Acts of Parliament. . . . The ancient functions of the Privy Council are now performed by committees, excepting those formal measures which proceed from the authority of her Majesty in Council. The acts of these committees are designated as those of the Lords of the Council. These Lords of Council (who are usually selected by the Lord President of the Council, of whom more hereafter) constitute a high court of record for the investigation of all offences against the Government, and of such other extraordinary matters as may be brought before them. . . . If the matter be one properly cognisable by a legal tribunal, it is referred to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. This committee, which is composed of the Lord President, the Lord Chancellor, and such members of the Privy Council as from time to time hold certain high judicial offices, has jurisdiction in appeals from all colonial courts: it is also the supreme court of maritime jurisdiction, and the tribunal wherein the Crown exercises its judicial supremacy in ecclesiastical cases. The Privy Council has also to direct local authorities throughout the kingdom in matters affecting the preservation of the public health. A committee of the Privy Council is also appointed to provide 'for the general management and superintendence of Education,' and subject to this committee is the Science and Art Department for the United Kingdom. . . . Formerly meetings of the Council were frequently held, but they now seldom occur oftener than once in three or four weeks, and are always convened to assemble at the royal residence for the time being. The attendance of seven Privy Councillors used to be regarded as the quorum necessary to constitute a Council for ordinary purposes of state, but this number has been diminished frequently to only three. No Privy Councillor presumes to attend upon any meeting of the Privy Council unless specially summoned. The last time the whole Council was convoked was in 1839. Privy Councillors are appointed absolutely, without patent or grant, at the discretion of the Sovereign. Their number is unlimited. . . . Since the separate existence of the Cabinet Council, meetings of the Privy Council for purposes of deliberation have ceased to be held. The Privy Council consists ordinarily of the members of the Royal Family, the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, the Bishop of London, all the Cabinet Ministers, the Lord Chancellor, the chief officers of the Royal Household, the Judges of the Courts of Equity, the Chief Justices of the Courts of Common Law, and some of the Puisne Judges, the Ecclesiastical and Admiralty Judges and the Judge-Advocate, the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, the Speaker of the House of Commons, the Ambassadors and the Chief Ministers Plenipotentiary, the Governors of the chief colonies, the Commander-in-Chief, the Vice-President of the Committee of Council for Education, certain other officials I need not particularise, and occasionally a Junior Lord of the Admiralty, though it is not usual for Under Secretaries of State or Junior Lords of the Treasury or Admiralty to have this rank conferred upon them. A seat in the Privy Council is sometimes given to persons retiring from the public service, who have filled responsible situations under the Crown, as an honorary distinction. A Privy Councillor is styled Right Honourable, and he takes precedence of all baronets, knights, and younger sons of viscounts and barons."—A. C. Ewald, *The Crown and its Advisers, lect.* 2.

ALSO IN: A. V. Dicey, *The Privy Council.*

PROBULI, The.—A board of ten provisional councillors, instituted at Athens during the later period of the Peloponnesian War, after the great calamity at Syracuse. It was intended to introduce a conservative agency into the too democratic constitution of the state; to be "a board composed of men of mature age, who should examine all proposals and motions, after which

only such among the latter as this board had sanctioned and approved should come before the citizens. This new board was, at the same time, in urgent cases itself to propose the necessary measures."—E. Curtius, *Hist. of Greece, bk.* 4, *ch.* 5.—See ATHENS: B. C. 413–411.

PROBUS, Roman Emperor, A. D. 276–282.

PROBUS, Wall of. See GERMANY: A. D. 277.

PROCESSION OF THE HOLY SPIRIT, Controversy on. See FILIOQUE CONTROVERSY.

PROCONSUL AND PROPRÆTOR, Roman.—"If a Consul was pursuing his operations ever so successfully, he was liable to be superseded at the year's close by his successor in the Consulship: and this successor brought with him new soldiers and new officers; everything, it would seem, had to be done over again. This was always felt in times of difficulty, and the constitutional usages were practically suspended. . . . In the year 328 B. C. the Senate first assumed the power of decreeing that a Consul or Prætor might be continued in his command for several successive years, with the title of Proconsul, or Proprætor, the power of these officers being, within their own district, equal to the power of the Consul or Prætor himself. The Proconsul also was allowed to keep part of his old army, and would of course continue his Tribunes and Centurions in office. . . . Almost all the great successes of Marcellus and Scipio were gained in Proconsular commands."—H. G. Liddell, *Hist. of Rome, bk.* 4, *ch.* 35.

PROCURATOR.—PROCTOR. See ROME: B. C. 31–A. D. 14.

PROHIBITIONISTS.—A party in American politics which contends for the enactment of laws to prohibit the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors. See TEMPERANCE.

PROMANTY, The Right of. See GREECE: B. C. 449–445.

PROPAGANDA, The College of the. See PAPACY: A. D. 1622.

PROPHESYINGS.—In the early part of the reign of Queen Elizabeth, among those English reformers who were subsequently known as Puritans, "the clergy in several dioceses set up, with encouragement from their superiors, a certain religious exercise, called prophesyings. They met at appointed times to expound and discuss together particular texts of Scripture, under the presidency of a moderator appointed by the bishop, who finished by repeating the substance of their debate, with his own determination upon it. These discussions were in public, and it was contended that this sifting of the grounds of their faith, and habitual argumentation, would both tend to edify the people, very little acquainted as yet with their religion, and supply in some degree the deficiencies of learning among the pastors themselves." The prophesyings, however, were suppressed by the queen and Archbishop Parker. —H. Hallam, *Const. Hist. of Eng., ch.* 4 (*v.* 1).

ALSO IN: J. B. Marsden, *Hist. of the Early Puritans, ch.* 4, *sect.* 7–25.

PROPHETS, The Hebrew.—"The Hebrew word 'Nabi' is derived from the verb 'naba.' . . . The root of the verb is said to be a word signifying 'to boil or bubble over,' and is thus taken from the metaphor of a fountain bursting forth from the heart of man, into which God has poured it. Its actual meaning is 'to pour forth excited utterances,' as appears from its occasional use in the sense of 'raving.' Even to this day, in the East, the ideas of prophet and madman are closely connected. The religious sense, in which, with these exceptions, the word is always employed, is that of 'speaking' or 'singing under a divine afflatus or impulse,' to which the peculiar form of the word, as just observed, lends itself. . . . It is this word that the Seventy translated by a Greek term not of frequent usage in classical authors, but which, through their adoption of it, has passed into all modern European languages; namely, the word . . . Prophet. . . . The English words 'prophet,' 'prophecy,' 'prophesying,' originally kept tolerably close to the Biblical use of the word. The celebrated dispute about 'prophesyings,' in the sense of 'preachings,' in the reign of Elizabeth, and the treatise of Jeremy Taylor on 'The Liberty of Prophesying,' i. e. the liberty of preaching, show that even down to the seventeenth century the word was still used, as in the Bible, for 'preaching,' or 'speaking according to the will of God.' In the seventeenth century, however, the limitation of the word to the sense of 'prediction' had gradually begun to appear. . . . The Prophet then was 'the messenger or interpreter of the Divine will.'"—Dean Stanley, *Lect's on the Hist. of the Jewish Church, lect.* 19 (*v.* 1).

PROPHETS, Schools of the. See EDUCATION, ANCIENT; JUDÆA.

PROPONTIS, The.—The small sea which intervenes between the Pontus Euxinus (Black Sea) and the Ægean. So-called by the Greeks; now called the Sea of Marmora.

PROPRÆTOR, Roman. See PROCONSUL.

PROPYLÆA OF THE ACROPOLIS, The. See ACROPOLIS OF ATHENS.

PROTECTIVE TARIFFS. See TARIFF LEGISLATION.

PROTECTORATE, Cromwell's. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1653 (DECEMBER); 1654–1658.

PROTESTANT, Origin of the name. See PAPACY: A. D. 1525–1529.

PROTESTANT FLAIL, The. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1678–1679.

PROTESTANT REFORMATION: Bohemia. See BOHEMIA: A.D. 1405–1415, and after.

England. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1527–1534, to 1558–1588.

France. See PAPACY: A. D. 1521–1535; and FRANCE: A. D. 1532–1547, and after.

Germany. See PAPACY: A. D. 1516–1517, 1517, 1517–1521, 1521–1522, 1522–1525, 1525–1529, 1530–1531, 1537–1563; also, GERMANY: A. D. 1517–1523, and 1530–1532, to 1552–1561; also PALATINATE OF THE RHINE: A. D. 1518–1572.

Hungary. See HUNGARY. A. D. 1526–1567.

Ireland: its failure. See IRELAND: A. D. 1535–1553.

Netherlands. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1521–1555, and after.

Piedmont. See SAVOY: A. D. 1559–1580.

Scotland. See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1547–1557; 1557; 1558–1560; and 1561–1568.

Sweden and Denmark. See SCANDINAVIAN STATES: A. D. 1397–1527.

Switzerland. See PAPACY: A. D. 1519–1524; SWITZERLAND: A. D. 1528–1531; and GENEVA: A. D. 1536–1564.

PROTOSEVASTOS. See SEVASTOS.

PROVENCE: Roman origin.—"The colonization of Narbo [Narbonne, B. C. 118] may be considered as the epoch when the Romans finally settled the province of southern Gallia, which they generally named Gallia Provincia, and sometimes simply Provincia. From the time of Augustus it was named Narbonensis Provincia, and sometimes Gallia Braccata. It comprehended on the east all the country between the Rhone and the Alps. The most northeastern town in the Provincia was Geneva in the territory of the Allobroges. Massilia, the ally of Rome, remained a free city. On the west side of the Rhone, from the latitude of Lugdunum (Lyon), the Cevenna, or range of the Cévennes, was the boundary of the Provincia. . . . The limits of the Provincia were subsequently extended to Carcaso (Carcassone) and Tolosa (Toulouse); and it will appear afterwards that some additions were made to it even on the other side of the Cévennes. This country is a part of France which is separated by natural boundaries from the rest of that great empire, and in climate and products it is Italian rather than French. In the Provincia the Romans have left some of the noblest and most enduring of their great works."—G. Long, *Decline of the Roman Republic, v.* 1, *ch.* 22.—The Provincia of the Romans became the Provence of mediæval times.

Cession to the Visigoths.—"The fair region which we now call Provence, nearly the earliest formed and quite the latest lost 'Provincia' of Rome, that region in which the Latin spirit dwelt so strongly that the Roman nobles thought of migrating thither in 401, when Alaric first invaded Italy, refused to submit to the rule of the upstart barbarian [Odovacar, or Odoacer, who subverted the Western Empire in 476]. The Provençals sent an embassy to Constantinople to claim the protection of Zeno for the still loyal subjects of the Empire." But Zeno "inclined to the cause of Odovacar. The latter, however, who perhaps thought that he had enough upon his hands without forcing his yoke on the Provençals, made over his claim to Euric king of the Visigoths, whose influence was at this time predominant in Gaul."—T. Hodgkin, *Italy and Her Invaders, bk.* 4, *ch.* 4 (*v.* 3).—See, also, ARLES: A. D. 508-510.

A. D. 493-526.—Embraced in the Ostrogothic kingdom of Theodoric. See ROME: A. D. 488-526.

A. D. 536.—Cession to the Franks.—Out of the wreck of the Visigothic kingdom in Gaul, when it was overthrown by the Frank king, Clovis, the Ostrogothic king of Italy, Theodoric, seems to have secured Provence. Eleven years after the death of Theodoric, and on the eve of the subversion of his own proudly planted kingdom, in 536, his successor Witigis, or Vitigis, bought the neutrality of the Franks by the cession to them of all the Ostrogothic possessions in Gaul, which were Provence and part of Dauphiné.—T. Hodgkin, *Italy and Her Invaders, bk.* 4, *ch.* 9 (*v.* 3), *and bk.* 5, *ch.* 3 (*v.* 4).

A. D. 877-933.—The Kingdom. See BURGUNDY: A. D. 843-933.

A. D. 943-1092.—The Kings become Counts.—The Spanish connection.—"Southern France, . . . after having been the inheritance of several of the successors of Charlemagne, was elevated in 879 to the rank of an independent kingdom, by Bozon, who was crowned at Mantes under the title of King of Arles, and who reduced under his dominion Provence, Dauphiny, Savoy, the Lyonnese, and some provinces of Burgundy. The sovereignty of this territory exchanged, in 943, the title of King for that of Count, under Bozon II.; but the kingdom of Provence was preserved entire, and continued in the house of Burgundy, of which Bozon I. was the founder. This noble house became extinct in 1092, in the person of Gilibert, who left only two daughters, between whom his possessions were divided. One of these, Faydide, married Alphonso, Count of Toulouse; and the other, Douce, became the wife of Raymond Berenger, Count of Barcelona. . . . The accession of Raymond Berenger, Count of Barcelona and husband of Douce, to the throne of Provence, gave a new direction to the national spirit, by the mixture of the Catalans with the Provençals. . . . Raymond Berenger and his successors introduced into Provence the spirit both of liberty and chivalry, and a taste for elegance and the arts, with all the sciences of the Arabians. The union of these noble sentiments gave birth to that poetical spirit which shone out, at once, over Provence and all the south of Europe, like an electric flash in the midst of the most palpable darkness, illuminating all things by the brightness of its flame."—J. C. L. S. de Sismondi, *Literature of the South of Europe, ch.* 3 (*v.* 1).—See, also, BURGUNDY: A. D. 1032.

A. D. 1179-1207.—Before the Albigensian Crusade.—"At the accession of Philippe Auguste [crowned as joint-king of France, 1179, succeeded his father, 1180], the greater part of the south of France was holden, not of him, but of Pedro of Arragon, as the supreme suzerain [see SPAIN: A. D. 1035-1258]. To the Arragonese king belonged especially the counties of Provence, Forcalquier, Narbonne, Beziers, and Carcassonne. His supremacy was acknowledged by the Counts of Bearn, of Armagnac, of Bigorre, of Comminges, of Foix, of Roussillon, and of Montpellier; while the powerful Count of Toulouse, surrounded by his estates and vassals, maintained with difficulty his independence against him. To these extensive territories were given the names sometimes of Provence, in the larger and less exact use of that word, and sometimes of Languedoc, in allusion to the rich, harmonious, picturesque, and flexible language which was then vernacular there [see LANGUE D'OC]. They who used it called themselves Provençaux or Aquitanians, to indicate that they were not Frenchmen, but members of a different and indeed of a hostile nation. Tracing their descent to the ancient Roman colonists and to the Gothic invaders of Southern Gaul, the Provençaux regarded with a mixture of contempt, of fear, and ill will, the inhabitants of the country north of the Loire, who had made far less progress than themselves, either in civil liberty, or in the arts and refinements of social life. . . . Toulouse, Marseilles, Arles, Beziers, and many other of their greater cities, emulous of the Italian republics, with whom they traded and formed alliances, were themselves living under a government which was virtually republican. Each of these free cities being, however, the capital of one of the greater lords among whom the whole of Aquitaine was parceled out, became the seat of a princely and luxurious court. A genial climate, a fertile soil, and an active commerce,

rendered the means of subsistence abundant even to the poor, and gave to the rich ample resources for indulging in all the gratifications which wealth can purchase. . . . They lived as if life had been one protracted holiday. Theirs was the land of feasting, of gallantry, and of mirth. . . . They refined and enhanced the pleasures of appetite by the pleasures of the imagination. They played with the stern features of war in knightly tournaments. They parodied the severe toils of justice in their courts of love. They transferred the poet's sacred office and high vocation to the Troubadours, whose amatory and artificial effusions posterity has willingly let die, notwithstanding the recent labours of MM. Raynouard and Fauriel to revive them."— Sir J. Stephen, *Lect's on the Hist. of France, lect.* 7.— "In the south of France, more particularly, peace, riches, and a court life, had introduced, amongst the nobility, an extreme laxity of manners. Gallantry seems to have been the sole object of their existence. The ladies, who only appeared in society after marriage, were proud of the celebrity which their lovers conferred on their charms. They were delighted with becoming the objects of the songs of their Troubadour; nor were they offended at the poems composed in their praise, in which gallantry was often mingled with licentiousness. They even themselves professed the Gay Science, 'el Gai Saber,' for thus poetry was called; and, in their turn, they expressed their feelings in tender and impassioned verses. They instituted Courts of Love, where questions of gallantry were gravely debated and decided by their suffrages. They gave, in short, to the whole south of France the character of a carnival, affording a singular contrast to the ideas of reserve, virtue, and modesty, which we usually attribute to those good old times."— J. C. L. S. de Sismondi, *Literature of the South of Europe, ch.* 3 (*v.* 1).

Also in: C. C. Fauriel, *Hist. of Provençal Poetry.*— See, also, Troubadours.

A. D. 1209-1242.—The Albigensian Crusades. See Albigenses.

A. D. 1246.— The count becomes founder of the Third House of Anjou. See Anjou: A. D. 1206-1442.

A. D. 1348.—Sale and transfer of Avignon to the Pope. See Papacy: A. D. 1294-1348.

A. D. 1536-1546.—Invasion by Charles V.— Defensive wasting of the country.—Massacre of Waldenses. See France: A. D. 1532-1547.

16th Century.—Strength of Protestantism. See France: A. D. 1559-1561.

PROVIDENCE, R. I.: The Plantation and the City. See Rhode Island.

PROVISIONS OF OXFORD AND WESTMINSTER. See Oxford, Provisions of.

PROVISORS, Statute of. See England: A. D. 1306-1393.

PROXENI.— In ancient Sparta, "the so-called Proxeni, whose number was fluctuating, served as the subordinates of the kings in their diplomatic communication with foreign States."—G. Schömann, *Antiq. of Greece: The State, pt.* 3, *ch.* 1, *sect.* 9.

PRUSA: A. D. 1326.—The first capital of the Ottomans. See Turks (Ottomans): A. D. 1240-1326.

PRUSSIA: The original country and its name.—"Five-hundred miles, and more, to the east of Brandenburg, lies a Country then [10th century] as now called Preussen (Prussia Proper), inhabited by Heathens, where also endeavours at conversion are going on, though without success hitherto. . . . Part of the great plain or flat which stretches, sloping insensibly, continuously, in vast expanse, from the Silesian Mountains to the amber-regions of the Baltic; Preussen is the seaward, more alluvial part of this,— extending west and east, on both sides of the Weichsel (Vistula), from the regions of the Oder river to the main stream of the Memel. 'Bordering-on-Russia' its name signifies: Bor-Russia, B'russia, Prussia; or — some say it was only on a certain inconsiderable river in those parts, river Reussen, that it 'bordered,' and not on the great Country, or any part of it, which now in our days is conspicuously its next neighbour. Who knows?—In Henry the Fowler's time, and long afterwards, Preussen was a vehemently Heathen country; the natives a Miscellany of rough Serbic Wends, Letts, Swedish Goths, or Dryasdust knows not what;— very probably a sprinkling of Swedish Goths, from old time, chiefly along the coasts. Dryasdust knows only that these Preussen were a strong-boned, iracund herdsman-and-fisher people; highly averse to be interfered with, in their religion especially. Famous otherwise, through all the centuries, for the amber they had been used to fish, and sell in foreign parts. . . . Their knowledge of Christianity was trifling; their aversion to knowing anything of it was great."—T. Carlyle, *Frederick the Great, bk.* 2, *ch.* 2.

13th Century.—Conquered and Christianized by the Teutonic Knights.—The first Christian missionary who ventured among the savage heathen of Prussia Proper was Adalbert, bishop of Prague, who fell a martyr to his zeal in 997. For two centuries after that tragedy they were little disturbed in their paganism; but early in the 13th century a Pomeranian monk named Christian succeeded in establishing among them many promising churches. The heathen party in the country, however, was enraged by the progress of the Christians and rose furiously against them, putting numerous converts to the sword. "Other agencies were now invoked by Bishop Christian, and the 'Order of Knights Brethren of Dobrin,' formed on the model of that which we have already encountered in Livonia, was bidden to coerce the people into the reception of Christianity. But they failed to achieve the task assigned them, and then it was that the famous 'Order of Teutonic Knights,' united with the 'Brethren of the Sword' in Livonia, concentrated their energies on this European crusade. Originally instituted for the purpose of succouring German pilgrims in the Holy Land, the 'Order of Teutonic Knights,' now that the old crusades had become unpopular, enrolled numbers of eager adventurers determined to expel the last remains of heathenism from the face of Europe. After the union of the two Orders had been duly solemnized at Rome, in the presence of the Pope, in the year A. D. 1238, they entered the Prussian territory, and for a space of nearly fifty years continued a series of remorseless wars against the wretched inhabitants. Slowly but surely they made their way into the

very heart of the country, and secured their conquests by erecting castles, under the shadow of which rose the towns of Culm, Thorn, Marienwerder, and Elbing, which they peopled with German colonists. The authority of the Order knew scarcely any bounds. Themselves the faithful vassals of the Pope, they exacted the same implicit obedience, alike from the German immigrant, or colonist, and the converted Prussians. . . . In A. D. 1243 the conquered lands were divided by the Pope into three bishoprics, Culm, Pomerania, and Ermeland, each of which was again divided into three parts, one being subject to the bishop, and the other two to the brethren of the Order."—G. F. Maclear, *Apostles of Mediæval Europe, ch.* 16.—"None of the Orders rose so high as the Teutonic in favour with mankind. It had by degrees landed possessions far and wide over Germany and beyond, . . . and was thought to deserve favour from above. Valiant servants, these; to whom Heaven had vouchsafed great labours and unspeakable blessings. In some fifty or fifty-three years they had got Prussian Heathenism brought to the ground; and they endeavoured to tie it well down there by bargain and arrangement. But it would not yet lie quiet, nor for a century to come; being still secretly Heathen; revolting, conspiring ever again, ever on weaker terms, till the Satanic element had burnt itself out, and conversion and composure could ensue."—T. Carlyle, *Hist. of Frederick the Great, bk.* 2, *ch.* 6 (*v.* 1).—See, also, Livonia: 12–13th Centuries.

A. D. 1466-1618.—Conquest and annexation to the Polish crown.—Surrender by the Teutonic Knights.—Erection into a duchy.—Union with the electorate of Brandenburg. See Poland: A. D. 1333–1572; and Brandenburg: A. D. 1417–1640.

A. D. 1626-1629.—Conquests of Gustavus Adolphus of Sweden in his war with Poland. See Scandinavian States (Sweden): A. D. 1611–1629.

A. D. 1656-1688.—Complete sovereignty of the duchy acquired by the Great Elector of Brandenburg.—His curbing of the nobles. See Brandenburg: A. D. 1640–1688.

A. D. 1700.—The Dukedom erected into a Kingdom.—In the last year of the 17th century, Europe was on the verge of the great War of the Spanish Succession. The Emperor was making ready to contest the will by which Charles II. of Spain had bequeathed his crown to Philip, Duke of Anjou, grandson of Louis XIV. of France (see Spain: A. D. 1698–1700). "He did not doubt that he would speedily involve England, Holland, and the Germanic diet in his quarrel. Already several German princes were pledged to him; he had gained the Duke of Hanover by an elector's hat, and a more powerful prince, the Elector of Brandenburg, by a royal crown. By a treaty of November 16, 1700, the Emperor had consented to the erection of ducal Prussia into a kingdom, on condition that the new King should furnish him an aid of 10,000 soldiers. The Elector Frederick III. apprised his courtiers of this important news at the close of a repast, by drinking 'to the health of Frederick I. King of Prussia'; then caused himself to be proclaimed King at Königsberg, January 15, 1701."—H. Martin, *Hist. of France: Age of Louis XIV.* (*tr. by M. L. Booth*), *v.* 2, *ch.* 5.

A. D. 1713.—Neufchatel and Spanish Guelderland acquired.—Orange relinquished. See Utrecht: A. D. 1712–1714.

A. D. 1717-1809.—Abolition of serfdom. See Slavery, Mediæval: Germany.

A. D. 1720.—Acquisition of territory from Sweden, including Stettin. See Scandinavian States (Sweden): A. D. 1719–1721.

A. D. 1720-1794.—Reign of Frederick William I., and after.—The later history of Prussia, under Frederick William, Frederick the Great, and their successors, will be found included in that of Germany.

PRUSSIAN LANGUAGE, The Old.—"The Old Prussian, a member of the Lithuanic family of languages, was spoken here as late as the 16th century, remains of which, in the shape of a catechism, are extant. This is the language of the ancient Æstyi, or 'Men of the East,' which Tacitus says was akin to the British, an error arising from the similarity of name, since a Slavonian . . . would call the two languages by names so like as 'Prytskaia' and 'Brytskaia,' and a German . . . by names so like as 'Pryttisc' and 'Bryttisc.' The Guttones, too, of Pliny, whose locality is fixed from the fact of their having been collecters of the amber of East Prussia and Courland, were of the same stock."—R. G. Latham, *The Ethnology of Europe, ch.* 8.

PRUTH, The Treaty of the (1711). See Scandinavian States (Sweden): A. D. 1707–1718.

PRYDYN. See Scotland: The Picts and Scots.

PRYTANES.—PRYTANEUM.—The Council of Four Hundred, said to have been instituted at Athens by Solon, "was divided into sections, which, under the venerable name of prytanes, succeeded each other throughout the year as the representatives of the whole body. Each section during its term assembled daily in their session house, the prytaneum, to consult on the state of affairs, to receive intelligence, information, and suggestions, and instantly to take such measures as the public interest rendered it necessary to adopt without delay. . . . According to the theory of Solon's constitution, the assembly of the people was little more than the organ of the council, as it could only act upon the propositions laid before it by the latter."—C. Thirlwall, *Hist. of Greece, ch.* 11.—"Clisthenes . . . enlarged the number of the senate, 50 being now elected by lot from each tribe, so as to make in all 500. Each of these companies of 50 acted as presidents of both the senate and the assemblies, for a tenth part of the year, under the name of Prytanes: and each of these tenth parts, of 35 or 36 days, so as to complete a lunar year, was called a Prytany."—G. F. Schömann, *Dissertation on the Assemblies of the Athenians, p.* 14.—See, also, Athens: B. C. 594.

PRYTANIS.—A title frequently recurring among the Greeks was that of Prytanis, which signified prince, or supreme ruler. "Even Hiero, the king or tyrant of Syracuse, is addressed by Pindar as Prytanis. At Corinth, after the abolition of the monarchy, a Prytanis, taken from the ancient house of the Bacchiadæ, was annually appointed as supreme magistrate [see Corinth: B. C. 745–725]. . . . The same title was borne by the supreme magistrate in the

Corinthian colony of Corcyra. . . . In Rhodes we find in the time of Polybius a Prytany lasting for six months."—G. Schömann, *Antiq. of Greece: The State, pt.* 2, *ch.* 5.

PSALTER OF CASHEL.—PSALTER OF TARA. See TARA, HILL AND FEIS OF.

PSEPHISM.—A decree, or enactment, in ancient Athens.

PSEUDO-ISIDORIAN DECRETALS, The. See PAPACY: A. D. 829–847.

PTOLEMAIS, Syria. See ACRE.

PTOLEMIES, The. See EGYPT: B. C. 323–30.

PTOLEMY KERAUNOS, The intrigues and death of. See MACEDONIA: B. C. 297–280; and GAULS: B. C. 280–279.

PTOLEMY SOTER, and the Wars of the Diadochi. See MACEDONIA: B. C. 323–316, to 297–280; and EGYPT: B. C. 323–30.

PTOLEMY'S CANON.—An important chronological list of Chaldean, Persian, Macedonian and Egyptian kings, compiled or continued by Claudius Ptolemæus, an Alexandrian mathematician and astronomer in the reign of the Second Antoninus.—W. Hales, *New Analysis of Chronology, v.* 1, *bk.* 1.

PUANS, OR WINNEBAGOES, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: SIOUAN FAMILY.

PUBLIC MEALS. See SYSSITIA.

PUBLIC PEACE, The. See LANDFRIEDE.

PUBLIC WEAL, League of the. See FRANCE: A. D. 1461–1468; and 1453–1461.

PUBLICANI.—The farmers of the taxes, among the Romans. See VECTIGAL.

PUBLICIANI, The. See ALBIGENSES; and PAULICIANS.

PUEBLA: Capture by the French (1862). See MEXICO: A. D. 1861–1867.

PUBLILIAN LAW OF VOLERO, The. See ROME: B. C. 472–471.

PUBLILIAN LAWS, The. See ROME: B. C. 340.

PUEBLOS.—The Spanish word pueblo, meaning town, village, or the inhabitants thereof, has acquired a special signification as applied, first, to the sedentary or village Indians of New Mexico and Arizona, and then to the singular villages of communal houses which they inhabit.—D. G. Brinton, *The American Race, p.* 113.—"The purely civic colonies of California were called pueblos to distinguish them from missions or presidios. The term pueblo, in its most extended meaning, may embrace towns of every description, from a hamlet to a city. . . . However, in its special significance, a pueblo means a corporate town."—F. W. Blackmar, *Spanish Institutions of the Southwest, ch.* 8.—See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: PUEBLOS.

PUELTS, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: PAMPAS TRIBES.

PUERTO CAVELLO, Spanish capitulation at (1823). See COLOMBIAN STATES: A. D. 1819–1830.

PUJUNAN FAMILY, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: PUJUNAN FAMILY.

PULASKI, Fort: A. D. 1861.—Threatened by the Union forces. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1861 (OCTOBER—DECEMBER: SOUTH CAROLINA—GEORGIA).

A. D. 1862 (February—April).—Siege and capture. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1862 (FEBRUARY—APRIL: GEORGIA—FLORIDA).

PULLANI, The.—The descendants of the first Crusaders who remained in the East and married Asiatic women are represented as having been a very despicable half-breed race. They were called the Pullani. Prof. Palmer suggests a derivation of the name from "fulani," anybodies. Mr. Keightley, on the contrary, states that before the crusading colonists overcame their prejudice against Oriental wives, women were brought to them from Apulia, in Italy. Whence the name Pullani, applied indiscriminately to all the progeny of the Latin settlers.—W. Besant and E. H. Palmer, *Jerusalem, ch.* 7.

ALSO IN: T. Keightley, *The Crusaders* [*ch.* 2].

PULTNEY ESTATE, The. See NEW YORK: A. D. 1786–1799.

PULTOWA, Battle of (1709). See SCANDINAVIAN STATES (SWEDEN): A. D. 1707–1718.

PULTUSK, Battle of (1703). See SCANDINAVIAN STATES (SWEDEN): A. D. 1701–1707. . . . **Battle of (1806).** See GERMANY: A. D. 1806–1807.

PUMBADITHA, The School of. See JEWS: 7TH CENTURY.

PUNCAS, OR PONCAS, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: SIOUAN FAMILY, and PAWNEE (CADDOAN) FAMILY.

PUNIC.—The adjective Punicus, derived from the name of the Phœnicians, was used by the Romans in a sense which commonly signified "Carthaginian,"—the Carthaginians being of Phœnician origin. Hence "Punic Wars," "Punic faith," etc., the phrase "Punic faith" being an imputation of faithlessness and treachery.

PUNIC WARS, The First.—When Pyrrhus quitted Italy he is said to have exclaimed, "How fair a battle-field are we leaving to the Romans and Carthaginians." He may easily have had sagacity to foresee the deadly struggle which Rome and Carthage would soon be engaged in, and he might as easily have predicted, too, that the beginning of it would be in Sicily. Rome had just settled her supremacy in the whole Italian peninsula; she was sure to covet next the rich island that lies so near to it. In fact, there was bred quickly in the Roman mind such an eagerness to cross the narrow strait that it waited only for the slenderest excuse. A poor pretext was found in the year 264 B. C. and it was so despicably poor that the proud Roman senators turned over to the popular assembly of the Comitia the responsibility of accepting it. There came to Rome from Messene, in Sicily—or Messana, as the Romans called the city—an appeal. It did not come from the citizens of Messene, but from a band of freebooters who had got possession of the town. These were mercenaries from Campania (lately made Roman territory by the Samnite conquest) who had been in the pay of Agathocles of Syracuse. Disbanded on that tyrant's death, they had treacherously seized Messene, slain most of the male inhabitants, taken to themselves the women, and settled down to a career of piracy and robbery, assuming the name of Mamertini,—children of Mamers, or Mars. Of course, all Sicily, both Greek and Carthaginian, was roused against them by the outrages they committed. Being hard pressed, the Mamertines invoked, as Italians, the protection of Rome; although one party among them appears to have preferred an arrangement of

terms with the Carthaginians. The Roman Senate, being ashamed to extend a friendly hand to the Mamertine cutthroats, but not having virtue enough to decline an opportunity for fresh conquests, referred the question to the people at large. The popular vote sent an army into Sicily, and Messene, then besieged by Hiero of Syracuse on one side and by a Carthaginian army on the other, was relieved of both. The Romans thereon proceeded, in two aggressive campaigns, against Syracusans and Carthaginians alike, until Hiero bought peace with them, at a heavy cost, and became their half-subject ally for the remainder of his life. The war with the Carthaginians was but just commenced. Its first stunning blow was struck at Agrigentum, the splendid city of Phalaris, which the Carthaginians had destroyed, B. C. 405, which Timoleon had rebuilt, and which one of the Hannibals ("son of Gisco") now seized upon for his stronghold. In a great battle fought under the walls of Agrigentum (B. C. 262) Hannibal lost the city and all but a small remnant of his army. But the successes of the Romans on land were worth little to them while the Carthaginians commanded the sea. Hence they resolved to create a fleet, and are said to have built a hundred ships of the quinquereme order and twenty triremes within sixty days, while rowers for them were trained by an imitative exercise on land. The first squadron of this improvised navy was trapped at Lipara and lost; the remainder was successful in its first encounter with the enemy. But where naval warfare depended on good seamanship the Romans were no match for the Carthaginians. They contrived therefore a machine for their ships, called the Corvus, or raven, by which, running straight on the opposing vessel, they were able to grasp it by the throat, so to speak, and force fighting at close quarters. That accomplished, they were tolerably sure of victory. With their corvus they half annihilated the Carthaginian fleet in a great sea-fight at Mylæ, B. C. 260, and got so much mastery of the sea that they were able to attack their Punic foes even in the island of Sardinia, but without much result. In 257 B. C. another naval battle of doubtful issue was fought at Tyndaris, and the following year, in the great battle of Ecnomus, the naval power of the Carthaginians, for the time being, was utterly crushed. Then followed the invasion of Carthaginian territory by Regulus, his complete successes at first, his insolent proposal of hard terms, and the tremendous defeat which overwhelmed him at Adis a little later, when he, himself, was taken prisoner. The miserable remnant of the Roman army which held its ground at Clypea on the African coast was rescued the next year (B. C. 255) by a new fleet, but only to be destroyed on the voyage homeward, with 260 ships, in a great storm on the south coast of Sicily. Then Carthaginians reappeared in Sicily and the war in that unhappy island was resumed. In 254 B. C. the Romans took the strong fortified city of Panormus. In 253, having built and equipped another fleet, they were robbed of it again by a storm at sea, and the Carthaginians gained ground and strength in Sicily. In 251 the Roman consul, Cæcilius Metellus, drove them back from the walls of Panormus and inflicted on them so discouraging a defeat, that they sent Regulus, their prisoner, on parole, with an embassy, to solicit peace at Rome. How Regulus advised his countrymen against peace, and how he returned to Carthage to meet a cruel death—the traditional story is familiar to all readers, but modern criticism throws doubt upon it. In 250 B. C. the Romans undertook the siege of Lilybæum, which, with the neighboring port of Drepana, were the only strongholds left to the Carthaginians. The siege then commenced was one of the most protracted in history, for when the First Punic War ended, nine years later, Lilybæum was still resisting, and the Romans only acquired it with all the rest of Sicily, under the terms of the treaty of peace. Meantime the Carthaginians won a bloody naval victory at Drepana (B. C. 249) over the Roman fleet, and the latter, in the same year, had a third fleet destroyed on the coast by relentless storms. In the year 247 B. C. the Carthaginian command in Sicily was given to the great Hamilcar, surnamed Barca, who was the father of a yet greater man, the Hannibal who afterwards brought Rome very near to destruction. Hamilcar Barca, having only a few mutinous mercenary soldiers at his command, and almost unsupported by the authorities at Carthage, established himself, first, on the rocky height of Mount Ercte, or Hercte, near Panormus, and afterwards on Mount Eryx, and harassed the Romans for six years. The end came at last as the consequence of a decisive naval victory near the Ægatian Isles, which the Romans achieved, with a newly built fleet, in March B. C. 241. The Carthaginians, discouraged, proposed peace, and purchased it by evacuating Sicily and paying a heavy war indemnity. Thus Rome acquired Sicily, but the wealth and civilization of the great island had been ruined beyond recovery.—R. B. Smith, *Carthage and the Carthaginians, ch.* 4–7.

Also in: W. Ihne, *Hist. of Rome, bk.* 4, *ch.* 3.—Polybius, *Histories, bk.* 1.—A. J. Church, *The Story of Carthage, pt.* 4, *ch.* 1–3.—See, also, Rome: B. C. 264–241.

The Second.—Between the First Punic War and the Second there was an interval of twenty-three years. Carthage, meantime, had been brought very near to destruction by the Revolt of the Mercenaries (see Carthage: B. C. 241–238) and had been saved by the capable energy of Hamilcar Barca. Then the selfish faction which hated Hamilcar had regained power in the Punic capital, and the Barcine patriot could do no more than obtain command of an army which he led, on his own responsibility, into Spain, B. C. 237. The Carthaginians had inherited from the Phœnicians a considerable commerce with Spain, but do not seem to have organized a control of the country until Hamilcar took the task in hand. Partly by pacific influences and partly by force, he established a rule, rather personal than Carthaginian, which extended over nearly all southern Spain. With the wealth that he drew from its gold and silver mines he maintained his army and bought or bribed at Carthage the independence he needed for the carrying out of his plans. He had aimed from the first, no doubt, at organizing resources with which to make war on Rome. Hamilcar was killed in battle, B. C. 228, and his son-in-law, Hasdrubal, who succeeded him, lived only seven years more. Then Hannibal, the son of Hamilcar, in his twenty-sixth year, was chosen to the command in Spain. He waited two years, for

the settling of his authority and for making all preparations complete, and then he threw down a challenge to the Romans for the war which he had sworn to his father that he would make the one purpose of his life. The provocation of war was the taking of the city of Saguntum, a Greek colony on the Spanish coast, which the Romans had formed an alliance with. It was taken by Hannibal after a siege of eight months and after most of the inhabitants had destroyed themselves, with their wealth. When Rome declared war it was with the expectation, no doubt, that Spain and Africa would be the battle grounds. But Hannibal did not wait for her attack. He led his Spanish army straight to Italy, in the early summer of B. C. 218, skirting the Pyrenees and crossing the Alps. The story of his passage of the Alps is familiar to every reader. The difficulties he encountered were so terrible and the losses sustained so great that Hannibal descended into Italy with only 20,000 foot and 6,000 horse, out of 50,000 of the one and 9,000 of the other which he had led through Gaul. He received some reinforcement and co-operation from the Cisalpine Gauls, but their strength had been broken by recent wars with Rome and they were not efficient allies. In the first encounter of the Romans with the dread invader, on the Ticinus, they were beaten, but not seriously. In the next, on the Trebia, where Scipio, the consul, made a determined stand, they sustained an overwhelming defeat. This ended the campaign of B. C. 218. Hannibal wintered in Cisalpine Gaul and passed the Apennines the following spring into Etruria, stealing a march on the Roman army, under the popular consul Flaminius, which was watching to intercept him. The latter pursued and was caught in ambush at Lake Trasimene, where Flaminius and 15,000 of his men were slain, while most of the survivors of the fatal field were taken prisoners and made slaves. Rome then seemed open to the Carthaginian, but he knew, without doubt, that his force was not strong enough for the besieging of the city, and he made no attempt. What he aimed at was the isolating of Rome and the arraying of Italy against her, in a great and powerfully handled combination of the jealousies and animosities which he knew to exist. He led his troops northward again, after the victory of Lake Trasimene, across the mountains to the Adriatic coast, and rested them during the summer. When cooler weather came he moved southward along the coast into Apulia. The Romans meantime had chosen a Dictator, Q. Fabius Maximus, a cautious man, whose plan of campaign was to watch and harass and wear out the enemy, without risking a battle. It was a policy which earned for him the name of "The Cunctator," or Lingerer. The Roman people were discontented with it, and next year (B. C. 216) they elected for one of the consuls a certain Varro who had been one of the mouthpieces of their discontent. In opposition to his colleague, Æmilius Paullus, Varro soon forced a battle with Hannibal at Cannæ, in Apulia, and brought upon his countrymen the most awful disaster in war that they ever knew. Nearly 50,000 Roman citizens were left dead on the field, including eighty senators, and half the young nobility of the state. From the spoils of the field Hannibal was said to have sent three bushels of golden rings to Carthage, stripped from the fingers of Roman knights. Rome reeled under the blow, and yet haughtily refused to ransom the 20,000 prisoners in Hannibal's hands, while she met the discomfited Varro with proud thanks, because "he had not despaired of the Republic." Capua now opened its gates to Hannibal and became the headquarters of his operations. The people of Southern Italy declared generally in his favor; but he had reached and passed, nevertheless, the crowning point of his success. He received no effective help from Carthage; nor from his brother in Spain, who was defeated by the elder Scipios, that same year (B. C. 216) at Ibera, just as he had prepared to lead a fresh army into Italy. On the other hand, the energies of the Romans had risen with every disaster. Their Latin subjects continued faithful to them; but they lost at this time an important ally in Sicily, by the death of the aged Hiero of Syracuse, and the Carthaginians succeeded in raising most of the island against them. The war in Sicily now became for a time more important than that in Italy, and the consul Marcellus, the most vigorous of the Roman generals, was sent to conduct it. His chief object was the taking of Syracuse and the great city sustained another of the many dreadful sieges which it was her fate to endure. The siege was prolonged for two years, and chiefly by the science and the military inventions of the famous mathematician, Archimides. When the Romans entered Syracuse at last (B. C. 212) it was to pillage and slay without restraint, and Archimides was one of the thousands cut down by their swords. Meantime, in Italy, Tarentum had been betrayed to Hannibal, but the Romans still held the citadel of the town. They had gained so much strength in the field that they were now able to lay siege to Capua and Hannibal was powerless to relieve it. He attempted a diversion by marching on Rome, but the threat proved idle and Capua was left to its fate. The city surrendered soon after (B. C. 211) and the merciless conquerors only spared it for a new population. For three or four years after this the war in Italy was one of minor successes and reverses on both sides, but Hannibal lost steadily in prestige and strength. In Spain, Hannibal's brother, Hasdrubal, had opportunely beaten and slain (B. C. 212) both the elder Scipios; but another and greater Scipio, P. Cornelius, son of Publius, had taken the field and was sweeping the Carthaginians from the peninsula. Yet, despite Scipio's capture of New Carthage and his victories, at Bæcula, and elsewhere, Hasdrubal contrived, in some unexplained way, in the year 208, B. C., to cross the Pyrenees into Gaul and to recruit reinforcements there for a movement on Italy. The next spring he passed the Alps and brought his army safely into Cisalpine Gaul; but his dispatches to Hannibal fell into the hands of the Romans and revealed his plans. The swift energy of one of the consuls, C. Claudius Nero, brought about a marvellous concentration of Roman forces to meet him, and he and his army perished together in an awful battle fought on the banks of the Metaurus, in Umbria. The last hopes of Hannibal perished with them; but he held his ground in the extreme south of Italy and no Roman general dared try to dislodge him. When Scipio returned next year (B. C. 206) and reported the complete conquest of Spain, he was

chosen consul with the understanding that he would carry the war into Africa, though the senate stood half opposed. He did so in the early months of the year 204 B. C. crossing from Sicily with a comparatively small armament and laying siege to Utica. That year he accomplished nothing, but during the next winter he struck a terrible blow, surprising and burning the camps of the Carthaginians and their Numidian allies and slaughtering 40,000 of their number. This success was soon followed by another, on the Great Plains, which lie 70 or 80 miles to the southwest of Carthage. The Numidian king, Syphax, was now driven from his throne and the kingdom delivered over to an outlawed prince, Massinissa, who became, thenceforth, the most useful and unscrupulous of allies to the Romans. Now pushed to despair, the Carthaginians summoned Hannibal to their rescue. He abandoned Italy at the call and returned to see his own land for the first time since as a boy he left it with his father. But even his genius could not save Carthage with the means at his command. The long war was ended in October of the year 202 B. C. by the battle which is called the battle of Zama, though it was fought at some distance westward of that place. The Carthaginian army was routed utterly, and Hannibal himself persuaded his countrymen to accept a peace which stripped them of their ships and their trade, their possessions in Spain and all the islands, and their power over the Numidian states, besides wringing from them a war indemnity of many millions. On those hard terms, Carthage was suffered to exist a few years longer.—R. B. Smith, *Carthage and the Carthaginians.*

ALSO IN: T. Arnold, *Hist. of Rome, ch.* 43–47. —H. G. Liddell, *Hist. of Rome, ch.* 31–34.—T. A. Dodge, *Hannibal, ch.* 11–39.—See, also, ROME: B. C. 218–211, to 211–202.

The Third. See CARTHAGE: B. C. 146; and ROME: B. C. 151–146.

PUNJAB, OR PUNJAUB, OR PANJAB, The.—"Everything has a meaning in India, and the Panjab is only another name for the Five Rivers which make the historic Indus. They rise far back among the western Himalayas, bring down their waters from glaciers twenty-five miles in length, and peaks 26,000 feet high, and hurl their mighty torrent into one great current, which is thrown at last into the Arabian Sea. It is a fertile region, not less so than the Valley of the Ganges. This Panjab is the open door, the only one by which the European of earlier days was able to descend upon the plains of India for conquest and a new home. . . . In the Panjab every foot of the land is a romance. No one knows how many armies have shivered in the winds of the hills of Afghanistan, and then pounced down through the Khaibar Pass into India, and overspread the country, until the people could rise and destroy the stranger within the gates. Whenever a European invader of Asia has reached well into the continent, his dream has always been India. That country has ever been, and still is, the pearl of all the Orient. Its perfect sky in winter, its plenteous rains in summer, its immense rivers, its boundless stores of wealth, and its enduring industries, which know no change, have made it the dream of every great conqueror."—J. F. Hurst, *Indika, ch.* 75.—"In form, the country is a great triangle, its base resting on the Himalayan chain and Cashmere, and its apex directed due south-west. . . . The five streams which confer its name, counting them from north to south, are the Upper Indus, the Jhelum, the Chenab, the Ravee and the Sutlej, the Indus and Sutlej constituting respectively the western and eastern boundary. . . . The four divisions enclosed by the five convergent streams are called doabs—lands of two waters. . . . Besides the territory thus delineated, the Punjab of the Sikhs included Cashmere, the Jummoo territory to Spiti and Tibet, the trans-Indus frontier and the Hazara highlands in the west; and to the east the Jullundhur Doab with Kangra and Noorpoor. These last, with the frontier, are better known as the cis- and trans-Sutlej states."—E. Arnold, *The Marquis of Dalhousie's Administration of British India, ch.* 2 (*v.* 1).—The Sikhs established their supremacy in the Punjab in the 18th century, and became a formidable power, under the famous Runjet Singh, in the early part of the 19th century (see SIKHS). The English conquest of the Sikhs and annexation of the Punjab to British India took place in 1849. See INDIA: A. D. 1845–1849.

PUNT, Land of.—"Under the name of Punt, the old inhabitants of Kemi [ancient Egypt] meant a distant land, washed by the great ocean, full of valleys and hills, abounding in ebony and other rich woods, in incense, balsam, precious metals, and costly stones; rich also in beasts, as cameleopards, hunting leopards, panthers, dog-headed apes, and long-tailed monkeys. . . . Such was the Ophir of the Egyptians, without doubt the present coast of the Somauli land in sight of Arabia, but separated from it by the sea. According to an old obscure tradition, the land of Punt was the original seat of the gods. From Punt the holy ones had travelled to the Nile valley, at their head Amon, Horus, Hathor."—H. Brugsch, *Hist. of Egypt under the Pharaohs, ch.* 8.

PURCHASE IN THE ARMY, Abolition of. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1871.

PURITANS: The movement taking form. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1559–1566.

First application of the Name. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1564–1565 (?).

In distinction from the Independents or Separatists.—"When, in 1603, James I. became king of England, he found his Protestant subjects divided into three classes,—Conformists, or High Ritualists; Nonconformists, or Broad-Church Puritans; and Separatists, popularly called Brownists [and subsequently called Independents]. The Conformists and the Puritans both adhered to the Church of England, and were struggling for its control. . . . The Puritans objected to some of the ceremonies of the Church, such as the ring in marriage, the sign of the cross in baptism, the promises of godparents, the showy vestments, bowing in the creed, receiving evil-livers to the communion, repetitions, and to kneeling at communion as if still adoring the Host, instead of assuming an ordinary attitude as did the apostles at the Last Supper. The majority of the lower clergy and of the middle classes are said to have favored Puritanism. . . . Dr. Neal says that the Puritan body took form in 1564, and dissolved in

1644. During that term of eighty years the Puritans were ever 'in and of the Church of England'; as Dr. Prince says in his Annals (1736), those who left the Episcopal Church 'lost the name of Puritans and received that of the Separatists.'. . . The Separatists, unlike the Puritans, had no connection with the National Church, and the more rigid of them even denied that Church to be scriptural, or its ministrations to be valid. . . . The Pilgrim Fathers, the founders of our Plymouth, the pioneer colony of New England, were not Puritans. They never were called by that name, either by themselves or their contemporaries. They were Separatists, slightingly called Brownists, and in time became known as Independents or Congregationalists. As Separatists they were oppressed and maligned by the Puritans. They did not restrict voting or office-holding to their church-members. They heartily welcomed to their little State all men of other sects, or of no sects, who adhered to the essentials of Christianity and were ready to conform to the local laws and customs. . . . Though their faith was positive and strong, they laid down no formal creed."—J. A. Goodwin, *The Pilgrim Republic, ch.* 2 *and* 1.—"The reader of this history must have remarked that 'Puritan' and 'Separatist' were by no means convertible terms; that, in point of fact, they very often indicated hostile parties, pitted against each other in bitter controversies. And the inquiry may have arisen — How is this? Were not the Separatists all Puritans? . . . The term 'Puritan' was originally applied to all in the church of England who desired further reformation — a greater conformity of church government and worship to primitive and apostolic usages. But after awhile the term became restricted in its application to those who retained their respect for the church of England, and their connection with it, notwithstanding its acknowledged corruptions; in distinction from those who had been brought to abandon both their respect for that church and their connection with it, under the conviction that it was hopelessly corrupt, and could never be reformed. The Separatists, then, were indeed all Puritans, and of the most thorough and uncompromising kind. They were the very essence — the oil of Puritanism. But the Puritans were by no means all Separatists; though they agreed with them in doctrinal faith, being all thoroughly Calvinistic in their faith." —G. Punchard, *Hist. of Congregationalism, v.* 3, *app., note F.*

Also in: G. E. Ellis, *The Puritan Age and Rule in the Colony of Mass. Bay, ch.* 3.—See Independents or Separatists.—D. Campbell, *The Puritan in Holland, Eng., and Am., ch.* 16 (*v.* 2).

A. D. 1604.— Hampton Court Conference with James I. See England: A. D. 1604.

A. D. 1629.—Incorporation of the Governor and Company of Massachusetts Bay. See Massachusetts: A. D. 1623–1629 The Dorchester Company.

A. D. 1629-1630.— The exodus to Massachusetts Bay. See Massachusetts: A. D. 1623–1629; 1629–1630; and 1630.

A. D. 1631-1636.—The Theocracy of Massachusetts Bay. See Massachusetts: A. D. 1631–1636; and 1636.

A. D. 1638-1640.—At the beginning of the English Civil War. See England: A. D. 1638–1640.

PURUARAN, Battle of (1814). See Mexico: A. D. 1810–1819.

PURUMANCIANS, The. See Chile: A. D. 1450–1724.

PUT-IN-BAY, Naval Battle at. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1812–1813 Harrison's Northwestern Campaign.

PUTEOLI.—The maritime city of Puteoli, which occupied the site of the modern town of Pozzuoli, about 7 miles from Naples, became under the empire the chief emporium of Roman commerce in Italy. The vicinity of Puteoli and its neighbor Baiæ was one of the favorite resorts of the Roman nobility for villa residence. It was at Puteoli that St. Paul landed on his journey to Rome.—T. Mommsen, *Hist. of Rome, bk.* 4, *ch.* 11.

PUTNAM, Israel, and the American Revolution. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1775 (April — May), (May — August); 1776 (August), (September—November).

PYDNA, Battle of (B. C. 168). See Greece: B. C. 214–146.

PYLÆ CASPIÆ. See Caspian Gates.

PYLÆ CILICIÆ. See Cilician Gates.

PYLUS, Athenian seizure of. See Greece: B. C. 425.

PYRAMID. — "The name 'pyramid'— first invented by the ancients to denote the tombs of the Egyptian kings, and still used in geometry to this day — is of Greek origin. The Egyptians themselves denoted the pyramid — both in the sense of a sepulchre and of a figure in Solid Geometry — by the word 'abumir;' while, on the other hand, the word 'Pir-am-us' is equivalent to the 'edge of the pyramid,' namely, the four edges extending from the apex of the pyramid to each corner of the quadrangular base."— H. Brugsch, *Hist. of Egypt, ch.* 7.

PYRAMIDS, Battle of the. See France: A. D. 1798 (May—August).

PYRENEES, Battles of the (1813). See Spain: A. D. 1812–1814.

PYRENEES, Treaty of the. See France: A. D. 1659–1661.

PYRRHIC DANCE. — A spirited military dance, performed in armor, which gave much delight to the Spartans, and is said to have been taught to children only five years old. It was thought to have been invented by the Cretans.— G. Schömann, *Antiq. of Greece: The State, pt.* 3.

PYRRHUS, and his campaigns in Italy and Sicily. See Rome: B. C. 282–275.

PYTHIAN GAMES. See Delphi.

PYTHIAS, Knights of. See Insurance.

PYTHO, The Sanctuary of. — According to the Greek legend, a monstrous serpent, or dragon, Pytho, or Python, produced from the mud left by the deluge of Deucalion, lived in a great cavern of Mount Parnassus until slain by the god Apollo. The scene of the exploit became the principal seat of the worship of Apollo, the site of his most famous temple, the home of the oracle which he inspired. The temple and its seat were originally called Pytho; the cavern, from which arose mephitic and intoxicating vapors was called the Pythium; the priestess who inhaled those vapors and uttered the oracles which they were supposed to inspire, was the Pythia; Apollo, himself, was often called Pythius. Subsequently, town, temple and oracle were more commonly known by the name of Delphi. See Delphi.

Q.

QUADI, The: Early place and history. See MARCOMANNI.

Campaigns of Marcus Aurelius against. See SARMATIAN AND MARCOMANNIAN WARS OF MARCUS AURELIUS.

A. D. 357-359.—War of Constantius. See LIMIGANTES.

A. D. 374-375.—War of Valentinian.—A treacherous outrage of peculiar blackness, committed by a worthless Roman officer on the frontier, in 374, provoked the Quadi to invade the province of Pannonia. They overran it with little opposition, and their success encouraged inroads by the neighboring Sarmatian tribes. In the following year, the Emperor Valentinian led a retaliatory expedition into the country of the Quadi and revenged himself upon it with unmerciful severity. At the approach of winter he returned across the Danube, but only to wait another spring, when his purpose was to complete the annihilation of the offending Quadi. The latter, thereupon, sent ambassadors to humbly pray for peace. The choleric emperor received them, but their presence excited him to such rage that a blood-vessel was ruptured in his body and he died on the spot.—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, ch.* 25.

Probable Modern Representatives of. See BOHEMIA: ITS PEOPLE.

QUADRILATERAL, The.—A famous military position in northern Italy, formed by the strong fortresses at Peschiera, Verona, Mantua, and Legnano, bears this name. "The Quadrilateral . . . fulfils all the requirements of a good defensive position, which are to cover rearward territory, to offer absolute shelter to a defending army whenever required, and to permit of ready offensive: first, by the parallel course of the Mincio and Adige; secondly, by the fortresses on these rivers; thirdly, by passages offered at fortified points which insure the command of the rivers."—Major C. Adams, *Great Campaigns in Europe from* 1796 *to* 1870, *p.* 232.

QUADRUPLE ALLIANCE (A. D. 1718). See SPAIN: A. D. 1713-1725; also, ITALY: A. D. 1715-1735.

QUÆSTIO PERPETUA. See CALPURNIAN LAW.

QUÆSTOR, The Imperial.—In the later Roman empire, "the Quaestor had the care of preparing the Imperial speeches, and was responsible for the language of the laws. . . . His office is not unlike that of the Chancellor of a mediaeval monarch."—T. Hodgkin, *Italy and Her Invaders, bk.* 1, *ch.* 3 (*v.* 1).

QUÆSTORS, Roman.—"Probably created as assistants to the consuls in the first year of the republic. At first two; in 421 B. C., four; in 241, eight; in 81, twenty; in 45, forty. Thrown open to plebeians in 421 B. C. Elected in the Comitia Tributa. The quæstor's office lasted as long as the consul's to whom he was attached."—R. F. Horton, *Hist. of the Romans, app. A.*—"We have seen how the care of the city's treasures had been intrusted to two city quæstors, soon after the abolition of the monarchy. In like manner, soon after the fall of the decemvirate, the expenditures connected with military affairs, which had hitherto been in the hands of the consuls, were put under the control of new patrician officers, the military quæstors, who were to accompany the army on its march."—A. Tighe, *Development of the Roman Const., ch.* 6.

ALSO IN: W. Ihne, *Researches into the Hist. of the Roman Const., pp.* 75-84.

QUÆSTORS OF THE FLEET. See ROME: B. C. 275.

QUAKERS: Origin of the Society of Friends.—George Fox and his early Disciples.—"The religious movement which began with the wandering preacher George Fox . . . grew into the Society of Friends, or, as they came to be commonly called, 'The Quakers.' George Fox was born in 1624, the year before Charles I. came to the throne; and he was growing up to manhood all through the troubled time of that king's reign, while the storms were gathering which at last burst forth in the civil wars. It was not much that he knew of all this, however. He was growing up in a little out-of-the-way village of Leicestershire—Fenny Drayton—where his father was 'by profession a weaver.'" While he was still a child, the companions of George Fox "laughed at his grave, sober ways, yet they respected him, too; and when, by-and-by, he was apprenticed to a shoemaker, his master found him so utterly trustworthy, and so true and unbending in his word, that the saying began to go about, 'If George says "verily" there is no altering him.'. . . He was more and more grieved at what seemed to him the lightness and carelessness of men's lives. He felt as if he were living in the midst of hollowness and hypocrisy. . . . His soul was full of great thoughts of something better and nobler than the common religion, which seemed so poor and worldly. . . . He wandered about from place to place—Northampton, London, various parts of Warwickshire—seeking out people here and there whom he could hear of as very religious, and likely to help him through his difficulties. . . . After two years of lonely, wandering life, he began to see a little light. It came to his soul that all these outward forms, and ceremonies, and professions that people were setting up and making so much ado about as 'religion,' were nothing in themselves; that priestly education and ordination was nothing—did not really make a man any nearer to God; that God simply wanted the hearts and souls of all men to be turned to Him, and the worship of their own thought and feeling. And with the sense of this there arose within him a great loathing of all the formalism, and priestcraft, and outward observances of the Churches. . . . But he did not find peace yet. . . . He writes: 'My troubles continued, and I was often under great temptations; I fasted much and walked abroad in solitary places many days.'. . . It was a time like Christ's temptations in the wilderness, or Paul's three years in Arabia, before they went forth to their great life-mission. But to him, as to them, came, at last, light and peace and an open way. . . . A voice seemed to come to him which said, 'There is one, even Christ Jesus, that can speak to thy condition.' 'And when I heard it,' he says, 'my heart did leap for joy.' Fixing his mind upon Christ, all things began to be clearer to him; he saw the grand simple truth of a religion of

spirit and life. . . . It was at Dukinfield, near Manchester, in 1647, that he began to speak openly to men of what was in his heart. . . . In those days, when he was wandering away from men, and shrinking with a sort of horror from the fashions of the world, he had made himself a strong rough suit of leather, and this for many years was his dress. Very white and clean indeed was the linen under that rough leather suit, for he hated all uncleanness either of soul or body; and very calm and clear were his eyes, that seemed to search into men's souls, and quailed before no danger, and sometimes lighted up with wonderful tenderness. A tall, burly man he was, too, of great strength. . . . Everywhere he saw vanity and worldliness, pretence and injustice. It seemed laid upon him that he must testify against it all. He went to courts of justice, and stood up and warned the magistrates to do justly; he went to fairs and markets, and lifted up his voice against wakes, and feasts and plays, and also against people's cozening and cheating. . . . He testified against great things and small, bade men not swear, but keep to 'yea' and 'nay,' and this in courts of justice as everywhere else; he spoke against lip-honour — that men should give up using titles of compliment, and keep to plain 'thee' and 'thou'; 'for surely,' he said, 'the way men address God should be enough from one to another.' But all this was merely the side-work of his life, flowing from his great central thought of true, pure life in the light of the Spirit of God. That was his great thought, and that he preached most of all; he wanted men to give up all their forms, and come face to face with the Spirit of God, and so worship Him and live to Him. Therefore he spoke most bitterly of all against all priestcraft. . . . Gradually followers gathered to him; little groups of people here and there accepted his teachings — began to look to him as their leader. He did not want to found a sect; and as for a church — the Church was the whole body of Christ's faithful people everywhere; so those who joined him would not take any name as a sect or church. They simply called themselves 'friends'; they used no form of worship, but met together, to wait upon the Lord with one another; believing that His Spirit was always with them, and that, if anything was to be said, He would put it into their hearts to say it." From the first, Fox suffered persecution at the hands of the Puritans. They "kept imprisoning him for refusing to swear allegiance to the Commonwealth; again and again he suffered in this way: in Nottingham Castle, in 1648; then, two years later, at Derby, for six months, at the end of which time they tried to force him to enter the army; but he refused, and so they thrust him into prison again, this time into a place called the Dungeon, among 30 felons, where they kept him another half-year. Then, two years later, in 1653, he was imprisoned at Carlisle, in a foul, horrible hole. . . . He was again imprisoned in Launceston gaol, for eight long months. After this came a quieter time for him; for he was taken before Cromwell, and Cromwell had a long conversation with him. . . . During Cromwell's life he was persecuted no more, but with the restoration of Charles II. his dangers and sufferings began again. . . . His followers caught his spirit, and no persecutions could intimidate them. . . . They made no secret of where their meetings were to be, and at the time there they assembled. Constables and informers might be all about the place, it made no difference; they went in, sat down to their quiet worship; if any one had a word to say he said it. The magistrates tried closing the places, locked the doors, put a band of soldiers to guard them. The Friends simply gathered in the street in front, held their meetings there; went on exactly as if nothing had happened. They might all be taken off to prison, still it made no difference. . . . Is it wonderful that such principles, preached with such noble devotion to truth and duty, rapidly made way? By the year 1665, when Fox had been preaching for 18 years, the Society of Friends numbered 80,000, and in another ten years it had spread more widely still, and its founder had visited America, and travelled through Holland and Germany, preaching his doctrine of the inward light, and everywhere founding Meetings. Fox himself did not pass away until [1690] he had seen his people past all the days of persecution."— B. Herford, *The Story of Religion in England, ch.* 27.—"At a time when personal revelation was generally believed, it was a pardonable self-delusion that he [Fox] should imagine himself to be commissioned by the Divinity to preach a system which could only be objected to as too pure to be practised by man. This belief, and an ardent temperament, led him and some of his followers into unseasonable attempts to convert their neighbours, and unseemly intrusions into places of worship for that purpose, which excited general hostility against them, and exposed them to frequent and severe punishments. . . . Although they, like most other religious sects, had arisen in the humble classes of society, . . . they had early been joined by a few persons of superior rank and education. . . . The most distinguished of their converts was William Penn, whose father, Admiral Sir William Penn, had been a personal friend of the King [James II.], and one of his instructors in naval affairs."— Sir J. Mackintosh, *Hist. of the Revolution in Eng. in* 1688, *ch.* 6.— "At one of the interviews between G. Fox and Gervas Bennet — one of the magistrates who had committed him at Derby — the former bade the latter 'Tremble at the word of the Lord'; whereupon Bennet called him a Quaker. This epithet of scorn well suited the tastes and prejudices of the people, and it soon became the common appellation bestowed on Friends."— C. Evans, *Friends in the* 17*th Century, ch.* 2.

Also in: J. Gough, *Hist. of the People called Quakers.*—W. R. Wagstaff, *Hist. of the Society of Friends.*—T. Clarkson, *Portraiture of Quakerism.* —*American Church History, v.* 12.

A. D. 1656-1661.—The persecution in Massachusetts. See Massachusetts: A. D. 1656–1661.

A. D. 1681.—Penn's acquisition of Pennsylvania. See Pennsylvania: A. D. 1681.

A. D. 1682.— Proprietary purchase of New Jersey. See New Jersey: A. D. 1673–1682.

A. D. 1688-1776. — Early growth of anti-slavery sentiment in the Society. See Slavery, Negro: A. D. 1688–1780.

QUALIFICATION OF SUFFRAGE: In England. See England: A. D. 1884–1885.

In Rhode Island. See Rhode Island: A. D. 1888.

QUANTRELL'S GUERRILLAS. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1863 (August: Missouri—Kansas).

QUAPAWS, The. See American Aborigines: Siouan Family.

QUATRE BRAS, Battle of. See France: A. D. 1815 (June).

QUEBEC, City: A. D. 1535.—Its Indian occupants.—Its name.—When Jacques Cartier sailed up the St. Lawrence, in 1535, he found an Indian village called Stadacona occupying the site of the present city of Quebec. "The Indian name Stadacona had perished before the time of Champlain, owing, probably, to the migration of the principal tribe and the succession of others." The name Quebec, afterwards given to the French settlement on the same ground, is said by some to be likewise of Indian origin, having reference to the narrowing of the river at that point. "Others give a Norman derivation for the word: it is said that Quebec was so-called after Caudebec, on the Seine." La Potherie says that the Normans who were with Cartier, when they saw the high cape, cried "Quel bec!" from which came the name Quebec. "Mr. Hawkins terms this 'a derivation entirely illusory and improbable,' and asserts that the word is of Norman origin. He gives an engraving of a seal belonging to William de la Pole, earl of Suffolk, dated in the 7th of Henry V., or A. D. 1420. The legend or motto is 'Sigillum Willielmi de la Pole, Comitis Suffolckiæ, Domine de Hamburg et de Quebec.'"—E. Warburton, *The Conquest of Canada, v.* 1, *ch.* 2, *and foot-note.*

A. D. 1608.—The founding of the city by Champlain. See Canada: A. D. 1608–1611.

A. D. 1629-1632.—Capture by the English, brief occupation and restoration to France. See Canada: A. D. 1628–1635.

A. D. 1639.—The founding of the Ursuline Convent. See Canada: A. D. 1637–1657.

A. D. 1690.—Unsuccessful attack by Sir Williams Phips and the Massachusetts colonists. See Canada: A. D. 1689–1690.

A. D. 1711.—Threatened by the abortive expedition of Admiral Walker. See Canada: A. D. 1711–1713.

A. D. 1759.—Wolfe's conquest. See Canada: A. D. 1759 (June—September).

A. D. 1760.—Attempted recovery by the French. See Canada: A. D. 1760.

A. D. 1775-1776.—Unsuccessful siege by the Americans.—Death of Montgomery. See Canada: A. D. 1775–1776.

QUEBEC, Province: A. D. 1763.—Creation of the English province. See Canada: A. D. 1763–1774.

A. D. 1774.—Vast extension of the province by the Quebec Act. See Canada: A. D. 1763–1774.

A. D. 1867.—On the formation of the confederated Dominion of Canada, in 1867, the eastern province formerly called Lower Canada received the name of Quebec. See Canada: A. D. 1867.

QUEBEC ACT, The. See Canada: A. D. 1763–1774.

QUEBEC RESOLUTIONS, The. See Canada: A. D. 1867.

QUEBRADA-SECA, Battle of (1862). See Venezuela: A. D. 1829–1886.

QUEEN, Origin of the word. See King.

QUEEN ANNE'S BOUNTY.—"Her Majesty's [Queen Anne's] birthday, which was the 6th of February, falling this year [1704] on a Sunday, its celebration had been postponed till the next day. On that day, then, as well beseeming her pious and princely gift, Sir Charles Hedges as Secretary of State brought down to the House of Commons a message from the Queen, importing that Her Majesty desired to make a grant of her whole revenue arising out of the First Fruits and Tenths for the benefit of the poorer clergy. These First Fruits and Tenths had been imposed by the Popes some centuries ago for the support of the Holy Wars, but had been maintained long after those wars had ceased [see Annates]. The broad besom of Henry VIII. had swept them from the Papal to the Royal treasury, and there they continued to flow. In the days of Charles II. they had been regarded as an excellent fund out of which to provide for the female favourites of His Majesty and their numerous children. . . . Upon the Queen's message the Commons returned a suitable address, and proceeded to pass a bill enabling Her Majesty to alienate this branch of the revenue, and to create a corporation by charter to apply it for the object she desired. . . . This fund has ever since and with good reason borne the name of 'Queen Anne's Bounty.' Its application has been extended to the building of parsonage-houses as well as to the increase of poor livings."—Earl Stanhope, *Hist. of Eng.: Reign of Queen Anne, ch.* 4.

QUEEN ANNE'S WAR.—The wide-ranging conflict which is known in European history as the War of the Spanish Succession, appears in American history more commonly under the name of Queen Anne's War. See New England: A. D. 1702–1710.

QUEENSBERRY PLOT, The. See Scotland: A. D. 1703–1704.

QUEENSLAND. See Australia: A. D. 1859.

QUEENSTOWN HEIGHTS, The battle of. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1812 (September—November).

QUELCHES, The. See American Aborigines: Pampas Tribes.

QUERANDIS, The. See American Aborigines: Pampas Tribes.

QUESNOY: A. D. 1659.—Ceded to France. See France: A. D. 1659–1661.

A. D. 1794.—Siege and capture by the French. See France: A. D. 1794 (March—July).

QUIBÉRON BAY, Naval battle of. See England: A. D. 1759 (August—November). **....Defeat of French Royalists (1795).** See France: A. D. 1794–1796.

QUICHES, The. See American Aborigines: Quiches.

QUICHUAS, The. See Peru: The aboriginal inhabitants.

QUIDS, The.—John Randolph of Virginia "had been one of the Republican leaders while the party was in opposition [during the second administration of Washington and the administration of John Adams, as Presidents of the United States], but his irritable spirit disqualified him for heading an Administration party. He could

attack, but could not defend. He had taken offense at the President's [Jefferson's] refusal to make him Minister to England, and immediately took sides with the Federalists [1805] followed by a number of his friends, though not sufficient to give the Federalists a majority. . . . The Randolph faction, popularly called 'Quids,' gave fresh life to the Federalists in Congress, and made them an active and useful opposition party."—A. Johnston, *Hist. of Am. Politics, ch.* 6, *sect.* 3.

QUIETISM. See Mysticism.

QUIJO, OR NAPO, The. See American Aborigines: Andesians.

QUINARIUS, The. See As.

QUINCY RAILWAY, The. See Steam Locomotion on land.

QUINDECEMVIRS, The.—The quindecemvirs, at Rome, had the custody of the Sibylline books.—C. Merivale, *Hist. of the Romans, ch.* 31.

QUINNIPIACK. See Connecticut: A. D. 1638.

QUIPU.—WAMPUM.—"The Peruvians adopted a . . . unique system of records, that by means of the quipu. This was a base cord, the thickness of the finger, of any required length, to which were attached numerous small strings of different colors, lengths, and textures, variously knotted and twisted one with another. Each of these peculiarities represented a certain number, a quality, quantity, or other idea, but what, not the most fluent quipu reader could tell unless he was acquainted with the general topic treated of. Therefore, whenever news was sent in this manner a person accompanied the bearer to serve as verbal commentator, and to prevent confusion the quipus relating to the various departments of knowledge were placed in separate storehouses, one for war, another for taxes, a third for history, and so forth. On what principle of mnemotechnics the ideas were connected with the knots and colors we are totally in the dark; it has even been doubted whether they had any application beyond the art of numeration. Each combination had, however, a fixed ideographic value in a certain branch of knowledge, and thus the quipu differed essentially from the Catholic rosary, the Jewish phylactery, or the knotted strings of the natives of North America and Siberia, to all of which it has at times been compared. The wampum used by the tribes of the North Atlantic coast was, in many respects, analogous to the quipu. In early times it was composed chiefly of bits of wood of equal size, but different colors. These were hung on strings which were woven into belts and bands, the hues, shapes, sizes, and combinations of the strings hinting their general significance. Thus the lighter shades were invariable harbingers of peaceful or pleasant tidings, while the darker portended war and danger. The substitution of beads or shells in place of wood, and the custom of embroidering figures in the belts were, probably, introduced by European influence."—D. G. Brinton, *The Myths of the New World, ch.* 1.—See, also, Wampum.

QUIRINAL, The.—"The Palatine city was not the only one that in ancient times existed within the circle afterwards enclosed by the Servian walls; opposite to it, in its immediate vicinity, there lay a second city on the Quirinal. . . . Even the name has not been lost by which the men of the Quirinal distinguished themselves from their Palatine neighbours. As the Palatine city took the name of 'the Seven Mounts,' its citizens called themselves the 'mount-men' ('montani'), and the term 'mount,' while applied to the other heights belonging to the city, was above all associated with the Palatine; so the Quirinal height—although not lower, but on the contrary somewhat higher, than the former—as well as the adjacent Viminal, never in the strict use of the language received any other name than 'hill' ('collis'). . . . Thus the site of the Roman commonwealth was still at this period occupied by the Mount-Romans of the Palatine and the Hill-Romans of the Quirinal as two separate communities confronting each other and doubtless in many respects at feud. . . . That the community of the Seven Mounts early attained a great preponderance over that of the Quirinal may with certainty be inferred."—T. Mommsen, *Hist. of Rome, bk.* 1, *ch.* 4.—See, also, Palatine Hill, and Seven Hills of Rome.

QUIRITES.—In early Rome the warrior-citizens, the full burgesses, were so-called. "The king, when he addressed them, called them 'lance-men' (quirites). . . . We need not . . . regard the name Quirites as having been originally reserved for the burgesses on the Quirinal. . . . It is indisputably certain that the name Quirites denoted from the first, as well as subsequently, simply the full burgess."—T. Mommsen, *Hist. of Rome, bk.* 1, *ch.* 4 *and* 5.—The term quirites, in fact, signified the citizens of Rome as a body. Whether it originally meant "men of the spear," as derived from a Sabine word, is a question in some dispute.—H. G. Liddell, *Hist. of Rome, bk.* 1, *ch.* 5.

QUITO: The ancient kingdom and the modern city. See Ecuador.

QUIVIRA. See American Aborigines: Pueblos.

QUORATEAN FAMILY, The. See American Aborigines: Quoratean Family.

R.

RAAB, Battle of. See Germany: A. D. 1809 (January—June).

RABBLING. See Scotland: A. D. 1688–1690.

RABELAIS, on Education. See Education, Renaissance.

RAB-SHAKEH.—The title of the chief minister of the Assyrian kings. The Rab-Shakah of Sennacherib demanded the surrender of Jerusalem.

RACHISIUS, King of the Lombards, A. D. 744–750.

RADAGAISUS, OR RADAGAIS, OR RODOGAST; Invasion of Italy by.—"In the year 406, Italy was suddenly overrun by a vast multitude composed of Vandals, Sueves, Burgunds, Alans, and Goths, under the command of a king named Radagais. To what nation this king belonged is not certain, but it seems likely that he was an Ostrogoth from the region of the Black Sea, who had headed a tribe of his countrymen in a revolt against the Huns. The invading host is said to have consisted of 200,000

warriors, who were accompanied by their wives and families. These barbarians were heathens, and their manners were so fierce and cruel that the invasion excited far more terror than did that of Alaric. . . . Stilicho [the able minister and general of the contemptible Emperor of the West, Honorius] found it hard work to collect an army capable of opposing this savage horde, and Radagais had got as far as Florence before any resistance was offered to him. But while he was besieging that city, the Roman general came upon him, and, by surrounding his army with earthworks, compelled him to surrender. The barbarian king was beheaded, and those of the captives whose lives were spared were sold into slavery." — H. Bradley, *Story of the Goths, ch.* 10.

ALSO IN: T. Hodgkin, *Italy and Her Invaders, bk.* 1, *ch.* 5.—See, also, ROME: A. D. 404–408.

RÆTIA. See RHÆTIA.

RAGA, RAGHA, OR RHAGES.—"The Median city next in importance to the two Ecbatanas was Raga or Rhages, near the Caspian Gates, almost at the extreme eastern limits of the territory possessed by the Medes. The great antiquity of this place is marked by its occurrence in the Zendavesta among the primitive settlements of the Arians. Its celebrity during the time of the Empire is indicated by the position which it occupies in the romances of Tobit and Judith. . . . Rhages gave name to a district; and this district may be certainly identified with the long narrow tract of fertile territory intervening between the Elburz mountain-range and the desert, from about Kasvin to Khaar, or from long. 50° to 52° 30′. The exact site of the city of Rhages within this territory is somewhat doubtful. All accounts place it near the eastern extremity; and, as there are in this direction ruins of a town called Rhei or Rhey, it has been usual to assume that they positively fix the locality. But . . . there are grounds for placing Rhages very much nearer to the Caspian Gates."—G. Rawlinson, *Five Great Monarchies: Media, ch* 1.—See, also, CASPIAN GATES.

RAGÆ. See RATÆ.

RAGMAN'S ROLL. See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1328.

RAID OF RUTHVEN, The. See SCOTLAND. A. D. 1582.

RAILROADS, The beginning of. See STEAM LOCOMOTION ON LAND.

RAISIN RIVER, Battle of. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1812–1813 HARRISON'S NORTHWESTERN CAMPAIGN.

RAJA, OR RAJAH.—MAHARAJA.—Hindu titles, equivalent to king and great king.

RAJPOOTS, OR RAJPUTS.—RAJPOOTANA.—"The Rajpoots, or sons of Rajas, are the noblest and proudest race in India. . . . They claim to be representatives of the Kshatriyas; the descendants of those Aryan warriors who conquered the Punjab and Hindustan in times primeval. To this day they display many of the characteristics of the heroes of the Maha Bharata and Ramayana. They form a military aristocracy of the feudal type. . . . The Rajpoots are the links between ancient and modern India. In days of old they strove with the kings of Magadha for the suzerainty of Hindustan from the Indus to the lower Gangetic valley. They maintained imperial thrones at Lahore and Delhi, at Kanouj and Ayodhya. In later revolutions their seats of empire have been shifted further west and south, but the Rajpoot kingdoms still remain as the relics of the old Aryan aristocracy. . . . The dynasties of Lahore and Delhi faded away from history, and perchance have reappeared in more remote quarters of India. The Rajpoots still retain their dominion in the west, whilst their power and influence have been felt in every part of India; and to this day a large Rajpoot element characterizes the populations, not only of the Punjab and Hindustan, but of the Dekhan and Peninsula. The Rajpoot empire of a remote antiquity is represented in the present day by the three kingdoms of Meywar, Marwar, and Jeypore. Meywar, better known as Chittore or Udaipore, is the smallest but most important of the three. It forms the garden of Rajpootana to the eastward of the Aravulli range. Westward of the range is the dreary desert of Marwar. Northward of Meywar lies the territory of Jeypore, the intermediate kingdom between Meywar and the Mussulmans. . . . In former times the sovereigns of Meywar were known as the Ranas of Chittore; they are now known as the Ranas of Udaipore. They belong to the blue blood of Rajpoot aristocracy."—J. T. Wheeler, *Hist. of India, v.* 3, *ch.* 7.—"Everywhere [in the central region of India] Rajput septs or petty chiefships may still be found existing in various degrees of independence. And there are, of course, Rajput Chiefs outside Rajputana altogether, though none of political importance. But Rajputana proper, the country still under the independent rule of the most ancient families of the purest clans, may now be understood generally to mean the great tract that would be crossed by two lines, of which one should be drawn on the map of India from the frontier of Sind Eastward to the gates of Agra; and the other from the Southern border of the Punjab Government near the Sutlej Southward and South-Eastward until it meets the broad belt of Maratha States under the Guicowar, Holkar, and Scindia, which runs across India from Baroda to Gwalior. This territory is divided into nineteen States, of which sixteen are possessed by Rajput clans, and the Chief of the clan or sept is the State's ruler. To the Sesodia clan, the oldest and purest blood in India, belong the States of Oodeypoor, Banswarra, Pertabgarh, and Shahpura; to the Rathore clan, the States of Jodhpoor and Bikanir; Jeypoor and Ulwar to the Kuchwaha, and so on."—Sir A. C. Lyall, *Asiatic Studies, ch.* 8.

RALEIGH, Sir Walter: Colonizing undertakings in Virginia. See AMERICA: A. D. 1584–1586, and 1587–1590.....**Guiana and El Dorado expeditions.** See EL DORADO.

RAMBOUILLET, The Hôtel de.—The marquise de Rambouillet, who drew around herself, at Paris, the famous coterie which took its name from her hospitable house, was the daughter of a French nobleman, Jean de Vivonne, sieur de Saint-Gohard, afterwards first marquis de Pisani, who married a Roman lady of the noble family of the Strozzi. Catherine de Vivonne was born of this union in 1588, and in 1600, when less than twelve years old, became the wife of Charles d'Angennes, vidame du Mans afterwards marquis de Rambouillet. Her married life was more than half a century in duration; she was the mother of seven children, and she

survived her husband thirteen years. During the minority of the husband the ancient residence of his family had been sold, and from 1610 to 1617 the marquis and marquise were engaged in building a new Hôtel de Rambouillet, which the latter is credited with having, in great part, designed. Her house being finished, she opened it "to her friends and acquaintances, and her receptions, which continued until the Fronde (1648), brought together every evening the choicest society of the capital, and produced a profound influence upon the manners and literature of the day. The marquise ceased attending court some years before the death of Henry IV., her refinement and pure character finding there an uncongenial atmosphere. The marquise was not alone a woman of society, but was carefully educated and fond of literature. Consequently the reunions at the Hôtel de Rambouillet were distinguished by a happy combination of rank and letters. Still more important was the new position assumed by the hostess and the ladies who frequented her house. Until the XVIIth century the crudest views prevailed as to the education and social position of woman. It was at the Hôtel de Rambouillet that her position as the intellectual companion of man was first recognized, and this position of equality, and the deferential respect which followed it, had a powerful influence in refining the rude manners of men of rank whose lives had been passed in camps, and of men of letters who had previously enjoyed few opportunities for social polish. The two classes met for the first time on a footing of equality, and it resulted in elevating the occupation of letters, and imbuing men of rank with a fondness for intellectual pursuits. The reunions at the Hôtel de Rambouillet began, as has been said, about 1617, and extend until the Fronde (1648) or a few years later. This period Larroumet ('Précieuses Ridicules,' p. 14) divides into three parts: from 1617 to about 1629; from 1630 to 1640; and from 1640 to the death of the marquise in 1665. During the first period the habitués of the Hôtel de Rambouillet were": the marquis du Vigean, the maréchal de Souvré, the duke de la Tremoïlle, Richelieu (then bishop of Luçon), the cardinal de la Valette, the poets Malherbe, Racan, Gombauld, Chapelain, Marino, the preacher Cospeau, Godeau, the grammarian Vaugelas, Voiture, Balzac, Segrais, Mlle. Paulet, the princesse de Montmorency, Mlle. du Vigean, and the daughters of the marquise de Rambouillet, "of whom the eldest, Julie d'Angennes, until her marriage in 1645 to the marquis de Montausier, was the soul of the reunions of the Hôtel de Rambouillet. The second period was that of its greatest brilliancy. To the illustrious names just mentioned must be added": the great Condé, the marquis de Montausier, Saint-Évremond, La Rochefoucald, Sarrasin, Costar, Patru, Conrart, Georges de Scudéry, Mairet, Colletet, Ménage, Benserade, Cotin, Desmarets, Rotrou, Scarron, P. Corneille, Bossuet, Mlle. de Bourbon, later duchesse de Longueville, Mlle. de Coligny, Mme. Aubry, and Mlle. de Scudéry, "yet unknown as a writer. . . . After 1640 the Hôtel de Rambouillet began to decline; but two names of importance belong to this period: Mme. de la Fayette, and Mme. de Sévigné. . . . Voiture died in 1648, the year which witnessed the outbreak of the Fronde, after which the reunions at the Hôtel de Rambouillet virtually ceased. . . . Until the time of Roederer ['Mémoire pour servir à l'histoire de la société polie en France'] it was generally supposed that the word 'Précieuse' was synonymous with Hôtel de Rambouillet, and that it was the marquise and her friends whom Molière intended to satirize. Roederer endeavored to show that it was not the marquise but her bourgeois imitators, the circle of Mlle. de Scudéry . . . ; Victor Cousin attempts to prove that it was neither the marquise nor Mlle. de Scudéry, but the imitators of the latter. . . . The editor of Molière in the 'Grands Écrivains de la France,' M. Despois (v. 2, p. 4) believes that the Hôtel de Rambouillet, including Mlle. de Scudéry, was the object of Molière's satire, although he had no intention of attacking any particular person among the 'Précieuses,' but confined himself to ridiculing the eccentricities common to them all. It is with this last view that the editor of the present work unhesitatingly agrees, for reasons which he hopes some day to give in detail in an edition of the two plays of Molière mentioned above ['Précieuses Ridicules,' and 'Les Femmes Savantes']. From Paris the influence of the 'Précieuses' spread into the provinces, doubtless with all the exaggerations of an unskilful imitation."—T. F. Crane, *Introd. to "La Société Française au Dix-Septième Siècle."*

Also in: A. G. Mason, *The Women of the French Salons, ch.* 2–7.

RAMBOUILLET DECREE, The. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1810–1812.

RAMESES, RAAMSES, OR RAMSES, Treasure-city of. See Jews: The route of the Exodus.

RAMESSIDS, The. — The nineteenth dynasty of Egyptian kings, sprung from Rameses I. fourteenth to twelfth centuries B. C. See Egypt: About B. C. 1400–1200.

RAMILLIES, Battle of (1706). See Netherlands: A. D. 1706–1707.

RAMIRO I., King of Aragon, A. D. 1035–1063.....Ramiro I., King of Leon and the Asturias, or Oviedo, 842–850.....Ramiro II., King of Aragon, 1134–1137.....Ramiro II., King of Leon and the Asturias, or Oviedo, 930–950.....Ramiro III., King of Leon and the Asturias, or Oviedo, 967–982.

RAMNES.—RAMNIANS, The. See Rome: Beginnings and Name.

RAMOTH-GILEAD. — The strong fortress of Ramoth-Gilead, on the frontier of Samaria and Syria, was the object and the scene of frequent warfare between the Israelites and the Arameans of Damascus. It was there that king Ahab of Samaria, in alliance with Judah, was killed in battle, fighting against Ben-hadad of Damascus.—1 *Kings, xxii.*

Also in: Dean Stanley, *Lect's on the Hist. of the Jewish Church, lect.* 33.

RANAS OF UDAIPORE OR CHITTORE. See Rajpoots.

RANDOLPH, Edmund, and the framing and adoption of the Federal Constitution. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1787; 1787–1789.....**In the Cabinet of President Washington.** See United States of Am.: A. D. 1789–1792.

RANJIT SINGH, OR RUNJIT SINGH, The conquests of. See Sikhs.

RANTERS.—MUGGLETONIANS.— "'These [the Ranters] made it their business,'

says Baxter, 'to set up the Light of Nature under the name of Christ in Man, and to dishonour and cry down the Church, the Scripture, and the present Ministry, and our worship and ordinances; and called men to hearken to Christ within them. But withal they conjoined a cursed doctrine of Libertinism, which brought them to all abominable filthiness of life. They taught, as the Familists, that God regardeth not the actions of the outward man, but of the heart, and that to the pure all things are pure.' . . . Of no sect do we hear more in the pamphlets and newspapers between 1650 and 1655, though there are traces of them of earlier date. . . . Sometimes confounded with the Ranters, but really distinguishable, were some crazed men, whose crazes had taken a religious turn, and whose extravagances became contagious.— Such was a John Robins, first heard of about 1650, when he went about, sometimes as God Almighty, sometimes as Adam raised from the dead. . . . One heard next, in 1652, of two associates, called John Reeve and Ludovick Muggleton, who professed to be 'the two last Spiritual Witnesses (Rev. xi.) and alone true Prophets of the Lord Jesus Christ, God alone blessed to all eternity.' They believed in a real man-shaped God, existing from all eternity, who had come upon earth as Jesus Christ, leaving Moses and Elijah to represent him in Heaven." Muggleton died in 1698, "at the age of 90, leaving a sect called The Muggletonians, who are perhaps not extinct yet."—D. Masson, *Life of John Milton, v.* 5, *pp.* 17–20.

RAPALLO, Battle of (1425). See ITALY: A. D. 1412–1447.....**Massacre at (1494).** See ITALY: A. D. 1494–1496.

RAPE OF THE SABINE WOMEN, The. See ROME: B. C. 753–510.

RAPES OF SUSSEX.—"The singular division of Sussex [England] into six 'rapes' [each of which is subdivided into hundreds] seems to have been made for military purposes. The old Norse 'hreppr' denoted a nearly similar territorial division."—T. P. Taswell-Langmead, *Eng. Const. Hist., ch.* 1, *foot-note.*—"The 'reebning,' or mensuration by the rope or line, supplied the technical term of 'hrepp' to the glossary of Scandinavian legislation: archæologists have therefore pronounced an opinion that the 'Rapes' of Sussex, the divisions ranging from the Channel shore to the Suthrige border, were, according to Norwegian fashion, thus plotted out by the Conqueror."—Sir F. Palgrave, *Hist. of Normandy and Eng., bk.* 1, *ch.* 5.

RAPHIA, Battle of (B. C. 217). See SELEUCIDÆ: B. C. 224–187.

RAPID INDIANS. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: RAPID INDIANS.

RAPIDAN, Campaign of Meade and Lee on the. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1863 (JULY—NOVEMBER: VIRGINIA).

RAPPAHANNOCK STATION, Battle of. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1863 (JULY—NOVEMBER: VIRGINIA).

RAPPAREES.—TORIES.—"Ejected proprietors [in Ireland, 17th and 18th centuries] whose names might be traced in the annals of the Four Masters, or around the sculptured crosses of Clonmacnoise, might be found in abject poverty hanging around the land which had lately been their own, shrinking from servile labour as from an intolerable pollution, and still receiving a secret homage from their old tenants. In a country where the clan spirit was intensely strong, and where the new landlords were separated from their tenants by race, by religion, and by custom, these fallen and impoverished chiefs naturally found themselves at the head of the discontented classes; and for many years after the Commonwealth, and again after the Revolution, they and their followers, under the names of tories and rapparees, waged a kind of guerrilla war of depredations upon their successors. After the first years of the 18th century, however, this form of crime appears to have almost ceased; and although we find the names of tories and rapparees on every page of the judicial records, the old meaning was no longer attached to them, and they had become the designations of ordinary felons, at large in the country."—W. E. H. Lecky, *Hist. of Eng., 18th Century, ch.* 7 (*v.* 2).—"The distinction between the Irish foot soldier and the Irish Rapparee had never been very strongly marked. It now disappeared [during the war in Ireland between James II. and William of Orange—A. D. 1691]. Great part of the army was turned loose to live by marauding."—Lord Macaulay, *Hist. of Eng., ch.* 17 (*v.* 4).—"The Rapparee was the lowest of the low people. . . . The Rapparee knew little difference between friend and foe; receiving no mercy, they gave none."—Sir J. Dalrymple, *Memoirs of Gt. Britain and Ireland, pt.* 2, *bk.* 5 (*v.* 3).—"Political disaffection in Ireland has been the work, on the one hand, of the representatives of the old disinherited families—the Kernes, and Gallowglasses of one age, the Rapparees of the next, the houghers and ravishers of a third; on the other, of the restless aspirations of the Catholic clergy."—J. A. Froude, *The English in Ireland, bk.* 9, *ch.* 1 (*v.* 3).

RARITANS, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: ALGONQUIAN FAMILY.

RAS.—RASENNA. See ETRUSCANS.

RASCIA. See BALKAN AND DANUBIAN STATES, 7TH CENTURY (SERVIA, CROATIA, ETC.).

RASCOL.—RASKOL.—RASKOLNIKS. See RUSSIA: A. D. 1655–1659.

RASTA, The. See LEUGA.

RASTADT, Congress of.—Murder of French envoys. See FRANCE: A. D. 1799 (APRIL—SEPTEMBER).

RASTADT, The Treaty of (1714). See UTRECHT: A. D. 1712–1714.

RATÆ, OR RAGÆ.—A Roman town in Britain—"one of the largest and most important of the midland cities, adorned with rich mansions and temples, and other public buildings. Its site is now occupied by the town of Leicester."—T. Wright, *Celt, Roman and Saxon, ch.* 5.

RATHMINES, Battle of (1649). See IRELAND: A. D. 1646–1649.

RATHS.—"Of those ancient Raths, or Hill-fortresses, which formed the dwellings of the old Irish chiefs, and belonged evidently to a period when cities were not yet in existence, there are to be found numerous remains throughout the country. This species of earthen work is distinguished from the artificial mounds, or tumuli, by its being formed upon natural elevations, and always surrounded by a rampart."—T. Moore, *Hist. of Ireland, ch.* 9.

RATHSMANN, RATHSMEISTER, etc. See CITIES, IMPERIAL AND FREE, OF GERMANY.

RATISBON: Taken by the Swedish-German forces (1633). See GERMANY: A. D. 1632–1634.

RATISBON, Battle of. See GERMANY: A. D. 1809 (JANUARY—JUNE).

RATISBON, Catholic League of. See PAPACY: A. D. 1522–1525.

RAUCOUX, Battle of (1746). See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1746–1747.

RAUDINE PLAIN, Battle of the. See CIMBRI AND TEUTONES: B. C. 113–102.

RAURACI, The.—An ancient tribe "whose origin is perhaps German, established on both banks of the Rhine, towards the elbow which that river forms at Bâle."—Napoleon III., *Hist. of Cæsar, bk.* 3, *ch.* 2, *foot-note.*

RAVENIKA, The Parliament of.—Henry, the second emperor of the Latin empire of Romania, or empire of Constantinople, convened a general parliament or high-court of all his vassals, at Ravenika, in 1209, for the determining of the feudal relations of all the subjects of the empire. Ravenika is in ancient Chalkidike, some fifty miles from Thessalonica.—G. Finlay, *Hist. of Greece from its Conquest by the Crusaders, ch.* 4, *sect.* 4.

RAVENNA: B. C. 50.—Cæsar's advance on Rome. See ROME: B. C. 52–50.

A. D. 404.—Made the capital of the Western Empire.—"The houses of Ravenna, whose appearance may be compared to that of Venice, were raised on the foundation of wooden piles. The adjacent country, to the distance of many miles, was a deep and impassable morass; and the artificial causeway which connected Ravenna with the continent might be easily guarded, or destroyed, on the approach of a hostile army. These morasses were interspersed, however, with vineyards; and though the soil was exhausted by four or five crops, the town enjoyed a more plentiful supply of wine than of fresh water. The air, instead of receiving the sickly and almost pestilential exhalations of low and marshy grounds, was distinguished, like the neighbourhood of Alexandria, as uncommonly pure and salubrious; and this singular advantage was ascribed to the regular tides of the Adriatic. . . . This advantageous situation was fortified by art and labour; and, in the twentieth year of his age, the Emperor of the West [Honorius, A. D. 395–423] anxious only for his personal safety, retired to the perpetual confinement of the walls and morasses of Ravenna. The example of Honorius was imitated by his feeble successors, the Gothic kings, and afterwards the exarchs, who occupied the throne and palace of the emperors; and till the middle of the eighth century Ravenna was considered as the seat of government and the capital of Italy."—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, ch.* 30.

ALSO IN: T. Hodgkin, *Italy and Her Invaders, ch.* 9.—See, also, ROME: A. D. 404–408.

A. D. 490-493.—Siege and capture by Theodoric.—Murder of Odoacer.—Capital of the Ostrogothic kingdom. See ROME: A. D. 488–526.

A. D. 493-525.—The capital of Theodoric the Ostrogoth.—"The usual residence of Theodoric was Ravenna, with which city his name is linked as inseparably as those of Honorius or Placidia. The letters of Cassiodorus show his zeal for the architectural enrichment of this capital. Square blocks of stone were to be brought from Faenza, marble pillars to be transported from the palace on the Pincian Hill: the most skilful artists in mosaic were invited from Rome, to execute some of those very works which we still wonder at in the basilicas and baptisteries of the city by the Ronco. The chief memorials of his reign which Theodoric has left at Ravenna are a church, a palace, and a tomb."—T. Hodgkin, *Italy and Her Invaders, bk.* 4, *ch.* 8 (*v.* 3).

A. D. 540.—Surrender to Belisarius. See ROME: A. D. 535–553.

A. D. 554-800.—The Exarchate. See ROME: A. D. 554–800.

A. D. 728-751.—Decline and fall of the Exarchate. See PAPACY: A. D. 728–774.

A. D. 1275.—The Papal sovereignty confirmed by Rodolph of Hapsburg. See GERMANY: A. D. 1273–1308.

A. D. 1512.—Taken by the French.—Battle before the city.—Defeat of the Spaniards. See ITALY: A. D. 1510–1513.

RAVENSPUR.—The landing place of Henry of Lancaster, July 4, 1399, when he came back from banishment to demand the crown of England from Richard II. It is on the coast of Yorkshire.

RAYMOND, of Toulouse, The Crusade of. See CRUSADES: A. D. 1096–1099; also, JERUSALEM: A. D. 1099; and 1099–1144.

RAYMOND, Battle of. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1863 (APRIL—JULY: ON THE MISSISSIPPI).

REAL, Spanish. See SPANISH COINS.

REAMS'S STATION, Battle of. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1864 (AUGUST: VIRGINIA).

REASON, The Worship of. See FRANCE: A. D. 1793 (NOVEMBER).

REBECCAITES.—DAUGHTERS OF REBECCA.—Between 1839 and 1844, a general outbreak occurred in Wales against what were thought to be the excessive tolls collected on the turnpike roads. Finding that peaceful agitation was of no avail the people determined to destroy the turnpike gates, and did so very extensively, the movement spreading from county to county. They applied to themselves the Bible promise given to the descendants of Isaac's wife, that they should possess the "gate" of their enemies, and were known as the Daughters, or Children of Rebecca, or Rebeccaites. Their proceedings assumed at last a generally riotous and lawless character, and were repressed by severe measures. At the same time Parliament removed the toll-gate grievance by an amended law.—W. N. Molesworth, *Hist. of Eng.*, 1830–1874, *v.* 2, *p.* 131.

RECESS.—Certain decrees of the Germanic diet were so called. See PAPACY: A. D. 1530–1531.

RECHABITES, The.—An ascetic religious association, or order, formed among the Israelites, under the influence of the prophet Elijah, or after his death. Like the monks of a later time, they mostly withdrew into the desert. "The vow of their order was so strict that they were not allowed to possess either vineyards or corn-fields or houses, and they were consequently rigidly confined for means of subsistence to the products of the wilderness."—H. Ewald, *Hist. of Israel, bk.* 4, *sect.* 1 (*v.* 4).

RECIPROCITY TREATY, Canadian. See TARIFF LEGISLATION, &c. (UNITED STATES AND CANADA): A. D. 1854–1866.

RECOLLECTS, OR RÉCOLLETS.—This name is borne by a branch of the Franciscan order of friars, to indicate that the aim of their lives is the recollection of God and the forgetfulness of worldly things.

RECONSTRUCTION: President Lincoln's Louisiana plan. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1863–1864 (DECEMBER—JULY). ....**President Johnson's plan.** See same, A. D. 1865 (MAY—JULY).....**The question in Congress.** See same: A. D. 1865–1866 (DECEMBER—APRIL), 1866–1867 (OCTOBER—MARCH), 1867 (MARCH). . . . .See also: SOUTH CAROLINA: A. D. 1865–1876; TENNESSEE: A. D. 1865–1866; LOUISIANA: A. D. 1865–1867.

RECULVER, Roman origin of. See REGULBIUM.

RED CAP OF LIBERTY, The. See LIBERTY CAP.

RED CROSS, The.—"A confederation of relief societies in different countries, acting under the Geneva Convention, carries on its work under the sign of the Red Cross. The aim of these societies is to ameliorate the condition of wounded soldiers in the armies in campaign on land or sea. The societies had their rise in the conviction of certain philanthropic men, that the official sanitary service in wars is usually insufficient, and that the charity of the people, which at such times exhibits itself munificently, should be organized for the best possible utilization. An international public conference was called at Geneva, Switzerland, in 1863, which, though it had not an official character, brought together representatives from a number of Governments. At this conference a treaty was drawn up, afterwards remodeled and improved, which twenty-five Governments have signed. The treaty provides for the neutrality of all sanitary supplies, ambulances, surgeons, nurses, attendants, and sick or wounded men, and their safe conduct, when they bear the sign of the organization, viz: the Red Cross. Although the convention which originated the organization was necessarily international, the relief societies themselves are entirely national and independent; each one governing itself and making its own laws according to the genius of its nationality and needs. It was necessary for recognizance and safety, and for carrying out the general provisions of the treaty, that a uniform badge should be agreed upon. The Red Cross was chosen out of compliment to the Swiss Republic, where the first convention was held, and in which the Central Commission has its headquarters. The Swiss colors being a white cross on a red ground, the badge chosen was these colors reversed. There are no 'members of the Red Cross,' but only members of societies whose sign it is. There is no 'Order of the Red Cross.' The relief societies use, each according to its convenience, whatever methods seem best suited to prepare in times of peace for the necessities of sanitary service in times of war. They gather and store gifts of money and supplies; arrange hospitals, ambulances, methods of transportation of wounded men, bureaus of information, correspondence, &c. All that the most ingenious philanthropy could devise and execute has been attempted in this direction. In the Franco-Prussian war this was abundantly tested. . . . This society had its inception in the mind of Monsieur Henri Dunant, a Swiss gentleman, who was ably seconded in his views by Monsieur Gustave Moynier and Dr. Louis Appia, of Geneva."—*Hist. of the Red Cross* (*Washington*, 1883).

RED FORTRESS, The. The Alhambra. See SPAIN: A. D. 1238–1273.

RED LAND, The. See VEHMGERICHTS.

RED LEGS. See JAYHAWKERS.

RED RIVER COMPANY AND SETTLEMENT.—RIEL'S REBELLION. See CANADA: A. D. 1869–1873.

RED RIVER EXPEDITION. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1864 (MARCH—MAY: LOUISIANA).

RED ROBE, Counsellors of the. See VENICE: A. D. 1032–1319.

RED TERROR, The.—The later period of the French Reign of Terror, when the guillotine was busiest, is sometimes so called. See FRANCE: A. D. 1794–1795 (JULY—APRIL).

REDAN, Assaults on the (1855). See RUSSIA: A. D. 1854–1856.

REDEMPTIONERS.—"Redemptioners, or term slaves, as they were sometimes called, constituted in the early part of the 18th century a peculiar feature of colonial society. They were recruited from among all manner of people in the old world, and through this channel Europe emptied upon America, not only the virtuous poor and oppressed of her population, but the vagrants, felons, and the dregs of her communities. . . . There were two kinds of redemptioners: 'indented servants,' who had bound themselves to their masters for a term of years previous to their leaving the old country; and 'free-willers,' who, being without money and desirous of emigrating, agreed with the captains of ships to allow themselves and their families to be sold on arrival, for the captain's advantage, and thus repay costs of passage and other expenses."—A. D. Mellick, Jr., *The Story of an Old Farm, ch.* 11.

REDEMPTORISTS, The.—The members of the congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer, founded by St. Alphonsus Maria de Liguori, in 1732, are commonly known as Redemptorists. The congregation is especially devoted to apostolic work among neglected classes of people. It has monasteries in several parts of Europe.

REDONES, The. See VENETI OF WESTERN GAUL.

REDSTICKS, The.—This name was given to the hostile Creek Indians of Florida. See FLORIDA: A. D. 1816–1818.

REDUCTIONS IN PARAGUAY, The Jesuit. See PARAGUAY: A. D. 1608–1873.

REEVE. See GEREFA; and MARGRAVE.

REFERENDARIUS. See CHANCELLOR.

REFERENDUM AND INITIATIVE, The Swiss.—"A popular vote under the name Referendum was known in the valleys of Graubünden and Wallis as early as the 16th century. Here existed small federations of communities who regulated certain matters of general concern by means of assemblies of delegates from each village. These conventions were not allowed to decide upon any important measure finally, but must refer the matter to the various constituencies. If a majority of these approved, the act might be passed at the next assembly. This

REFERENDUM AND INITIATIVE.

primitive system lasted till the French invasion of 1798, and was again established in Graubünden in 1815. The word Referendum was also used by the old federal diets, in which there were likewise no comprehensive powers of legislation. If not already instructed the delegates must vote 'ad referendum' and carry all questions to the home government. The institution as now known is a product of this century. It originated in the canton of St. Gallen in 1830, where at the time the constitution was undergoing revision. As a compromise between the party which strove for pure democracy and that desiring representative government, it was provided that all laws should be submitted to popular vote if a respectable number of voters so demanded. Known at first by the name Veto, this system slowly found its way into several of the German-speaking cantons, so that soon after the adoption of the federal constitution five were employing the optional Referendum. Other forms of popular legislation were destined to find wider acceptance, but at present [1891] in eight states, including three of the Romance tongue, laws must be submitted on request. . . . The usual limit of time during which the petition must be signed is 30 days. These requests are directed to the Executive Council of the state, and that body is obliged, within a similar period after receiving the same, to appoint a day for the vote. The number of signers required varies from 500 in the little canton Zug to 6,000 in St. Gallen, or from one-tenth to one-fifth of all the voters. Some states provide that in connection with the vote on the bill as a whole, an expression may be taken on separate points. Custom varies as to the number of votes required to veto a law. Some fix the minimum at a majority of those taking part in the election, and others at a majority of all citizens, whether voting or not. In case the vote is against the bill, the matter is referred by the Executive Council to the legislature. This body, after examining into the correctness of the returns, passes a resolution declaring its own act to be void. By means of the Initiative or Imperative Petition, the order of legislation just described is reversed, since the impulse to make law is received from below instead of above. The method of procedure is about as follows: Those who are interested in the passage of a new law prepare either a full draft of such a bill or a petition containing the points desired to be covered, with the reasons for its enactment, and then bring the matter before the public for the purpose of obtaining signatures. Endorsement may be given either by actually signing the petition or by verbal assent to it. The latter form of consent is indicated either in the town meetings of the communes, or by appearing before the official in charge of the petition and openly asking that his vote be given for it. If, in the various town meetings of the canton taken together, a stated number of affirmative votes are given for the petition, the effect is the same as if the names of voters had been signed. . . . The number of names required is about the same in proportion to the whole body of voters as for the Optional Referendum. The requisite number of signatures having been procured, the petition is carried to the legislature of the canton. This body must take the matter into consideration within a specified time (Solothurn, two months), and prepare a completed draft in accordance with the request. It may also at the same time present an alternate proposition which expresses its own ideas of the matter, so that voters may take their choice. In any case the legislature gives an opinion on the project, as to its desirability or propriety, and the public has thus a report of its own select committee for guidance. The bill is then submitted to the voters, and on receiving the assent of a majority, and having been promulgated by the executive authority, becomes a law of the land."—J. M. Vincent, *State and Federal Gov't in Switzerland, ch.* 13.—"Between 1874 and 1886, the federal legislature passed 113 laws and resolutions which were capable of being submitted to the referendum. Of these only 19 were subjected to the popular vote, and of these last 13 were rejected and 6 adopted. The strong opposing views, which are held in Switzerland regarding the expediency of the referendum, indicate that this is one of the features of the government which is open to future discussion."—B. Moses, *The Federal Gov't of Switzerland, p.* 119.—See, also, SWITZERLAND: A. D. 1848–1890.—"A plébiscite is a mass vote of the French people by which a Revolutionary or Imperial Executive obtains for its policy, or its crimes, the apparent sanction or condonation of France. Frenchmen are asked at the moment, and in the form most convenient to the statesmen or conspirators who rule in Paris, to say 'Aye' or 'No' whether they will, or will not, accept a given Constitution or a given policy. The crowd of voters are expected to reply in accordance to the wishes or the orders of the Executive, and the expectation always has met, and an observer may confidently predict always will meet, with fulfilment. The plébiscite is a revolutionary, or at least abnormal, proceeding. It is not preceded by debate. The form and nature of the question to be submitted to the nation is chosen and settled by the men in power. Rarely, indeed, when a plébiscite has been taken, has the voting itself been either free or fair. Taine has a strange tale to tell of the methods by which a Terrorist faction, when all but crushed by general odium, extorted from the country by means of the plébiscite a sham assent to the prolongation of revolutionary despotism. The credulity of partisanship can nowadays hardly induce even Imperialists to imagine that the plébiscites which sanctioned the establishment of the Empire, which declared Louis Napoleon President for life, which first re-established Imperialism, and then approved more or less Liberal reforms, fatal at bottom to the Imperial system, were the free, deliberate, carefully considered votes of the French nation given after the people had heard all that could be said for and against the proposed innovation. . . . The essential characteristics, however, the lack of which deprives a French plébiscite of all moral significance, are the undoubted properties of the Swiss Referendum. When a law revising the Constitution is placed before the people of Switzerland, every citizen throughout the land has enjoyed the opportunity of learning the merits and demerits of the proposed alteration. The subject has been 'threshed out,' as the expression goes, in Parliament; the scheme, whatever its worth, has received the deliberately given approval of the elected Legislature; it comes before the people with as much authority in its favour as a Bill

which in England has passed through both Houses."—A. V. Dicey, *The Referendum*, (*Contemporary Review, April*, 1890).—"A judgment of the referendum must be based on the working of the electoral machinery, on the interest shown by the voters, and on the popular discrimination between good and bad measures. The process of invoking and voting on a referendum is simple and easily worked, if not used too often. Although the Assembly has, in urgent cases, the constitutional right to set a resolution in force at once, it always allows from three to eight months' delay so as to permit the opponents of a measure to lodge their protests against it. Voluntary committees take charge of the movement, and, if a law is unpopular, little difficulty is found in getting together the necessary thirty thousand or fifty thousand signatures. Only thrice has the effort failed when made. When, as in 1882, the signatures run up to 180,000, the labor is severe, for every signature is examined by the national executive to see whether it is attested as the sign manual of a voter; sometimes, in an interested canton, as many as 70 per cent. of the voters have signed the demand. The system undoubtedly leads to public discussion: newspapers criticise; addresses and counter addresses are issued; cantonal councils publicly advise voters; and of late the federal Assembly sends out manifestoes against pending initiatives. The federal Executive Council distributes to the cantons enough copies of the proposed measure, so that one may be given to each voter. The count of the votes is made by the Executive Council as a returning-board. Inasmuch as the Swiss are unfamiliar with election frauds, and there has been but one very close vote in the national referenda, the count is not difficult, but there are always irregularities, especially where more than one question is presented to the voters at the same time. What is the effect of the popular votes, thus carried out? The following table, based on official documents, shows the results for the twenty years, 1875–1894:

	Passed.	Rejected.	Total.
(*a.*) Constitutional amendments proposed by the Assembly (referendum obligatory)	1	6	7
(*b.*) Constitutional amendments proposed by popular initiative (50,000 signatures)	2	1	*4
(*c.*) Laws passed by the Assembly (referendum demanded by 30,000)	14	6	20
	17	13	31

* One measure still pending.

Making allowances for cases where more than one question has been submitted at the same time, there have been twenty-four popular votes in twenty years. In addition, most of the cantons have their own local referenda; in Zurich, for example, in these twenty years, more than one hundred other questions have been placed before the sovereign people. These numbers are large in themselves, but surprising in proportion to the total legislation. Out of 158 general acts passed by the federal Assembly from 1874 to 1892, 27 were subjected to the referendum; that is, about one-sixth are reviewed and about one-tenth are reversed. Constitutional amendments usually get through sooner or later, but more than two-thirds of the statutes attacked are annulled. To apply the system on such a scale in any State of our Union is plainly impossible; thirty-nine-fortieths of the statute-book must still rest, as now, on the character of the legislators. Nevertheless it may be worth while to excise the other fortieth, if experience shows that the people are more interested and wiser than their representatives, when a question is put plainly and simply before them. I must own to disappointment over the use made by the Swiss of their envied opportunity. On the twenty referenda between 1879 and 1891 the average vote in proportion to the voters was but 58.5 per cent.; in only one case did it reach 67 per cent.; and in one case — the patent law of 1887 — it fell to about 40 per cent. in the Confederation, and to 9 per cent. in Canton Schwyz. On the serious and dangerous question of recognizing the right to employment, this present year, only about 56 per cent. participated. In Zurich there is a compulsory voting law, of which the curious result is that on both national and cantonal referenda many thousands of blank ballots are cast. The result of the small vote is that laws, duly considered by the national legislature and passed by considerable majorities, are often reversed by a minority of the voters. The most probable reason for this apathy is that there are too many elections — in some cantons as many as fifteen a year. Whatever the cause, Swiss voters are less interested in referenda than Swiss legislators in framing bills. . . . 'I am a friend of the referendum,' says an eminent member of the Executive Council, 'but I do not like the initiative.' The experience of Switzerland seems to show four things: that the Swiss voters are not deeply interested in the referendum; that the referendum is as likely to kill good as bad measures; that the initiative is more likely to suggest bad measures than good; that the referendum leads straight to the initiative. The referendum in the United States would therefore probably be an attempt to govern great communities by permanent town meeting."—Prof. A. B. Hart, *Vox Populi in Switzerland* (*Nation, Sept.* 13, 1894).

Also in: A. L. Lowell, *The Referendum in Switzerland and America* (*Atlantic Monthly, April*, 1894).—E. P. Oberholtzer, *The Referendum in America.*

REFORM, Parliamentary. See England: A. D. 1830; 1830–1832; 1865–1868, and 1884–1885.

REFORMATION: Bohemia. See Bohemia: A. D. 1405–1415; and 1419–1434, and after.

England. See England: A. D. 1527–1534, to 1558–1588.

France. See Papacy: A. D. 1521–1535; and France: A. D. 1532–1547, and after.

Germany. See Papacy: A. D. 1516–1517, 1517, 1517–1521, 1521–1522, 1522–1525, 1525–1529, 1530–1531, 1537–1563; also Germany: A. D. 1517–1523, 1530–1532, 1533–1546, 1546–1552, 1552–1561; also Palatinate of the Rhine: A. D. 1518–1572.

Hungary. See Hungary: A. D. 1526–1567.

Ireland; its failure. See Ireland: A. D. 1535–1553.

Netherlands. See Netherlands: A. D. 1521–1555, and after.

Piedmont. See Savoy and Piedmont: A. D. 1559–1580.

Scotland. See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1547–1557; 1557; 1558–1560; and 1561–1568.

Sweden and Denmark. See SCANDINAVIAN STATES: A. D. 1397–1527.

Switzerland. See PAPACY: A. D. 1519–1524; SWITZERLAND: A. D. 1528–1531; and GENEVA: A. D. 1504–1535; and 1536–1564.

REFORMATION, The Counter. See PAPACY: A. D. 1534–1540; 1537–1563; 1555–1603.

REGED. See CUMBRIA.

REGENSBURG. See RATISBON—under which name the town is more commonly known to English readers.

REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY, New York. See EDUCATION, MODERN: AMERICA: A. D. 1746–1787.

REGICIDES AT NEW HAVEN, The. See CONNECTICUT: A. D. 1660–1664.

REGILLUS, Lake, Battle at.—In the legendary history of the Roman kings it is told that the last of the Tarquins strove long to regain his throne, with the help of the Etruscans first, afterwards of the Latins, and that the question was finally settled in a great battle fought with the latter, near the Lake Regillus, in which the Romans were helped by Castor and Pollux, in person.—Livy, *History*, II. 19.

REGNI, The. See BRITAIN, CELTIC TRIBES.

REGULATORS OF NORTH CAROLINA. See NORTH CAROLINA: A. D. 1766–1771.

REGULBIUM.—One of the fortified Roman towns in Britain on the Kentish coast,—modern Reculver.—T. Wright, *Celt, Roman and Saxon, ch.* 5.—See ENGLAND: A. D. 449–473.

REGULUS, and the Carthaginians. See PUNIC WAR, THE FIRST.

REICHSTAG. See DIET, THE GERMANIC.

REIGN OF TERROR, The. See TERROR.

REIS EFFENDI. See SUBLIME PORTE.

REMI, The. See BELGÆ.

REMO, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: ANDESIANS.

REMONSTRANTS AND COUNTER-REMONSTRANTS. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1603–1619.

REMOVAL OF THE DEPOSITS. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1833–1836.

RENAISSANCE, The.—"The word Renaissance has of late years received a more extended significance than that which is implied in our English equivalent—the Revival of Learning. We use it to denote the whole transition from the Middle Ages to the Modern World; and though it is possible to assign certain limits to the period during which this transition took place, we cannot fix on any dates so positively as to say—between this year and that the movement was accomplished. To do so would be like trying to name the days on which spring in any particular season began and ended. Yet we speak of spring as different from winter and from summer. . . . By the term Renaissance, or new birth, is indicated a natural movement, not to be explained by this or that characteristic, but to be accepted as an effort of humanity for which at length the time had come, and in the onward progress of which we still participate. The history of the Renaissance is not the history of arts, or of sciences, or of literature, or even of nations. It is the history of the attainment of self-conscious freedom by the human spirit manifested in the European races. It is no mere political mutation, no new fashion of art, no restoration of classical standards of taste. The arts and the inventions, the knowledge and the books which suddenly became vital at the time of the Renaissance, had long lain neglected on the shores of the Dead Sea which we call the Middle Ages. It was not their discovery which caused the Renaissance. But it was the intellectual energy, the spontaneous outburst of intelligence, which enabled mankind at that moment to make use of them. The force then generated still continues, vital and expansive, in the spirit of the modern world. . . . The reason why Italy took the lead in the Renaissance was, that Italy possessed a language, a favourable climate, political freedom, and commercial prosperity, at a time when other nations were still semi-barbarous. . . . It was . . . at the beginning of the 14th century, when Italy had lost indeed the heroic spirit which we admire in her Communes of the 13th, but had gained instead ease, wealth, magnificence, and that repose which springs from long prosperity, that the new age at last began. . . . The great achievements of the Renaissance were the discovery of the world and the discovery of man. Under these two formulæ may be classified all the phenomena which properly belong to this period. The discovery of the world divides itself into two branches—the exploration of the globe, and the systematic exploration of the universe which is in fact what we call Science. Columbus made known America in 1492; the Portuguese rounded the Cape in 1497; Copernicus explained the solar system in 1507. It is not necessary to add anything to this plain statement. . . . In the discovery of man . . . it is possible to trace a twofold process. Man in his temporal relations, illustrated by Pagan antiquity, and man in his spiritual relations, illustrated by Biblical antiquity: these are the two regions, at first apparently distinct, afterwards found to be interpenetrative, which the critical and inquisitive genius of the Renaissance opened for investigation. In the former of these regions we find two agencies at work, art and scholarship. . . . Through the instrumentality of art, and of all the ideas which art introduced into daily life, the Renaissance wrought for the modern world a real resurrection of the body. . . . It was scholarship which revealed to men the wealth of their own minds, the dignity of human thought, the value of human speculation, the importance of human life regarded as a thing apart from religious rules and dogmas. . . . The Renaissance opened to the whole reading public the treasure-houses of Greek and Latin literature. At the same time the Bible in its original tongues was rediscovered. Mines of Oriental learning were laid bare for the students of the Jewish and Arabic traditions. What we may call the Aryan and the Semitic revelations were for the first time subjected to something like a critical comparison. With unerring instinct the men of the Renaissance named the voluminous subject-matter of scholarship 'Litteræ Humaniores,' the more human literature, the literature that humanises [hence the term Humanism]. . . . Not only did scholarship restore the classics and encourage literary criticism; it also restored the text of the Bible, and encouraged theological criticism. In the wake of theological freedom followed a free philosophy, no longer subject to the dogmas of the Church. . . . On the one side

Descartes, and Bacon, and Spinoza, and Locke are sons of the Renaissance, champions of new-found philosophical freedom; on the other side, Luther is a son of the Renaissance, the herald of new-found religious freedom."—J. A. Symonds, *Renaissance in Italy: Age of the Despots, ch.* 1.—"The Renaissance, so far as painting is concerned, may be said to have culminated between the years 1470 and 1550. These dates, it must be frankly admitted, are arbitrary; nor is there anything more unprofitable than the attempt to define by strict chronology the moments of an intellectual growth so complex, so unequally progressive, and so varied as that of Italian art. All that the historian can hope to do, is to strike a mean between his reckoning of years and his more subtle calculations based on the emergence of decisive genius in special men. An instance of such compromise is afforded by Lionardo da Vinci, who belongs, as far as dates go, to the last half of the fifteenth century, but who must on any estimate of his achievement, be classed with Michael Angelo among the final and supreme masters of the full Renaissance. To violate the order of time, with a view to what may here be called the morphology of Italian art, is, in his case, a plain duty. Bearing this in mind, it is still possible to regard the eighty years above mentioned as a period no longer of promise and preparation but of fulfilment and accomplishment. Furthermore, the thirty years at the close of the fifteenth century may be taken as one epoch in this climax of the art, while the first half of the sixteenth forms a second. Within the former falls the best work of Mantegna, Perugino, Francia, the Bellini, Signorelli, Fra Bartolommeo. To the latter we may reckon Michael Angelo, Raphael, Giorgione, Correggio, Titian, and Andrea del Sarto. Lionardo da Vinci, though belonging chronologically to the former epoch, ranks first among the masters of the latter; and to this also may be given Tintoretto, though his life extended far beyond it to the last years of the century."—The same, *Renaissance in Italy: The Fine Arts, ch.* 4–6.—"It would be difficult to find any period in the history of modern Europe equal in importance with that distinguished in history under the name of the Renaissance. Standing midway between the decay of the Middle Ages and the growth of modern institutions, we may say that it was already dawning in the days of Dante Alighieri, in whose immortal works we find the synthesis of a dying age and the announcement of the birth of a new era. This new era — the Renaissance — began with Petrarch and his learned contemporaries, and ended with Martin Luther and the Reformation, which event not only produced signal changes in the history of those nations which remained Catholic, but transported beyond the Alps the centre of gravity of European culture."—P. Villari, *Niccolo Machiavelli and his Times, v.* 1, *ch.* 1.—J. Burckhardt, *The Civilization of the Period of the Renaissance in Italy.*—On the communication of the movement of the Renaissance to France and Europe in general, as a notable consequence of the invasion of Italy by Charles VIII., see ITALY: A. D. 1494–1496.—See, also, ITALY: 14TH CENTURY, and 15–16TH CENTURIES; FLORENCE: A. D. 1469–1492; VENICE: 16TH CENTURY; FRANCE: A. D. 1492–1515, and 16TH CENTURY; EDUCATION: RENAISSANCE; ENGLAND: 15–16TH CENTURIES.

RÉNE (called The Good), Duke of Anjou and Lorraine and Count of Provence, A. D. 1434–1480; King of Naples, A. D. 1435–1442. See ANJOU: A. D. 1206–1442.

RENSSELAER, Van. See VAN RENSSELAER.

RENSSELAERWICK, The Patroon colony and manor of. See NEW YORK: A. D. 1621–1646; also, LIVINGSTON MANOR.

REPARTIMIENTOS.—ENCOMIENDAS.—Columbus, as governor of Hispaniola (Hayti), made an arrangement "by which the caciques in their vicinity, instead of paying tribute, should furnish parties of their subjects, free Indians, to assist the colonists in the cultivation of their lands: a kind of feudal service, which was the origin of the repartimientos, or distributions of free Indians among the colonists, afterwards generally adopted, and shamefully abused, throughout the Spanish colonies; a source of intolerable hardships and oppressions to the unhappy natives, and which greatly contributed to exterminate them from the island of Hispaniola. Columbus considered the island in the light of a conquered country, and arrogated to himself all the rights of a conqueror, in the name of the sovereigns for whom he fought."—W. Irving, *Life and Voyages of Columbus, bk.* 12, *ch.* 4 (*v.* 2).—"The words 'repartimiento' and 'encomienda' are often used indiscriminately by Spanish authors; but, speaking accurately, 'repartimiento' means the first apportionment of Indians,—'encomienda' the apportionment of any Spaniard's share which might become 'vacant' by his death or banishment."—Sir A. Helps, *Spanish Conquest in Am., bk.* 6, *ch.* 2, *foot-note* (*v.* 1).—"'Repartimiento,' a distribution; 'repartir,' to divide; 'encomienda,' a charge, a commandery; 'encomendar,' to give in charge; 'encomendero,' he who holds an encomienda. In Spain an encomienda, as here understood, was a dignity in the four military orders, endowed with a rental, and held by certain members of the order. It was acquired through the liberality of the crown as a reward for services in the wars against the Moors. The lands taken from the Infidels were divided among Christian commanders; the inhabitants of those lands were crown tenants, and life-rights to their services were given these commanders. In the legislation of the Indies, encomienda was the patronage conferred by royal favor over a portion of the natives, coupled with the obligation to teach them the doctrines of the Church, and to defend their persons and property. . . . The system begun in the New World by Columbus, Bobadilla, and Ovando was continued by Vasco Nuñez, Pedrarias, Cortés, and Pizarro, and finally became general."—H. H. Bancroft, *Hist. of the Pacific States, v.* 1, *p.* 262, *foot-note.*—See, also, SLAVERY, MODERN: OF THE INDIANS.

REPEAL OF THE UNION OF IRELAND WITH GREAT BRITAIN, The Agitation for. See IRELAND: A. D. 1811–1829, 1840–1841; and 1841–1848.

REPETUNDÆ. See CALPURNIAN LAW.

REPHAIM, The. See HORITES, THE.

REPRESENTATION OF THE PEOPLE ACT, 1884. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1884–1885.

REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT.—"This [representative government] is the great distinction between free states of the modern

type, whether kingly or republican, and the city-commonwealths of old Greece. It is the great political invention of Teutonic Europe, the one form of political life to which neither Thucydides, Aristotle, nor Polybios ever saw more than the faintest approach. In Greece it was hardly needed, but in Italy a representative system would have delivered Rome from the fearful choice which she had to make between anarchy and despotism."—E. A. Freeman, *Hist. of Federal Gov't, ch.* 2.—"Examples of nearly every form of government are to be found in the varied history of Greece: but nowhere do we find a distinct system of political representation. There is, indeed, a passage in Aristotle which implies a knowledge of the principles of representation. He speaks of 'a moderate oligarchy, in which men of a certain census elect a council entrusted with the deliberative power, but bound to exercise this power agreeably to established laws.' There can be no better definition of representation than this: but it appears to express his theoretical conception of a government, rather than to describe any example within his own experience. Such a system was incompatible with the democratic constitutions of the city republics: but in their international councils and leagues, we may perceive a certain resemblance to it. There was an approach to representation in the Amphictyonic Council, and in the Achaian League; and the several cities of the Lycian League had a number of votes in the assembly, proportioned to their size — the first example of the kind — being a still nearer approximation to the principles of representation. But it was reserved for later ages to devise the great scheme of representative government, under which large States may enjoy as much liberty as the walled cities of Greece, and individual citizens may exercise their political rights as fully as the Athenians, without the disorders and perils of pure democracy."—Sir T. E. May, *Democracy in Europe, v.* 1, *ch.* 3.—"The most interesting, and on the whole the most successful, experiments in popular government, are those which have frankly recognised the difficulty under which it labours. At the head of these we must place the virtually English discovery of government by Representation, which caused Parliamentary institutions to be preserved in these islands from the destruction which overtook them everywhere else, and to devolve as an inheritance upon the United States."—Sir H. S. Maine, *Popular Government, p.* 92.—"To find the real origin of the modern representative system we must turn to the assemblies of the second grade in the early German states. In these the freemen of the smaller locality — the Hundred or Canton — came together in a public meeting which possessed no doubt legislative power over matters purely local, but whose most important function seems to have been judicial — a local court, presided over by a chief who suggested and announced the verdict, which, however, derived its validity from the decision of the assembly, or, in later times, of a number of their body appointed to act for the whole. Those local courts, probably, as has been suggested, because of the comparatively restricted character of the powers which they possessed, were destined to a long life. On the continent they lasted until the very end of the middle ages, when they were generally overthrown by the introduction of the Roman law, too highly scientific for their simple methods. In England they lasted until they furnished the model, and probably the suggestion, for a far more important institution — the House of Commons. How many grades of these local courts there were on the continent below the national assembly is a matter of dispute. In England there was clearly a series of three. The lowest was the township assembly, concerned only with matters of very slight importance and surviving still in the English vestry meeting and the New England town-meeting. Above this was the hundred's court formed upon a distinctly representative principle, the assembly being composed, together with certain other men, of four representatives sent from each township. Then, third, the tribal assembly of the original little settlement, or, the small kingdom of the early conquest, seems to have survived when this kingdom was swallowed up in a larger one, and to have originated a new grade in the hierarchy of assemblies, the county assembly or shire court. At any rate, whatever may have been its origin, and whatever may be the final decision of the vigorously disputed question, whether in the Frankish state there were any assemblies or courts for the counties distinct from the courts of the hundreds, it is certain that courts of this grade came into existence in England and were of the utmost importance there. In them, too, the representative principle was distinctly expressed, each township of the shire being represented, as in the hundred's court, by four chosen representatives. These courts, also, pass essentially unchanged through the English feudal and absolutist period, maintaining local self-government and preserving more of the primitive freedom than survived elsewhere. We shall see more in detail, at a later point, how the representative principle originating in them is transferred to the national legislature, creating our modern national representative system — the most important single contribution to the machinery of government made in historic times, with the possible exception of federal government."—G. B. Adams, *Civilization during the Middle Ages, ch.* 5.— For an account of the rise and development of the representative system in the English Parliament, see PARLIAMENT, THE ENGLISH.

REPRESENTATIVES, House of. See CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES.

REPUBLICAN PARTY OF THE UNITED STATES, The earlier. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1789–1792; 1798; and 1825–1828.

The later. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1854–1855.

Liberal and Radical wings. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1872.

REPUBLICANS, Independent. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1884.

RESACA, Battle of. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1864 (MAY: GEORGIA).....**Hood's attack on.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1864 (SEPTEMBER—OCTOBER: GEORGIA).

RESACA DE LA PALMA, Battle of. See MEXICO: A. D. 1846–1847.

RESAINA, Battle of.—A battle, fought A. D. 241, in which Sapor I. the Persian king, was

defeated by the Roman emperor Gordian, in Mesopotamia.—G. Rawlinson, *Seventh Great Oriental Monarchy, ch.* 4.

RESCH-GLUTHA, The.—The "Prince of the Captivity." See JEWS: A. D. 200–400.

RESCISSORY, Act.—See SCOTLAND: A.D. 1660–1666.

RESCRIPTS, Roman Imperial. See CORPUS JURIS CIVILIS.

RESEN. See ROTENNU, THE.

RESIDENCIA.—"Residencia was the examination or account taken of the official acts of an executive or judicial officer [Spanish] during the term of his residence within the province of his jurisdiction, and while in the exercise of the functions of his office. . . . While an official was undergoing his residencia it was equivalent to his being under arrest, as he could neither exercise office nor, except in certain cases specified, leave the place."—H. H. Bancroft, *Hist. of the Pacific States, v.* 1, *p.* 250, *foot-note.*

ALSO IN: F. W. Blackmar, *Spanish Institutions of the Southwest, p.* 69.

RESIDENT AT EASTERN COURTS, The English. See INDIA. A. D. 1877.

RESTITUTION, The Edict of. See GERMANY: A. D. 1627–1629.

RETENNU, The. See ROTENNU, THE.

RETHEL, Battle of (1650). See FRANCE: A. D. 1650–1651.

RETREAT OF THE TEN THOUSAND, The. See PERSIA: B. C. 401–400.

RETZ, Cardinal De, and the Fronde. See FRANCE: A. D. 1649, to 1651–1653.

REUDIGNI, The. See AVIONES.

REUIL, Peace of. See FRANCE: A. D. 1649.

REVERE, Paul, The ride of. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1775 (APRIL).

REVIVAL OF LEARNING. See RENAISSANCE.

REVOLUTION, The American. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1765, and after.

The English, of 1688. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1688.

The French, of 1789. See FRANCE: A. D. 1787–1789, and after.

The French, of 1830. See FRANCE: A. D. 1815–1830.

The French, of 1848. See FRANCE: A. D. 1841–1848, and 1848.

REVOLUTION, The Year of. See EUROPE (v. 2, pp. 1098–1099); ITALY: A. D. 1848–1849; GERMANY: A. D. 1848 (MARCH), to 1848–1850; AUSTRIA: A. D. 1848, to 1848–1850; HUNGARY: A. D. 1847–1849; FRANCE: A. D. 1841–1848, and 1848.

REVOLUTIONARY TRIBUNAL, The. See FRANCE: A. D. 1793 (FEBRUARY—APRIL).

REYDANIYA, Battle of (1517). See TURKS: A. D. 1481–1520.

REYNOSA, Battle of. See SPAIN: A. D. 1808 (SEPTEMBER—DECEMBER).

RHÆTIA.—Rhætians, Vindelicians, etc.—"The Alps from the Simplon pass to the sources of the Drave were occupied by the Rhætians. Beyond the Inn and the Lake of Constance, the plain which slopes gently towards the Danube was known by the name of Vindelicia. Styria, the Kammergut of Salzburg, and the southern half of the Austrian Archduchy, belonged to the tribes of Noricum, while the passes between that country and Italy were held by the Carnians." The Roman conquest of this Alpine region was effected in the years 16 and 15 B. C. by the two stepsons of the Emperor Augustus, Tiberius and Drusus. In addition to the people mentioned above, the Camuni, the Vennones, the Brenni and the Genauni were crushed. "The free tribes of the eastern Alps appear then for the first time in history, only to disappear again for a thousand years."—C. Merivale, *Hist. of the Romans, ch.* 35.—See, also, TYROL.

Settlement of the Alemanni in. See ALEMANNI: A. D. 496–504.

RHAGES. See RAGA.

RHEGIUM, Siege of (B. C. 387).—Rhegium, an important Greek city, in the extreme south of Italy, on the strait which separates the peninsula from Sicily, incurred the hostility of the tyrant of Syracuse, the elder Dionysius, by scornfully refusing him a bride whom he solicited. The savage-tempered despot made several attempts without success to surprise the town, and finally laid siege to it with a powerful army and fleet. The inhabitants resisted desperately for eleven months, at the end of which time (B. C. 387) they were starved into surrender. "Dionysius, on entering Rhegium, found heaps of unburied corpses, besides 6,000 citizens in the last stage of emaciation. All these captives were sent to Syracuse, where those who could provide a mina (about £3.17s.) were allowed to ransom themselves, while the rest were sold as slaves. After such a period of suffering, the number of those who retained the means of ransom was probably very small."—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece, pt.* 2, *ch.* 83.

RHEIMS: Origin of the name. See BELGÆ.

A. D. 1429.—The crowning of Charles VII. See FRANCE: A. D. 1429–1431.

A. D. 1814.—Capture by the Allies and recovery by Napoleon. See FRANCE: A. D. 1814 (JANUARY—MARCH).

RHEINFELDEN, Siege and Battle of (1638). See GERMANY: A. D. 1634–1639.

RHETRÆ. See SPARTA: THE CONSTITUTION, &c.

RHINE, The Circle of the. See GERMANY: A. D. 1493–1519.

RHINE, The Confederation of the. See GERMANY: A. D. 1805–1806; 1806 (JANUARY—AUGUST); 1813 (OCTOBER—DECEMBER); and FRANCE: A. D. 1814 (JANUARY—MARCH).

RHINE, Roman passage of the. See USIPETES AND TENCTHERI.

RHINE LEAGUE, The.—The Rhine League was one of several Bunds, or confederations formed among the German trading towns in the middle ages, for the common protection of their commerce. It comprised the towns of southwest Germany and the Lower Rhine provinces. Prominent among its members were Cologne, Wessel and Munster. Cologne, already a large and flourishing city, the chief market of the trade of the Rhine lands, was a member, likewise, of the Hanseatic League (see HANSA TOWNS).—J. Yeats, *Growth and Vicissitudes of Commerce, p.* 158.—See, also, CITIES, IMPERIAL AND FREE, OF GERMANY; and FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.

RHODE ISLAND.

The aboriginal inhabitants. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: ALGONQUIAN FAMILY.

A. D. 1631-1636.—Roger Williams in Massachusetts. — His offenses against Boston Puritanism.—His banishment.— On the 5th of February, 1631, "the ship Lyon arrived at Nantasket, with twenty passengers and a large store of provisions. Her arrival was most timely, for the [Massachusetts] colonists were reduced to the last exigencies of famine. Many had already died of want, and many more were rescued from imminent peril by this providential occurrence. A public fast had been appointed for the day succeeding that on which the ship reached Boston. It was changed to a general thanksgiving. There was another incident connected with the arrival of this ship, which made it an era, not only in the affairs of Massachusetts, but in the history of America. She brought to the shores of New England the founder of a new State, the exponent of a new philosophy, the intellect that was to harmonize religious differences, and soothe the asperities of the New World; a man whose clearness of mind enabled him to deduce, from the mass of crude speculations which abounded in the 17th century, a proposition so comprehensive, that it is difficult to say whether its application has produced the most beneficial result upon religion, or morals, or politics. This man was Roger Williams, then about thirty-two years of age. He was a scholar, well versed in the ancient and some of the modern tongues, an earnest inquirer after truth, and an ardent friend of popular liberty as well for the mind as for the body. As a 'godly minister,' he was welcomed to the society of the Puritans, and soon invited by the church in Salem to supply the place of the lamented Higginson, as an assistant to their pastor Samuel Skelton. The invitation was accepted, but the term of his ministry was destined to be brief. The authorities at Boston remonstrated with those at Salem against the reception of Williams. The Court at its next session addressed a letter to Mr. Endicott to this effect: 'That whereas Mr. Williams had refused to join with the congregation at Boston, because they would not make a public declaration of their repentance for having communion with the churches of England, while they lived there; and, besides, had declared his opinion that the magistrate might not punish the breach of the Sabbath, nor any other offence, as it was a breach of the first table; therefore they marvelled that they would choose him without advising with the council, and withal desiring him, that they would forbear to proceed till they had conferred about it.' This attempt of the magistrates of Boston to control the election of a church officer at Salem, met with the rebuke it so richly merited. The people were not ignorant of the hostility their invitation had excited; yet on the very day the remonstrance was written, they settled Williams as their minister. The ostensible reasons for this hostility are set forth in the letter above cited. That they were to a great extent the real ones cannot be questioned. The ecclesiastical polity of the Puritans sanctioned this interference. Their church platform approved it. Positive statute would seem to require it. Nevertheless, we cannot but think that, underlying all this, there was a secret stimulus of ambition on the part of the Boston Court to strengthen its authority over the prosperous and, in some respects, rival colony of Salem. . . . As a political measure this interference failed of its object. The people resented so great a stretch of authority, and the church disregarded the remonstrance. . . . What could not as yet be accomplished by direct intervention of the Court was effected in a surer manner. The fearlessness of Williams in denouncing the errors of the times, and especially the doctrine of the magistrate's power in religion, gave rise to a system of persecution which, before the close of the summer, obliged him to seek refuge beyond the jurisdiction of Massachusetts in the more liberal colony of the Pilgrims. At Plymouth 'he was well accepted as an assistant in the ministry to Mr. Ralph Smith, then pastor of the church there.' The principal men of the colony treated him with marked attention. . . . The opportunities there presented for cultivating an intimate acquaintance with the chief Sachems of the neighboring tribes were well improved, and exerted an important influence, not only in creating the State of which he was to be the founder, but also in protecting all New England amid the horrors of savage warfare. Ousamequin, or Massasoit, as he is usually called, was the Sachem of the Wampanoags, called also the Pokanoket tribe, inhabiting the Plymouth territory. His seat was at Mount Hope, in what is now the town of Bristol, R. I. With this chief, the early and steadfast friend of the English, Williams established a friendship which proved of the greatest service at the time of his exile."— S. G. Arnold, *History of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, v.* 1, *ch.* 1. — Williams "remained at Plymouth, teaching in the church, but supporting himself by manual labor, nearly two years. His ministry was popular in the main and his person universally liked. Finally, however, he advanced some opinions which did not suit the steady-going Plymouth elders, and therefore, departing 'something abruptly,' he returned to Salem. There he acted as assistant to Mr. Skelton, the aged pastor of the church, and when Mr. Skelton died, less than a year later, became his successor. At Salem he was again under the surveillance of the rulers and elders of the Bay, and they were swift to make him sensible of it. He had written in Plymouth, for the Plymouth Governor and Council a treatise on the Massachusetts Patent, in which he had maintained his doctrine that the King could not give the settlers a right to take away from the natives their land without paying them for it. He was not a lawyer but an ethical teacher, and it was doubtless as such that he maintained this opinion. In our day its ethical correctness is not disputed. It has always been good Rhode Island doctrine. He also criticised the patent because in it King James claimed to be the first Christian prince who discovered New England, and because he called Europe Christendom or the Christian World. Williams did not scruple to denounce these formal fictions in downright Saxon as lies. He does not appear to have been, at any period of his life, a paragon of conventional propriety. A rumor of the treatise got abroad, though it remained unpublished. The patent happened to be a sensitive point with the

magistrates. It had been granted in England to an English trading company, and its transfer to Massachusetts was an act of questionable legality. Moreover it was exceedingly doubtful whether the rulers, in exercising the extensive civil jurisdiction which they claimed under it, did not exceed their authority. They were apprehensive of proceedings to forfeit it, and therefore were easily alarmed at any turning of attention to it. When they heard of the treatise they sent for it, and, having got it, summoned the author 'to be censured.' He appeared in an unexpectedly placable mood, and not only satisfied their minds in regard to some of its obscurer passages, but offered it, since it had served its purpose, to be burnt. The magistrates, propitiated by his complaisance, appeared to have accepted the offer as equivalent to a promise of silence, though it is impossible that he, the uncompromising champion of aboriginal rights, can ever have meant to give, or even appear to give, such a promise. Accordingly when they heard soon afterwards that he was discussing the patent they were deeply incensed, though it was doubtless the popular curiosity excited by their own indiscreet action which elicited the discussion. Their anger was aggravated by another doctrine then put forth by him, namely, that an oath ought not to be tendered to an unregenerate, or, as we should say, an unreligious man, because an oath is an act of worship, and cannot be taken by such a man without profanation. . . . He also taught that an oath being an act of worship, could not properly be exacted from any one against his will, and that even Christians ought not to desecrate it by taking it for trivial causes. . . . The magistrates again instituted proceedings against him, at first subjecting him to the ordeal of clerical visitation, then formally summoning him to answer for himself before the General Court. At the same time the Salem church was arraigned for contempt in choosing him as pastor while he was under question. The court, however, did not proceed to judgment, but allowed them both further time for repentance. It so happened that the inhabitants of Salem had a petition before the court for 'some land at Marblehead Neck, which they did challenge as belonging to their town.' The court, when the petition came up, refused to grant it until the Salem church should give satisfaction for its contempt, thus virtually affirming that the petitioners had no claim to justice even, so long as they adhered to their recusant pastor. Williams was naturally indignant. He induced his church — 'enchanted his church,' says Cotton Mather — to send letters to the sister churches, appealing to them to admonish the magistrates and deputies of their 'heinous sin.' He wrote the letters himself. His Massachusetts contemporaries say he was 'unlamblike.' Undoubtedly they heard no gentle bleating in those letters, but rather the reverberating roar of the lion chafing in his rage. The churches repelled the appeal; and then turning to the Salem church, besieged it only the more assiduously, laboring with it, nine with one, to alienate it from its pastor. What could the one church do,— with the magistracy against it, the clergy against it, the churches and the people against it, muttering their vague anathemas, and Salem town suffering unjustly on its account,— what could it do but yield? It yielded virtually if not yet in form; and Williams stood forth alone in his opposition to the united power of Church and State. . . . The fateful court day came at last. The court assembles, magistrates and deputies, with the clergy to advise them. Williams appears, not to be tried, but to be sentenced unless he will retract. He reaffirms his opinions. Mr. Hooker, a famous clerical dialectician, is chosen to dispute with him, and the solemn mockery of confutation begins. . . . Hour after hour, he argues unsubdued, till the sun sinks low and the weary court adjourns. On the morrow [Friday, October 9, 1635], still persisting in his glorious 'contumacy,' he is sentenced, the clergy all save one advising, to be banished, or, to adopt the apologetic but felicitous euphemism of his great adversary, John Cotton, 'enlarged' out of Massachusetts. He was allowed at first six weeks, afterwards until spring, to depart. But in January the magistrates having heard that he was drawing others to his opinion, and that his purpose was to erect a plantation about Narragansett Bay, 'from whence the infection would easily spread,' concluded to send him by ship, then ready, to England [see MASSACHUSETTS: A. D. 1636]. The story is familiar how Williams, advised of their intent, baffled it by plunging into the wilderness, where, after being 'sorely tost for one fourteen weeks, in a bitter winter season, not knowing what bread or bed did mean,' he settled with the opening spring, on the east bank of the Seekonk, and there built and planted."— T. Durfee, *Historical Discourse: Two hundred and fiftieth Anniversary of the Settlement of Providence*, 1886.— "The course pursued towards Roger Williams was not exceptional. What was done to him had been done in repeated instances before. Within the first year of its settlement the colony had passed sentence of exclusion from its territory upon no less than fourteen persons. It was the ordinary method by which a corporate body would deal with those whose presence no longer seemed desirable. Conceiving themselves to be by patent the exclusive possessors of the soil,— soil which they had purchased for the accomplishment of their personal and private ends,— the colonists never doubted their competency to fix the terms on which others should be allowed to share in their undertaking. . . . While there is some discrepancy in the contemporary accounts of this transaction, there is entire agreement on one point, that the assertion by Roger Williams of the doctrine of 'soul-liberty' was not the head and front of his offending. Whatever was meant by the vague charge in the final sentence that he had 'broached and divulged new and dangerous opinions, against the authority of magistrates,' it did not mean that he had made emphatic the broad doctrine of the entire separation of church and state. We have his own testimony on this point. In several allusions to the subject in his later writings,— and it can hardly be supposed that in a matter which he felt so sorely his memory would have betrayed him,— he never assigns to his opinion respecting the power of the civil magistrate more than a secondary place. He repeatedly affirms that the chief causes of his banishment were his extreme views regarding separation, and his denouncing of the patent. Had he been himself conscious of having incurred the hostility of the Massachusetts colony for asserting the great principle with which he was afterwards identified, he would

surely have laid stress upon it. . . . It is . . . clear that in the long controversy it had become covered up by other issues, and that his opponents, at least, did not regard it as his most dangerous heresy. So far as it was a mere speculative opinion it was not new. . . . To upbraid the Puritans as unrelenting persecutors, or extol Roger Williams as a martyr to the cause of religious liberty, is equally wide of the real fact. On the one hand, the controversy had its origin in the passionate and precipitate zeal of a young man whose relish for disputation made him never unwilling to encounter opposition, and on the other, in the exigencies of a unique community, where the instincts of a private corporation had not yet expanded into the more liberal policy of a body politic. If we cannot impute to the colony any large statesmanship, so neither can we wholly acquit Roger Williams of the charge of mixing great principles with some whimsical conceits. The years which he passed in Massachusetts were years of discipline and growth, when he doubtless already cherished in his active brain the germs of the principles which he afterwards developed; but the fruit was destined to be ripened under another sky."—J. L. Diman, *Orations and Essays, pp.* 114–117.

A. D. 1636.—The wanderings of the exiled Roger Williams.—His followers.—The settlement at Providence.—The little that is known of the wanderings of Roger Williams after his banishment from Salem, until his settlement at Providence, is derived from a letter which he wrote more than thirty years afterwards (June 22, 1670) to Major Mason, the hero of the Pequot War. In that letter he says: "When I was unkindly and unchristianly, as I believe, driven from my house and land and wife and children, (in the midst of a New England winter, now about thirty-five years past,) at Salem, that ever honored Governor, Mr. Winthrop, privately wrote to me to steer my course to Narragansett Bay and Indians, for many high and heavenly and public ends, encouraging me, from the freeness of the place from any English claims or patents. I took his prudent motion as a hint and voice from God, and waving all other thoughts and motions, I steered my course from Salem (though in winter snow, which I feel yet) unto these parts, wherein I may say Peniel, that is, I have seen the face of God. . . . I first pitched, and began to build and plant at Seekonk, now Rehoboth, but I received a letter from my ancient friend, Mr. Winslow, then Governor of Plymouth, professing his own and others love and respect to me, yet lovingly advising me, since I was fallen into the edge of their bounds, and they were loath to displease the Bay, to remove but to the other side of the water, and then he said, I had the country free before me, and might be as free as themselves, and we should be loving neighbors together. These were the joint understandings of these two eminently wise and Christian Governors and others, in their day, together with their counsel and advice as to the freedom and vacancy of this place, which in this respect, and many other Providences of the Most Holy and Only Wise, I called Providence. . . . Some time after, the Plymouth great Sachem, (Oufamaquin,) upon occasion affirming that Providence was his land, and therefore Plymouth's land, and some resenting it, the then prudent and godly Governor, Mr. Bradford, and others of his godly council, answered, that if, after due examination, it should be found true what the barbarian said, yet having to my loss of a harvest that year, been now (though by their gentle advice) as good as banished from Plymouth as from the Massachusetts, and I had quietly and patiently departed from them, at their motion to the place where now I was, I should not be molested and tossed up and down again, while they had breath in their bodies; and surely, between those, my friends of the Bay and Plymouth, I was sorely tossed, for one fourteen weeks, in a bitter winter season, not knowing what bread or bed did mean, beside the yearly loss of no small matter in my trading with English and natives, being debarred from Boston, the chief mart and port of New England."—*Letters of Roger Williams; ed. by J. R. Bartlett, pp.* 335–336.—"According to the weight of authority, and the foregoing extract, when Williams left Salem he made his way from there by sea, coasting, probably, from place to place during the 'fourteen weeks' that 'he was sorely tossed,' and holding intercourse with the native tribes, whose language he had acquired, as we have before stated, during his residence at Plymouth. Dr. Dexter and Professer Diman interpret this and other references differently, and conclude that the journey must have been by land. See Dexter, p. 62, note; Nar. Club Pub., Vol. II, p. 87. Perhaps the true interpretation is that the journey was partly by sea and partly by land; that is, from the coast inward—to confer with the natives—was by land, and the rest by sea." —O. S. Straus, *Roger Williams, ch.* 5, *and foot-note.*—Mr. Rider, the well-known critical student of Rhode Island history, has commented on the above passage in Mr. Straus's work as follows: "The distance from Salem by sea to Seekonk was across Massachusetts Bay, Cape Cod Bay, the Atlantic Ocean, Vineyard Sound, Buzzard's Bay, the Atlantic Ocean again, and Narragansett Bay,—a distance scarcely less than 500 miles, in and out, by the line of the coast; all of which had to be covered either in a birch bark canoe or in a shallop; if in a canoe, then to be paddled, but if in a shallop, where did Williams get it, and what became of it? history does not answer. If Williams was in a boat sailing into Narragansett Bay, 'the pleasure of the Most High to direct my steps into the Bay' would become a positive absurdity unless the Most High meant that Williams should jump overboard! He certainly could have taken no steps in a boat. But if Williams was in a boat, what sense could there be in his saying 'I was sorely tossed for one fourteen weeks, in a bitter (hyperbole again) winter season, not knowing what bread or bed did mean.' Did they not have beds in boats, nor bread? As to the expression in the Cotton Letter, it was his soul, and not his body, which was exposed to poverties, &c.; observe the quotation. . . . When Mr. Straus in his foot-note, speaks of Williams's journey, 'partly by sea and partly by land, that is from the coast inward, to confer with the natives,' he is dealing solely with the imagination. No such conference ever took place." —S. S. Rider, *Roger Williams* (*Book Notes, v.* 11, *p.* 148).—It was the opinion of Prof. Gammell that, when Roger Williams fled from Salem, "he made his way through the forest to the lodges of the Pokanokets, who occupied the country north from Mount Hope as far as Charles River.

Ousemaguin, or Massasoit, the famous chief of this tribe, had known Mr. Williams when he lived in Plymouth, and had often received presents and tokens of kindness at his hands; and now, in the days of his friendless exile, the aged chief welcomed him to his cabin at Mount Hope, and extended to him the protection and aid he required. He granted to him a tract of land on the Seekonk River, to which, at the opening of spring, he repaired, and where 'he pitched and began to build and plant' [near the beautiful bend in the river, now known as 'Manton's Cove,' a short distance above the upper bridge, directly eastward of Providence.—Foot-note]. At this place, also, at the same time, he was joined by a number of his friends from Salem. . . . But scarcely had the first dwelling been raised . . . when he was again disturbed, and obliged to move still further from Christian neighbors and the dwellings of civilized men," as related in his letter quoted above. "He accordingly soon abandoned the fields which he had planted, and the dwelling he had begun to build, and embarked in a canoe upon the Seekonk River, in quest of another spot where, unmolested, he might rear a home and plant a separate colony. There were five others, who, having joined him at Seekonk, bore him company." Coasting along the stream and "round the headlands now known as Fox Point and India Point, up the harbor, to the mouth of the Mooshausic River," he landed, and, "upon the beautiful slope of the hill that ascends from the river, he descried the spring around which he commenced the first 'plantations of Providence.' It was in the latter part of June, 1636, as well as can be ascertained, that Roger Williams and his companions began the settlement at the mouth of the Mooshausic River. A little north of what is now the centre of the city, the spring is still pointed out, which drew the attention of the humble voyagers from Seekonk. Here, after so many wanderings, was the weary exile to find a home, and to lay the foundations of a city, which should be a perpetual memorial of pious gratitude to the superintending Providence which had protected him and guided him to the spot. . . . The spot at which he had landed . . . was within the territory belonging to the Narragansetts. Canonicus, the aged chief of the tribe, and Miantonomo, his nephew, had visited the colonies of Plymouth and Massachusetts Bay, while Williams resided there, and had learned to regard him, in virtue of his being a minister, as one of the sachems of the English. He had also taken special pains to conciliate their good-will and gain their confidence. . . . Indeed, there is reason to believe that, at an early period after his arrival in New England, on finding himself so widely at variance with his Puritan brethren, he conceived the design of withdrawing from the colonies, and settling among the Indians, that he might labor as a missionary. . . . In all his dealings with the Indians, Mr. Williams was governed by a strict regard to the rights which, he had always contended, belonged to them as the sole proprietors of the soil. . . . It was by his influence, and at his expense, that the purchase was procured from Canonicus and Miantonomo, who partook largely of the shyness and jealousy of the English so common to their tribe. He says, 'It was not thousands nor tens of thousands of money that could have bought of them an English entrance into this bay.'"—W. Gammell, *Life of Roger Williams* (*Library of Am. Biog., series* 2, *v.* 4), *ch.* 6-7.

Also in: S. G. Arnold, *Hist. of R. I., v.* 1, *ch.* 1 *and* 4.—W. R. Staples, *Annals of Providence, ch.* 1.

A. D. 1636-1661.—Sale and gift of lands by the Indians to Roger Williams.—His conveyance of the same to his associates.—"The first object of Mr. Williams would naturally be, to obtain from the sachems a grant of land for his new colony. He probably visited them, and received a verbal cession of the territory, which, two years afterwards, was formally conveyed to him by a deed. This instrument may properly be quoted here. 'At Narraganset, the 24th of the first month, commonly called March, the second year of the plantation or planting at Moshassuck, or Providence [1638]; Memorandum, that we, Canonicus and Miantinomo, the two chief sachems of Narraganset, having two years since sold unto Roger Williams the lands and meadows upon the two fresh rivers, called Moshassuck and Wanasquatucket, do now, by these presents, establish and confirm the bounds of these lands, from the river and fields of Pawtucket, the great hill of Notaquoncanot, on the northwest, and the town of Mashapaug, on the west. We also in consideration of the many kindnesses and services he hath continually done for us, both with our friends of Massachusetts, as also at Connecticut, and Apaum, or Plymouth, we do freely give unto him all that land from those rivers reaching to Pawtuxet river; as also the grass and meadows upon the said Pawtuxet river. In witness whereof, we have hereunto set our hands. [The mark (a bow) of Canonicus. The mark (an arrow) of Miantonomo]. In the presence of [The mark of Sohash. The mark of Alsomunsit].'. . . The lands thus ceded to Mr. Williams he conveyed to twelve men, who accompanied, or soon joined, him, reserving for himself an equal part only." Twenty-three years later, on the 20th of December, 1661, he executed a more formal deed of conveyance to his associates and their heirs of the lands which had unquestionably been partly sold and partly given to himself personally by the Indians. This latter instrument was in the following words. "'Be it known unto all men by these presents, that I, Roger Williams, of the town of Providence, in the Narraganset Bay, in New England, having, in the year one thousand six hundred thirty-four, and in the year one thousand six hundred thirty-five had several treaties with Canonicus and Miantinomo, the two chief sachems of the Narraganset, and in the end purchased of them the lands and meadows upon the two fresh rivers called Moshassuck and Wanasquatucket, the two sachems having, by a deed under their hands, two years after the sale thereof, established and confirmed the bounds of these lands from the rivers and fields of Pawtucket, the great hill of Notaquoncanot on the northwest, and the town of Mashapaug on the west, notwithstanding I had the frequent promise of Miantinomo, my kind friend, that it should not be land that I should want about these bounds mentioned, provided that I satisfied the Indians there inhabiting. I having made covenant of peaceable neighborhood with all the sachems and natives round about us, and having, of a sense of God's merciful Providence unto me in my distress,

called the place Providence, I desired it might be for a shelter for persons distressed for conscience. I then considering the condition of divers of my distressed countrymen, I communicated my said purchase unto my loving friends, John Throckmorton, William Arnold, William Harris, Stukely Westcott, John Greene, Senior, Thomas Olney, Senior, Richard Waterman, and others, who then desired to take shelter here with me, and in succession unto so many others as we should receive into the fellowship and society of enjoying and disposing of the said purchase; and besides the first that were admitted, our town records declare, that afterwards we received Chad Brown, William Field, Thomas Harris, Senior, William Wickenden, Robert Williams, Gregory Dexter, and others, as our town book declares; and whereas, by God's merciful assistance, I was the procurer of the purchase, not by monies nor payment, the natives being so shy and jealous that monies could not do it, but by that language, acquaintance and favor with the natives, and other advantages, which it pleased God to give me, and also bore the charges and venture of all the gratuities, which I gave to the great sachems and other sachems and natives round about us, and lay engaged for a loving and peaceable neighborhood with them, to my great charge and travel; it was therefore thought fit by some loving friends, that I should receive some loving consideration and gratuity, and it was agreed between us, that every person, that should be admitted into the fellowship of enjoying land and disposing of the purchase, should pay thirty shillings unto the public stock; and first, about thirty pounds should be paid unto myself, by thirty shillings a person, as they were admitted; this sum I received, and in love to my friends, and with respect to a town and place of succor for the distressed as aforesaid, I do acknowledge the said sum and payment as full satisfaction; and whereas in the year one thousand six hundred and thirty-seven, so called, I delivered the deed subscribed by the two aforesaid chief sachems, so much thereof as concerneth the aforementioned lands, from myself and from my heirs, unto the whole number of the purchasers, with all my power, right and title therein, reserving only unto myself one single share equal unto any of the rest of that number; I now again, in a more formal way, under my hand and seal, confirm my former resignation of that deed of the lands aforesaid, and bind myself, my heirs, my executors, my administrators and assigns, never to molest any of the said persons already received, or hereafter to be received, into the society of purchasers, as aforesaid; but that they, their heirs, executors, administrators and assigns, shall at all times quietly and peaceably enjoy the premises and every part thereof, and I do further by these presents bind myself, my heirs, my executors, my administrators and assigns never to lay any claim, nor cause any claim to be laid, to any of the lands aforementioned, or unto any part or parcel thereof, more than unto my own single share, by virtue or pretence of any former bargain, sale or mortgage whatsoever, or jointures, thirds or entails made by me, the said Roger Williams, or of any other person, either for, by, through or under me. In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and seal, the twentieth day of December, in the present year one thousand six hundred sixty-one. Roger Williams.'. . . From this document, it appears, that the twelve persons to whom the lands, on the Moshassuck and Wanasquatucket rivers, were conveyed by Mr. Williams, did not pay him any part of the thirty pounds, which he received; but that the sum of thirty shillings was exacted of every person who was afterwards admitted, to form a common stock. From this stock, thirty pounds were paid to Mr. Williams, for the reasons mentioned in the instrument last quoted."— J. D. Knowles, *Memoir of Roger Williams, ch.* 8.

A. D. 1637.—The Pequot War.—"Williams was banished in 1636 and settled at Providence. The Pequot war took place the next year following. The Pequots were a powerful tribe of Indians, dwelling . . . in the valley of the Thames at the easterly end of Connecticut, and holding the lands west to the river of that name. The parties to this war were, the Massachusetts, Plymouth, and Connecticut colonies, assisted by the Narragansett and Mohegan tribes of Indians on one side, against the Pequots, single-handed, on the other. The Pequots undertook to make an alliance with the Narragansetts and the Mohegans (Hubbard's Indian Wars, 1677, p. 118), and but for Williams would have succeeded, (Narr. Club, v. 6, p. 269). Williams had obtained a powerful influence over Canonicus and Miantinomi, the great Sachems of the Narragansetts, (Narr. Club, v. 6, p. 17,) and Massachusetts having just banished him, sent at once to him to prevent if possible this alliance, (Narr. Club, v. 6, p. 269). By his influence a treaty of alliance was made with Miantinomi, Williams being employed by both sides as a friend, the treaty was deposited with him and he was made interpreter by Massachusetts for the Indians upon their motion, (Winthrop's Hist. N. E., 1853, v. 1, p. 237). The Narragansetts, the Mohegans, the Niantics, the Nipmucs, and the Cowesets, were by this treaty either neutrals or fought actively for the English in the war."—S. S. Rider, *Political results of the Banishment of Williams* (*Book Notes, v.* 8, *no.* 17).—See NEW ENGLAND: A. D. 1637.

A. D. 1638-1640.—The purchase, the settlement, and the naming of the island.—The founding of Newport.—Early in the spring of 1638, while Mrs. Anne Hutchinson was undergoing imprisonment at Boston (see MASSACHUSETTS: A. D. 1636-1638), "Mrs. Hutchinson's husband, Coddington, John Clarke, educated a physician, and other principal persons of the Hutchinsonian party, were given to understand that, unless they removed of their own accord, proceedings would be taken to compel them to do so. They sent, therefore, to seek a place of settlement, and found one in Plymouth patent; but, as the magistrates of that colony declined to allow them an independent organization, they presently purchased of the Narragansets, by the recommendation of Williams, the beautiful and fertile Island of Aquiday [or Aquetnet, or Aquidneck]. The price was 40 fathoms of white wampum; for the additional gratuity of ten coats and twenty hoes, the present inhabitants agreed to remove. The purchasers called it the Isle of Rhodes — a name presently changed by use to Rhode Island. Nineteen persons, having signed a covenant 'to incorporate themselves into a body politic,' and to submit to 'our Lord Jesus Christ,' and to his

'most perfect and absolute laws,' began a settlement at its northern end, with Coddington as their judge or chief magistrate, and three elders to assist him. They were soon joined by others from Boston; but those who were 'of the rigid separation, and savored Anabaptism,' removed to Providence, which now began to be well peopled."—R. Hildreth, *Hist. of the U. S., v.* 1, *ch.* 9.—"This little colony increased rapidly, so that in the following spring some of their number moved to the south-west part of the island and began the settlement of Newport. The northern part of the island which was first occupied was called Portsmouth. Both towns, however, were considered, as they were in fact, as belonging to the same colony. To this settlement, also, came Anne Hutchinson with her husband and family after they had been banished from Massachusetts. There is no record that in this atmosphere of freedom she occasioned any trouble or disturbance. Here she led a quiet and peaceable life until the death of her husband in 1642, when she removed to the neighborhood of New York, where she and all the members of her family, sixteen in number, were murdered by the Indians, with the exception of one daughter, who was taken into captivity. In imitation of the form of government which existed under the judges of Israel, during the period of the Hebrew Commonwealth, the two settlements, Rhode Island and Portsmouth, chose Coddington to be their magistrate, with the title of Judge, and a few months afterward they elected three elders to assist him. This form of government continued until 1640."—O. S. Straus, *Roger Williams, ch.* 6.

A. D. 1638-1647.—The Constitution of Providence Plantation.—The charter and the Union.—Religious liberty as understood by Roger Williams.—"The colonists of Plymouth had formed their social compact in the cabin of the Mayflower. The colonists of Providence formed theirs on the banks of the Mooshausick. 'We, whose names are hereunder,' it reads, 'desirous to inhabit in the town of Providence, do promise to subject ourselves in active or passive obedience to all such orders or agreements as shall be made for public good for the body, in an orderly way, by the major assent of the present inhabitants, masters of families, incorporated together into a town fellowship, and such others as they shall admit unto them only in civil things.' Never before, since the establishment of Christianity, has the separation of Church from State been definitely marked out by this limitation of the authority of the magistrate to civil things; and never, perhaps, in the whole course of history, was a fundamental principle so vigorously observed. Massachusetts looked upon the experiment with jealousy and distrust, and when ignorant or restless men confounded the right of individual opinion in religious matters with a right of independent action in civil matters, those who had condemned Roger Williams to banishment, eagerly proclaimed that no well ordered government could exist in connection with liberty of conscience. . . . Questions of jurisdiction also arose. Massachusetts could not bring herself to look upon her sister with a friendly eye, and Plymouth was soon to be merged in Massachusetts. It was easy to foresee that there would be bickerings and jealousies, if not open contention between them. Still the little Colony grew apace. The first church was founded in 1639. To meet the wants of an increased population the government was changed, and five disposers or selectmen charged with the principal functions of administration, subject, however, to the superior authority of monthly town meetings; so early and so naturally did municipal institutions take root in English colonies. A vital point was yet untouched. Williams, indeed, held that the Indians, as original occupants of the soil, were the only legal owners of it, and carrying his principle into all his dealings with the natives, bought of them the land on which he planted his Colony. The Plymouth and Massachusetts colonists, also, bought their land of the natives, but in their intercourse with the whites founded their claim upon royal charter. They even went so far as to apply for a charter covering all the territory of the new Colony. Meanwhile two other colonies had been planted on the shores of the Narragansett Bay: the Colony of Aquidnick, on the Island of Rhode Island, and the colony of Warwick. The sense of a common danger united them, and, in 1643, they appointed Roger Williams their agent to repair to England and apply for a royal charter. It has been treasured up as a bitter memory that he was compelled to seek a conveyance in New York, for Massachusetts would not allow him to pass through her territories. His negotiations were crowned with full success. . . . He found the King at open war with the Parliament, and the administration of the colonies entrusted to the Earl of Warwick and a joint committee of the two Houses. Of the details of the negotiation little is known, but on the 14th of March of the following year [1644], a 'free and absolute charter was granted as the Incorporation of Providence Plantations in Narragansett Bay in New England.' . . . Civil government and civil laws were the only government and laws which it recognized; and the absence of any allusion to religious freedom in it shows how firmly and wisely Williams avoided every form of expression which might seem to recognize the power to grant or to deny that inalienable right. . . . Yet more than three years were allowed to pass before it went into full force as a bond of union for the four towns. Then, in May, 1647, the corporators met at Portsmouth in General Court of Election, and, accepting the charter, proceeded to organize a government in harmony with its provisions. Warwick, although not named in the charter, was admitted to the same privileges with her larger and more flourishing sisters. This new government was in reality a government of the people, to whose final decision in their General Assembly all questions were submitted. 'And now,' says the preamble to the code, . . . 'it is agreed by this present Assembly thus incorporate and by this present act declared, that the form of government established in Providence Plantations is Democratical.'"—G. W. Greene, *Short Hist. of R. I., ch.* 3 *and* 5.—"The form of government being settled, they now prepared such laws as were necessary to enforce the due administration of it; but the popular approbation their laws must receive, before they were valid, made this a work of time; however, they were so industrious in it, that in the month of May, 1647, they completed a regular body of laws, taken chiefly from the laws of England, adding a very few of their own form-

ing, which the circumstances and exigencies of their present condition required. These laws, for securing of right, for determining controversies, for preserving order, suppressing vice, and punishing offenders, were, at least, equal to the laws of any of the neighbouring colonies; and infinitely exceeded those of all other Christian countries at that time in this particular,—that they left the conscience free, and did not punish men for worshipping God in the way, they were persuaded, he required. . . . It was often objected to Mr. Williams, that such great liberty in religious matters, tended to licentiousness, and every kind of disorder: To such objections I will give the answer he himself made, in his own words [Letter to the Town of Providence, January, 1654–5]. 'Loving Friends and Neighbours, It pleaseth God yet to continue this great liberty of our town meetings, for which, we ought to be humbly thankful, and to improve these liberties to the praise of the Giver, and to the peace and welfare of the town and colony, without our own private ends. I thought it my duty, to present you with this my impartial testimony, and answer to a paper sent you the other day from my brother,—"That it is blood-guiltiness, and against the rule of the gospel, to execute judgment upon transgressors, against the private or public weal." That ever I should speak or write a tittle that tends to such an infinite liberty of conscience, is a mistake; and which I have ever disclaimed and abhorred. To prevent such mistakes, I at present shall only propose this case.—There goes many a ship to sea, with many a hundred souls in one ship, whose weal and wo is common; and is a true picture of a commonwealth, or an human combination, or society. It hath fallen out sometimes, that both Papists and Protestants, Jews and Turks, may be embarked into one ship. Upon which supposal, I do affirm, that all the liberty of conscience that ever I pleaded for, turns upon these two hinges, that none of the Papists, Protestants, Jews, or Turks, be forced to come to the ship's prayers or worship; nor, secondly, compelled from their own particular prayers or worship, if they practise any. I further add, that I never denied that, notwithstanding this liberty, the commander of the ship ought to command the ship's course; yea, and also to command that justice, peace, and sobriety, be kept and practised, both among the seamen and all the passengers. If any seamen refuse to perform their service, or passengers to pay their freight;—if any refuse to help in person or purse, towards the common charges, or defence;—if any refuse to obey the common laws and orders of the ship, concerning their common peace and preservation;—if any shall mutiny and rise up against their commanders, and officers;—if any shall preach or write, that there ought to be no commanders, nor officers, because all are equal in Christ, therefore no masters, nor officers, no laws, nor orders, no corrections nor punishments—I say I never denied, but in such cases, whatever is pretended, the commander or commanders may judge, resist, compel, and punish such transgressors, according to their deserts and merits. This, if seriously and honestly minded, may, if it so please the Father of lights, let in some light, to such as willingly shut not their eyes. I remain, studious of our common peace and liberty,—Roger Williams.' This religious liberty was not only asserted in words, but uniformly adhered to and practised; for in the year 1656, soon after the Quakers made their first appearance in New England, and at which most of these colonies were greatly alarmed and offended: Those at that time called the four united colonies, which were the Massachusetts, Plymouth, Connecticut, and New Haven, wrote to this colony, to join with them in taking effectual methods to suppress them, and prevent their pernicious doctrines being spread and propagated in the country.—To this request the Assembly of this colony gave the following worthy answer: 'We shall strictly adhere to the foundation principle on which this colony was first settled; to wit, that every man who submits peaceably to the civil authority, may peaceably worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience, without molestation.' And not to the people of the neighbouring governments only, was this principle owned; but it was asserted in their applications to the ruling powers in the mother country; for in the year 1659, in an address of this colony to Richard Cromwell, then lord protector of England, Scotland, and Ireland, there is this paragraph,—'May it please your highness to know, that this poor colony of Providence Plantations, mostly consists of a birth and breeding of the providence of the Most High.—We being an outcast people, formerly from our mother nation, in the bishops' days; and since from the rest of the New English over-zealous colonies: Our frame being much like the present frame and constitution of our dearest mother England; bearing with the several judgments, and consciences, each of other, in all the towns of our colony.—The which our neighbour colonies do not; which is the only cause of their great offence against us.' But as every human felicity has some attendant misfortune, so the people's enjoyment of very great liberty, hath ever been found to produce some disorders, factions, and parties amongst them. . . . It must be confessed, the historians and ministers of the neighbouring colonies, in all their writings for a long time, represented the inhabitants of this colony as a company of people who lived without any order, and quite regardless of all religion; and this, principally, because they allowed an unlimited liberty of conscience, which was then interpreted to be profane licentiousness, as though religion could not subsist without the support of human laws, and Christians must cease to be so, if they suffered any of different sentiments to live in the same country with them. Nor is it to be wondered at, if many among them that first came hither, being tinctured with the same bitter spirit, should create much disturbance; nor that others, when got clear of the fear of censure and punishment should relax too much, and behave as though they were become indifferent about religion itself. With people of both these characters, the fathers of this colony had to contend. . . . In this age it seemed to be doubted whether a civil government could be kept up and supported without some particular mode of religion was established by its laws, and guarded by penalties and tests: And for determining this doubt, by an actual trial, appears to have been the principal motive with King Charles the Second, for granting free liberty of conscience to the people of this colony, by his charter of 1663,—in which

he makes use of these words: 'That they might hold forth a lively experiment, that a most flourishing civil state may stand, and best be maintained, and that amongst our English subjects, with a full liberty in religious concernments. And that true piety, rightly grounded on gospel principles, will give the best and greatest security to sovereignty, and will lay in the hearts of men the strongest obligations to true loyalty.'"—Stephen Hopkins, *Historical Account of the Planting and Growth of Providence* (*Mass. Hist. Soc. Coll's, 2d ser., v.* 9).

ALSO IN: S. G. Arnold, *Hist. of R. I., v.* 1, *ch.* 4. —*Records of the Colony of R. I. and Providence Plantations, v.* 1.

A. D. 1639.—The first Baptist Church.—"There can be little doubt, as to what were the religious tenets of the first settlers of Providence. At the time of their removal here, they were members of Plymouth and Massachusetts churches. Those churches, as it respects government, were Independent or Congregational, in doctrine, moderately Calvinistic and with regard to ceremonies, Pedobaptists. The settlers of Providence, did not cease to be members of those churches, by their removal, nor did the fact of their being members, constitute them a church, after it. They could not form themselves into a church of the faith and order of the Plymouth and Massachusetts churches, until dismissed from them; and after such dismissal, some covenant or agreement among themselves was necessary in order to effect it. That they met for public worship is beyond a doubt; but such meetings, though frequent and regular, would not make them a church. Among the first thirteen, were two ordained ministers, Roger Williams and Thomas James. That they preached to the settlers is quite probable, but there is no evidence of any intent to form a church, previous to March 1639. When they did attempt it, they had ceased to be Pedobaptists, for Ezekiel Holyman, a layman, had baptized Roger Williams, by immersion, and Mr. Williams afterwards had baptized Mr. Holyman and several others of the company, in the same manner. By this act they disowned the churches of which they had been members, and for this, they were soon excommunicated, by those churches. After being thus baptized, they formed a church and called Mr. Williams to be their pastor. This was the first church gathered in Providence. It has continued to the present day, and is now known as The First Baptist Church. . . . Mr. Williams held the pastoral office about four years, and then resigned the same. Mr. Holyman was his colleague. . . . A letter of Richard Scott, appended to 'A New England Fire-Brand Quenched,' and published about 1673, states that Mr. Williams left the Baptists and turned Seeker, a few months after he was baptized. Mr. Scott was a member of the Baptist church for some time, but at the date of this letter, had united with the Friends. According to Mr. Williams' new views as a Seeker, there was no regularly constituted church on earth, nor any person authorized to administer any church ordinance, nor could there be, until new apostles should be sent by the Great Head of the church, for whose coming he was seeking. He was not alone in these opinions. Many in his day believed that the ministry and ordinances of the christian church were irretrievably lost, during the papal usurpation. It has been supposed, by some, that Mr. Williams held these opinions while in Massachusetts, and that this was the reason he denied the church of England to be a true church, and withdrew from his connexion with the Salem church. Aside from the statement of Mr. Scott, above quoted, that Mr. Williams turned Seeker, after he joined the Baptists and walked with them some months, the supposition is shown to be groundless, by his administering baptism in Providence, as before stated, and joining with the first Baptist church there. These acts he could not have performed, had he then been a Seeker."—W. R. Staples, *Annals of the town of Providence, ch.* 7.

A. D. 1641-1647.—Samuel Gorton and the Warwick Plantation.—"Among the supporters of Mrs. Hutchinson, after her arrival at Aquedneck, was a sincere and courageous, but incoherent and crotchetty man named Samuel Gorton. In the denunciatory language of that day he was called a 'proud and pestilent seducer,' or, as the modern newspaper would say, a 'crank.' It is well to make due allowances for the prejudice so conspicuous in the accounts given by his enemies, who felt obliged to justify their harsh treatment of him. But we have also his own writings from which to form an opinion as to his character and views. . . . Himself a London clothier, and thanking God that he had not been brought up in 'the schools of human learning,' he set up as a preacher without ordination, and styled himself 'professor of the mysteries of Christ.' He seems to have cherished that doctrine of private inspiration which the Puritans especially abhorred. . . . Gorton's temperament was such as to keep him always in an atmosphere of strife. Other heresiarchs suffered persecution in Massachusetts, but Gorton was in hot water everywhere. His arrival in any community was the signal for an immediate disturbance of the peace. His troubles began in Plymouth, where the wife of the pastor preferred his teachings to those of her husband. In 1638 he fled to Aquedneck, where his first achievement was a schism among Mrs. Hutchinson's followers, which ended in some staying to found the town of Portsmouth while others went away to found Newport. Presently Portsmouth found him intolerable, flogged and banished him, and after his departure was able to make up its quarrel with Newport. He next made his way with a few followers to Pawtuxet, within the jurisdiction of Providence, and now it is the broad-minded and gentle Roger Williams who complains of his 'bewitching and madding poor Providence.' . . . Williams disapproved of Gorton, but was true to his principles of toleration and would not take part in any attempt to silence him. But in 1641 we find thirteen leading citizens of Providence, headed by William Arnold, sending a memorial to Boston, asking for assistance and counsel in regard to this disturber of the peace. How was Massachusetts to treat such an appeal? She could not presume to meddle with the affair unless she could have permanent jurisdiction over Pawtuxet; otherwise she was a mere intruder. . . . Whatever might be the abstract merits of Gorton's opinions, his conduct was politically dangerous; and accordingly the jurisdiction over Pawtuxet was formally conceded to Massachusetts. Thereupon that colony, assuming jurisdiction, summoned Gorton and his men to Boston, to prove their

title to the lands they occupied. They of course regarded the summons as a flagrant usurpation of authority, and instead of obeying it they withdrew to Shawomet [Warwick], on the western shore of Narragansett bay, where they bought a tract of land from the principal sachem of the Narragansetts, Miantonomo."—J. Fiske, *The Beginnings of New England, pp.* 163–168.—"Soon afterward, by the surrender to Massachusetts of a subordinate Indian chief, who claimed the territory . . . purchased by Gorton of Miantonomi [or Miantonomo], that Government made a demand of jurisdiction there also; and as Gorton refused their summons to appear at Boston, Massachusetts sent soldiers, and captured the inhabitants in their homes, took them to Boston, tried them, and sentenced the greater part of them to imprisonment for blasphemous language to the Massachusetts authorities. They were finally liberated, and banished; and as Warwick was included in the forbidden territory, they went to Rhode Island. Gorton and two of his friends soon afterward went to England." Subsequently, when, in 1647, the government of Providence Plantations was organized under the charter which Roger Williams had procured in England in 1644, "Warwick, whither Gorton and his followers had now returned, though not named in the charter, was admitted to its privileges."—C. Deane, *New England* (*Narrative and Critical History of America, v.* 3, *ch.* 9).

A. D. 1651-1652.—Coddington's usurpation.—Second mission of Roger Williams to England.—Restoration of the Charter.—First enactment against Slavery.—In 1651, William Coddington, who had been chosen President some time before, but who had gone to England without legally entering the office, succeeded by some means in obtaining from the Council of State a commission which appointed him governor of Rhode Island and Connecticut for life, with a council of six to assist him in the government. This apparently annulled the charter of the colony. Again the colony appealed to Roger Williams to plead its cause in England and again he crossed the ocean, "obtaining a hard-wrung leave to embark at Boston. . . . In the same ship went John Clarke, as agent for the Island towns, to ask for the revocation of Coddington's commission. On the success of their application hung the fate of the Colony. Meanwhile the Island towns submitted silently to Coddington's usurpation, and the main-land towns continued to govern themselves by their old laws, and meet and deliberate as they had done before in their General Assembly. It was in the midst of these dangers and dissensions that on the 19th of May, in the session of 1652, it was 'enacted and ordered . . . that no black mankind or white being forced by covenant, bond or otherwise shall be held to service longer than ten years,' and that 'that man that will not let them go free, or shall sell them any else where to that end that they may be enslaved to others for a longer time, hee or they shall forfeit to the Colonie forty pounds.' This was the first legislation concerning slavery on this continent. If forty pounds should seem a small penalty, let us remember that the price of a slave was but twenty. If it should be objected that the act was imperfectly enforced, let us remember how honorable a thing it is to have been the first to solemnly recognize a great principle. Soul liberty had borne her first fruits. . . . Welcome tidings came in September, and still more welcome in October. Williams and Clarke . . . had obtained, first, permission for the colony to act under the charter until the final decision of the controversy, and a few weeks later the revocation of Coddington's commission. The charter was fully restored."—G. W. Greene, *Short Hist. of Rhode Island, ch.* 6.

A. D. 1656.—Refusal to join in the persecution of Quakers. See MASSACHUSETTS: A. D. 1656–1661.

A. D. 1660-1663.—The Charter from Charles II., and the boundary conflicts with Connecticut.—"At its first meeting after the King [Charles II.] came to enjoy his own again, the government of Rhode Island caused him to be proclaimed, and commissioned Clarke [agent of the colony in England] to prosecute its interests at court, which he accordingly proceeded to do. . . . He was intrusted with his suit about a year before Winthrop's arrival in England; but Winthrop [the younger, who went to England on behalf of Connecticut] had been there several months, attending to his business, before he heard anything of the designs of Clarke. His charter of Connecticut had passed through the preliminary forms, and was awaiting the great seal, when it was arrested in consequence of representations made by the agent from Rhode Island. . . . Winthrop, in his new charter, had used the words 'bounded on the east by the Narrogancett River, commonly called Narragancett Bay, where the said river falleth into the sea.' To this identity between Narragansett River and Narragansett Bay Clarke objected, as will be presently explained. A third party was interested in the settlement of the eastern boundary of Connecticut. This was the Atherton Company, so called from Humphrey Atherton of Dorchester, one of the partners. They had bought of the natives a tract of land on the western side of Narragansett Bay; and when they heard that Connecticut was soliciting a charter, they naturally desired that their property should be placed under the government of that colony, rather than under the unstable government of Rhode Island. Winthrop, who was himself one of the associates, wrote from London that the arrangement he had made accorded with their wish. Rhode Island, however, maintained that the lands of the Atherton purchase belonged to her jurisdiction. . . . When Winthrop thought that he had secured for Connecticut a territory extending eastward to Narragansett Bay, Clarke had obtained for Rhode Island the promise of a charter which pushed its boundary westward to the Paucatuck River, so as to include in the latter colony a tract 25 miles wide, and extending in length from the southern border of Massachusetts to the sea. The interference of the charters with each other endangered both. The agents entered into a negotiation which issued, after several months, in a composition effected by the award of four arbiters. Two articles of it were material. One was that Paucatuck River should 'be the certain bounds between the two colonies, which said river should, for the future, be also called, alias, Narrogansett, or Narrogansett River.' The other allowed the Atherton Company to choose 'to which of those colonies they would belong.' The undesirable consequences of a dispute were thus averted; though to say that 'Paucatuck River' meant Narragansett Bay was much the same as

to give to the Thames the name of the British Channel; and if the agreement between the agents should stand, Connecticut would be sadly curtailed of her domain." On the 8th of July, 1663, "Clarke's charter, which the King probably did not know that he had been contradicting, passed the seals. It created 'a body corporate and politic, in fact and name, by the name of the Governor and Company of the English Colony of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations in New England in America.' Similar to the charter of Connecticut in grants marked by a liberality hitherto unexampled, it added to them the extraordinary provision that 'no person within the said colony, at any time thereafter, should be anywise molested, punished, disquieted, or called in question, for any difference of opinion in matters of religion which did not actually disturb the civil peace of the said colony.'. . . Matters were now all ripe for a conflict of jurisdiction between Rhode Island and Connecticut. Using the privilege of choice secured by the compact between the agents, the Atherton Company elected to place their lands, including a settlement known by the name of Wickford, under the government of the latter colony. Rhode Island enacted that all persons presuming to settle there without her leave should be 'taken and imprisoned for such their contempt.'. . . This proved to be the beginning of a series of provocations and reprisals between the inharmonious neighbors."—J. G. Palfrey, *Compendious Hist. of N. Eng., bk.* 2, *ch.* 12 (*v.* 2).

ALSO IN: S. S. Rider, *Book Notes, v.* 10, *pp.* 109–110.—S. G. Arnold, *Hist. of R. I., ch.* 8 (*v.* 1).

A. D. 1674-1678.—King Philip's War. See NEW ENGLAND: A. D. 1674–1675; 1675; 1676–1678.

A. D. 1683.—Death of Roger Williams.—Estimates of his character.—Roger Williams, having given all to his colony, seems to have died without property, dependent upon his children. His son, Daniel, in a letter written in 1710, says: "He never gave me but about three acres of land, and but a little afore he deceased. It looked hard, that out of so much at his disposing, that I should have so little, and he so little. . . . If a covetous man had that opportunity as he had, most of this town would have been his tenants." "Of the immediate cause and exact time of Mr. Williams' death we are not informed. It is certain, however, that he died at some time between January 16, 1682–3, and May 10, 1683. . . . He was in the 84th year of his age."—J. D. Knowles, *Memoir of Roger Williams, pp.* 111 *and* 354.—"We call those great who have devoted their lives to some noble cause, and have thereby influenced for the better the course of events. Measured by that standard, Roger Williams deserves a high niche in the temple of fame, alongside of the greatest reformers who mark epochs in the world's history. He was not the first to discover the principles of religious liberty, but he was the first to proclaim them in all their plenitude, and to found and build up a political community with those principles as the basis of its organization. The influence and effect of his 'lively experiment' of religious liberty and democratic government upon the political system of our country, and throughout the civilized world, are admirably stated by Professor Gervinus in his 'Introduction to the History of the Nineteenth Century.' He says: 'Roger Williams founded in 1636 a small new society in Rhode Island, upon the principles of entire liberty of conscience, and the uncontrolled power of the majority in secular affairs. The theories of freedom in Church and State, taught in the schools of philosophy in Europe, were here brought into practice in the government of a small community. It was prophesied that the democratic attempts to obtain universal suffrage, a general elective franchise, annual parliaments, entire religious freedom, and the Miltonian right of schism would be of short duration. But these institutions have not only maintained themselves here, but have spread over the whole union. They have superseded the aristocratic commencements of Carolina and of New York, the high-church party in Virginia, the theocracy in Massachusetts, and the monarchy throughout America; they have given laws to one quarter of the globe, and, dreaded for their moral influence, they stand in the back-ground of every democratic struggle in Europe.'"—O. S. Straus, *Roger Williams, p.* 233.—"Roger Williams, as all know, was the prophet of complete religious toleration in America. . . . That as a man he was 'conscientiously contentious' I should naturally be among the last to deny; most men who contribute materially towards bringing about great changes, religious or moral, are 'conscientiously contentious.' Were they not so they would not accomplish the work they are here to do."—C. F. Adams, *Massachusetts: its Historians and its History, p.* 25.—"The world, having at last nearly caught up with him, seems ready to vote—though with a peculiarly respectable minority in opposition—that Roger Williams was after all a great man, one of the true heroes, seers, world-movers, of these latter ages. Perhaps one explanation of the pleasure which we take in now looking upon him, as he looms up among his contemporaries in New England, may be that the eye of the observer, rather fatigued by the monotony of so vast a throng of sages and saints, all quite immaculate, all equally prim and stiff in their Puritan starch and uniform, all equally automatic and freezing, finds a relief in the easy swing of this man's gait, the limberness of his personal movement, his escape from the pasteboard proprieties, his spontaneity, his impetuosity, his indiscretions, his frank acknowledgments that he really had a few things yet to learn. Somehow, too, though he sorely vexed the souls of the judicious in his time, and evoked from them words of dreadful reprehension, the best of them loved him; for indeed this headstrong, measureless man, with his flashes of Welsh fire, was in the grain of him a noble fellow; 'a man,' as Edward Winslow said, 'lovely in his carriage.'. . . From his early manhood even down to his late old age, Roger Williams stands in New England a mighty and benignant form, always pleading for some magnanimous idea, some tender charity, the rectification of some wrong, the exercise of some sort of forbearance toward men's bodies or souls. It was one of his vexatious peculiarities, that he could do nothing by halves—even in logic. Having established his major and his minor premises, he utterly lacked the accommodating judgment which would have enabled him to stop there and go no further whenever it seemed that the concluding

member of his syllogism was likely to annoy the brethren. To this frailty in his organization is due the fact that he often seemed to his contemporaries an impracticable person, presumptuous, turbulent, even seditious."—M. C. Tyler, *Hist. of American Literature, ch.* 9, *sect.* 4.

A. D. 1686.—The consolidation of New England under Governor-general Andros. See NEW ENGLAND: A. D. 1686.

A. D. 1689-1701.—The charter government reinstated and confirmed. See CONNECTICUT: A. D. 1689–1701.

A. D. 1690.—King William's War.—The first Colonial Congress. See CANADA: A. D. 1689–1690; and UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1690.

A. D. 1747.—The founding of the Redwood Library. See LIBRARIES, MODERN: UNITED STATES OF AM.

A. D. 1754.—The Colonial Congress at Albany, and Franklin's Plan of Union. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1754.

A. D. 1760-1766.—The question of taxation by Parliament.—The Sugar Act.—The Stamp Act and its repeal.—The Declaratory Act.—The Stamp Act Congress. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1760–1775; 1763–1764; 1765; and 1766.

A. D. 1764.—The founding of Brown University.—Brown University was founded in 1764, especially in the interest of the Baptist Church, and with aid from that denomination in other parts of the country. It was placed first at Warren, but soon removed to Providence, where it was named in honor of its chief benefactor, John Brown.

A. D. 1766-1768.—The Townshend Duties.—The Circular Letter of Massachusetts. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1766–1767; and 1767–1768.

A. D. 1768-1770.—The quartering of troops in Boston.—The "Massacre" and the removal of the troops. See BOSTON: A. D. 1768; and 1770.

A. D. 1770-1773.—Repeal of the Townshend duties, except on Tea.—Committees of Correspondence instituted.—The Tea Ships and the Boston Tea-party. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1770, and 1772–1773; and BOSTON: A. D. 1773.

A. D. 1772.—The destruction of the Gaspé.—The first overt act of the Revolution. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1772.

A. D. 1774.—The Boston Port Bill, the Massachusetts Act, and the Quebec Act.—The First Continental Congress. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1774.

A. D. 1774.—The further introduction of Slaves prohibited. See SLAVERY, NEGRO: A. D. 1774.

A. D. 1775.—The beginning of the War of the American Revolution.—Lexington.—Concord.—The country in arms and Boston beleaguered.—Ticonderoga.—Bunker Hill.—The Second Continental Congress. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1775.

A. D. 1775.—Early naval enterprises in the war. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1775–1776 BEGINNING OF THE AM. NAVY.

A. D. 1776.—Allegiance to the king renounced.—State independence declared.—The British occupation.—"The last Colonial Assembly of Rhode Island met on the 1st of May. On the 4th, two months before the Congressional Declaration of Independence, it solemnly renounced its allegiance to the British crown, no longer closing its session with 'God save the King,' but taking in its stead as expressive of their new relations, 'God save the United Colonies.' . . . The Declaration of Independence by Congress was received with general satisfaction, and proclaimed with a national salute and military display. At Providence the King's arms were burned, and the Legislature assumed its legal title, 'The State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations.' . . . From the 4th of May, 1776, the Declaration of Independence of Rhode Island, to the battle of Tiverton Heights, on the 29th of August, 1778, she lived with the enemy at her door, constantly subject to invasion by land and by water, and seldom giving her watch-worn inhabitants the luxury of a quiet pillow. . . . In November . . . a British fleet took possession of her waters, a British army of her principal island. The seat of government was removed to Providence."—G. W. Greene, *Short Hist. of R. I., ch.* 24–25.—See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1776–1779.

A. D. 1776-1783.—The War of Independence to the end.—Peace with Great Britain. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1776, to 1783.

A. D. 1778.—Failure of attempts to drive the British from Newport. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1778 (JULY—NOVEMBER).

A. D. 1783-1790.—After the War of Independence.—Paper-money.—Opposition to the Federal Constitution.—Tardy entrance into the Union.—Rhode Island emerged from the war of independence bankrupt. "The first question was how to replenish the exhausted treasury. The first answer was that money should be created by the fiat of Rhode Island authorities. Intercourse with others was not much thought of. Fiat money would be good at home. So the paper was issued by order of the Legislature which had been chosen for that purpose. A 'respectable minority' opposed the insane measure, but that did not serve to moderate the insanity. When the credit of the paper began to fall, and traders would not receive it, laws were passed to enforce its reception at par. Fines and punishments were enacted for failure to receive the worthless promises. Starvation stared many in the face. Now it was the agricultural class against the commercial class; and the former party had a large majority in the state and General Assembly. When dealers arranged to secure trade outside the state, that they might not be compelled to handle the local paper currency, it was prohibited by act. When three judges decided that the law compelling men to receive this 'money' was unconstitutional, they were brought before that august General Assembly, and tried and censured for presuming to say that constitutional authority was higher than legislative authority. At last, however, that lesson was learned, and the law was repealed. Before this excitement had subsided the movement for a new national Constitution began. But what did Rhode Island want of a closer bond of union with other states? . . . She feared the 'bondage' of a centralized government. She had fought for the respective liberties of the other colonies, as an assistant in the struggle. She had fought for her own special, individual liberty as a matter of her own

interest. Further her needs were comparatively small as to governmental machinery, and taxation must be small in proportion; and she did not wish to be taxed to support a general government. . . . So when the call was made for each state to hold a convention to elect delegates to a Constitutional Convention, Rhode Island paid not the slightest attention to it. All the other states sent delegates, but Rhode Island sent none; and the work of that convention, grand and glorious as it was, was not shared by her. . . . The same party that favored inflation, or paper money, opposed the Constitution; and that party was in the majority and in power. The General Assembly had been elected with this very thing in view. Meanwhile the loyal party, which was found mostly in the cities and commercial centres, did all in its power to induce the General Assembly to call a convention; but that body persistently refused. Once it suggested a vote of the people in their own precincts; but that method was a failure. As state after state came into the Union, the Union party, by bonfire, parade, and loud demonstration, celebrated the event."—G. L. Harney, *How Rhode Island received the Constitution* (*New England Mag., May*, 1890).—"The country party was in power, and we have seen that elsewhere as well as in Rhode Island, it was the rural population that hated change. The action of the other states had been closely watched and their objections noted. One thing strikes a Rhode Islander very peculiarly in regard to the adoption of the federal constitution. The people were not to vote directly upon it, but only second-hand through delegates to a state convention. No amendment to our state constitution, even at this day, can be adopted without a majority of three-fifths of all the votes cast, the voting being directly on the proposition, and a hundred years ago no state was more democratic in its notions than Rhode Island. Although the Philadelphia Convention had provided that the federal constitution should be ratified in the different states by conventions of delegates elected by the people for that purpose, upon the call of the General Assembly, yet this did not accord with the Rhode Island idea, so in February, 1788, the General Assembly voted to submit the question whether the constitution of the United States should be adopted, to the voice of the people to be expressed at the polls on the fourth Monday in March. The federalists fearing they would be out-voted, largely abstained from voting, so the vote stood two hundred and thirty-seven for the constitution, and two thousand seven hundred and eight against it, there being about four thousand voters in the state at that time. Governor Collins, in a letter to the president of Congress written a few days after the vote was taken, gives the feeling then existing in Rhode Island, in this wise:—'Although this state has been singular from her sister states in the mode of collecting the sentiments of the people upon the constitution, it was not done with the least design to give any offence to the respectable body who composed the convention, or a disregard to the recommendation of Congress, but upon pure republican principles, founded upon that basis of all governments originally derived from the body of the people at large. And although, sir, the majority has been so great against adopting the Constitution, yet the people, in general, conceive that it may contain some necessary articles which could well be added and adapted to the present confederation. They are sensible that the present powers invested with Congress are incompetent for the great national government of the Union, and would heartily acquiesce in granting sufficient authority to that body to make, exercise and enforce laws throughout the states, which would tend to regulate commerce and impose duties and excise, whereby Congress might establish funds for discharging the public debt.'. A majority of the voters of the country was undoubtedly against the constitution, but convention after convention was carried by the superior address and management of its friends. Rhode Island lacked great men, who favored the constitution, to lead her. . . . The requisite number of states having ratified the constitution, a government was formed under it April 30, 1789. Our General Assembly, at its September session in that year, sent a long letter to Congress explanatory of the situation in Rhode Island, and its importance warrants my quoting a part of it. 'The people of this state from its first settlement,' ran the letter, 'have been accustomed and strongly attached to a democratical form of government. They have viewed in the new constitution an approach, though perhaps but small, toward that form of government from which we have lately dissolved our connection at so much hazard and expense of life and treasure,—they have seen with pleasure the administration thereof from the most important trusts downward, committed to men who have highly merited and in whom the people of the United States place unbounded confidence. Yet, even on this circumstance, in itself so fortunate, they have apprehended danger by way of precedent. Can it be thought strange, then, that with these impressions, they should wait to see the proposed system organized and in operation, to see what further checks and securities would be agreed to and established by way of amendments, before they would adopt it as a constitution of government for themselves and their posterity?' . . . Rhode Island never supposed she could stand alone. In the words of her General Assembly in the letter just referred to:—'They know themselves to be a handful, comparatively viewed.' This letter, as well as a former one I have quoted from, showed that she, like New Hampshire, Massachusetts, New York, Virginia, and North Carolina, hoped to see the constitution amended. Like the latter state she believed in getting the amendments before ratification, and so strong was the pressure for amendments that at the very first session of Congress a series of amendments was introduced and passed for ratification by the states, and Rhode Island, though the last to adopt the constitution, was the ninth state to ratify the first ten amendments to that instrument now in force; ratifying both constitution and amendments at practically the same time. One can hardly wonder at the pressure for amendments to the original constitution when the amendments have to be resorted to for provisions that Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free use thereof, or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press, or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the government for a redress of grievances; that excessive bail should not be

required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted; for right of trial by jury in civil cases; and for other highly important provisions."—H. Rogers, *Rhode Island's Adoption of the Federal Constitution* (*R. I. Hist. Soc.*, 1890).—The convention which finally accepted for Rhode Island and ratified the federal constitution met at South Kingston, in March, 1790, then adjourned to meet at Newport in May, and there completed its work. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1787, and 1787–1789.

A. D. 1814.—The Hartford Convention. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1814 (DECEMBER) THE HARTFORD CONVENTION.

A. D. 1841-1843.—The Dorr Rebellion.—The old Charter replaced by a State Constitution.—The old colonial charter of Rhode Island remained unchanged until 1843. Its property qualification of the right of suffrage, and the inequality of representation in the legislature which became more flagrant as the state and its cities increased in population, became causes of great popular discontent. The legislature turned a deaf ear to all demands for a democratic basis of government, and in 1841 a serious attempt was made by a resolute party to initiate and carry through a revision of the constitution independently of legislative action. A convention was held in October of that year which framed a constitution and submitted it to the vote of the people. It was adopted by a majority of the votes cast, and, in accordance with its provisions, an election was held the following April. Thomas Wilson Dorr was chosen Governor, and on the 3d of May, 1842, the new government was formally inaugurated by its supporters at Providence, where they were in the majority. "If Mr. Dorr and his officers, supported by the armed men then at their command, had taken possession of the State House, Arsenal, and other state property, and acted as if they had confidence in themselves and their cause, the result might have been different. This was the course desired and advocated by Mr. Dorr, but he was overruled by more timid men, who dared go just far enough to commit themselves, disturb the peace of the state, and provoke the Law and Order government, but not far enough to give themselves a chance of success. While the People's government was being organized in Providence, the regularly elected General Assembly met on the same day at Newport, inaugurated the officers as usual, and passed resolutions declaring that an insurrection existed in the state and calling on the President for aid, which was . . . declined with good advice as to amnesty and concession, which was not heeded. On the following day a member of the People's legislature was arrested under the Algerine law, and this arrest was followed by others, which in turn produced a plentiful crop of resignations from that body. . . . At the request of his legislature, Mr. Dorr now went to Washington and unsuccessfully tried to secure the aid and countenance of President Tyler. . . . During Mr. Dorr's absence, both parties were pushing on military preparations. . . . The excitement at this time was naturally great, though many were still inclined to ridicule the popular fears, and the wildest rumors filled the air." On the 18th, the Dorr party made an attempt to gain possession of the state arsenal, but it failed rather ignominiously, and Dorr himself fled to Connecticut. One more abortive effort was made, by others less sagacious than himself, to rally the supporters of the Constitution, in an armed camp, formed at Chepachet; but the party in power confronted it with a much stronger force, and it dispersed without firing a gun. This was the end of the "rebellion." "In June, 1842, while the excitement was still at its height, the General Assembly had called still another convention, which met in September and . . . framed the present constitution, making an extension of the suffrage nearly equivalent to that demanded by the suffrage party previous to 1841. In November this constitution was adopted, and in May, 1843, went into effect with a set of officers chosen from the leaders of the Landholders' party, the same men who had always ruled the state. . . . Early in August, Governor Dorr, who had remained beyond the reach of the authorities, against his own will and in deference to the wishes of his friends who still hoped, issued an address explaining and justifying his course and announcing that he should soon return to Rhode Island. Accordingly, on October 31, he returned to Providence, without concealment, and registered himself at the principal hotel. Soon afterwards, he was arrested and committed to jail, without bail, to await trial for treason. . . . The spirit in which this trial was conducted does no credit to the fairness or magnanimity of the court or of the Law and Order party. Under an unusual provision of the act, although all Dorr's acts had been done in Providence County, he was tried in Newport, the most unfriendly county in the state. . . . Every point was ruled against Mr. Dorr, and the charge to the jury, while sound in law, plainly showed the opinion and wishes of the court. It was promptly followed by a verdict of guilty, and on this verdict Mr. Dorr, on June 25, just two years from his joining the camp at Chepachet, was sentenced to imprisonment for life. . . . Declining an offer of liberation if he would take the oath to support the new constitution, Mr. Dorr went to prison and remained in close confinement until June, 1845, when an act of amnesty was passed, and he was released. A great concourse greeted him with cheers at the prison gates, and escorted him with music and banners to his father's house, which he had not entered since he began his contest for the establishment of the People's constitution. The newspapers all over the country, which favored his cause, congratulated him and spoke of the event as an act of tardy justice to a martyr in the cause of freedom and popular rights. . . . But Mr. Dorr's active life was over. He had left the prison broken in health and visibly declining to his end. The close confinement, dampness, and bad air had shattered his constitution, and fixed upon him a disease from which he never recovered. He lived nine years longer but in feeble health and much suffering."—C. H. Payne, *The Great Dorr War* (*New England Mag., June*, 1890).

ALSO IN: D. King, *Life and Times of Thomas Wilson Dorr.*

A. D. 1888.—Constitutional Amendment.—The qualification of the Suffrage.—"The adoption of the Amendment to the Constitution of Rhode Island, at the recent election, relating to the elective franchise, brings to a close a political struggle which began in earnest in 1819. Hence

it has been in progress about 80 years. It makes, or will ultimately make, great political changes here. . . . It may not be inopportune, upon the consummation of so great a political change, to note briefly some of the steps by which the change came to pass. . . . The qualifications of electors was not defined by the charter. That power was given to the General Assembly. A property qualification was first introduced into the laws in 1665, and has ever since been and now is in part retained. It was not at first specified to be land, but men of competent estates, without regard to the species of property, 'may be admitted to be freemen.' Even so accurate a scholar as the late Judge Potter, has erred in his statement of the case. He says that by the act of March, 1663–4, all persons were required to be of 'competent estate.' This is not correct. The proposition was made two years subsequent to the establishment of the charter, and was made by the King of England, and sent by him by commissioners to Rhode Island and was then adopted and enacted by the General Assembly. . . . This qualification was made to depend only on land, by the act of the General Assembly of February 1723–4, and was a purely Rhode Island measure (Digest. of R. I., 1730, p. 110). From that time until the present, covering a period of nearly 165 years, this qualification has in some measure remained. The value was then (in 1723) fixed at £100, and practically, it was never changed. It was raised or lowered from time to time to meet the fluctuation of paper money. Sometimes it was in 'old tenor' and sometimes in 'lawful money,' both of which were in paper, and reckoned usually in pounds, shillings and pence. In 1760, the amount was £40 lawful money. In 1763 'lawful money' was defined to be gold or silver. After the decimal system came into use, the mode of reckoning was changed into dollars. Thus in £40 are 800 shillings, which at six shillings to the dollar, which was then New England currency, is equal to $133.33; by the law of 1798 the sum was made $134, and so it has always since remained, and so under the recent amendment it remains as a qualification of an elector, who can vote on a question of expenditure, or the levying of a tax. . . . There was practically no change in the qualifications required of a man to become an elector from the earliest times down to 1842. In 1819 a serious attempt was made to obtain a constitution. A convention was called and a constitution was framed and submitted to the people, that is, to the Freemen, for adoption; but the General Assembly enacted that a majority of three-fifths should be required for its adoption. This was the origin of the three-fifth restriction in the present constitution. It did not enlarge the suffrage; a proposition to that end received only 3 votes against 61, nor was it of any general benefit, and it was as well that it failed. The political disabilities of men were confined to two classes, to wit: The second son, and other younger sons of freemen, and those other native American citizens of other states who had moved into Rhode Island, and therein acquired a residence. To these two classes, although possessed of abundant personal property, and upon which the state levied and collected taxes, and from whom the state exacted military service, the right to vote was denied, because among their possessions there was no land. It was taxation without representation, the very principle upon which the Revolution had been fought. In 1828 more than one-half the taxes paid in Providence were paid by men who could not vote upon any question. In 1830, in North Providence, there were 200 freemen and 579 native men, over twenty-one years, who were disfranchised. . . . There were in 1832 five men in Pawtucket who had fought the battles for Rhode Island through the Revolution, but who, possessing no land, had never been able to vote upon any question. . . . In another respect a great wrong was done. It was in the representation of the towns in the General Assembly. Jamestown had a representative for every eighteen freemen. Providence, one to every 275. Smithfield, one in every 206. Fifty dollars in taxes, in Barrington, had the same power in the representation that $750 had in Providence. The minority of legal voters actually controlled the majority. . . . Such then was the political condition of men in Rhode Island in 1830. There were about 8,000 Freemen and about 13,000 unenfranchised Americans with comparatively no naturalized foreigners among them. The agitation of the question did not cease. In 1829 it was so violent that the General Assembly referred the question to a committee, of which Benjamin Hazard was the head, and which committee made a report, always since known as Hazard's Report, which it was supposed would quiet forever the agitation. But it did not; for five years later a convention was called and a portion of a constitution framed. The question of foreigners was first seriously raised by Mr. Hazard in this report. By this term Mr. Hazard intended not only citizens of countries outside of the United States, but he intended American citizens of other American States. He would deny political rights to a man born in Massachusetts, who came to dwell in Rhode Island, in the same way that he would deny them to a Spaniard. A Massachusetts man must live here one year, the Spaniard three, but both must own land. These ideas were formulated in the constitution of 1834 as far as it went. . . . Fortunately it fell through and by the most disgraceful of actions; and its history when written will form one of the darkest chapters in Rhode Island history. This discrimination against foreign born citizens, that is, men born in countries outside of the United States, became more pointed in the proposed Landholders' Constitution of November 1841. A native of the United States could vote on a land qualification, or if he paid taxes upon other species of property. A foreigner must own land and he could not vote otherwise. This Constitution was defeated. Then came the People's Constitution, (otherwise known as the Dorr Constitution). It made no restrictions upon foreigners; it admitted all citizens of the United States upon an equal footing; negroes were excluded in both documents. This Constitution never went into effect. Then came the present Constitution, adopted in September, 1842, by which all the disabilities complained of were swept away with the exception of the discrimination in the case of foreigners. By it negroes were admitted, but foreigners were required to hold lands, as all the various propositions had provided with the single exception of the People's Constitution. Now comes the amendment recently adopted, and parallel

with it I have reproduced the section relating to the same matter from the People's Constitution:

Qualification of Electors under Amendment (Bourn) to Constitution, adopted April, 1888.

Section 1. Every male citizen of the United States of the age of 21 years, who has had his residence and home in this State for two years, and in the town or city in which he may offer to vote six months next preceding the time of his voting, and whose name shall be registered in the town or city where he resides on or before the last day of Dec., in the year next preceding to the time of his voting, shall have a right to vote in the election of all civil officers and on all questions in all legally organized town or ward meetings: Provided, that no person shall at any time be allowed to vote in the election of the City Council of any city, or upon any proposition to impose a tax, or for the expenditure of money in any town or city, unless he shall within the year next preceding have paid a tax assessed upon his property therein, valued at least at one hundred and thirty-four dollars.

Qualification of Electors under the People's (Dorr) Constitution, 1842.

Section 1. Every white male citizen of the United States of the age of twenty-one years, who has resided in this State for one year, and in any town, city or district of the same for six months next preceding the election at which he offers to vote, shall be an elector of all officers, who are elected, or may hereafter be made eligible by the people * *

Sec. 4. No elector who is not possessed of, and assessed for ratable property in his own right to the amount of one hundred and fifty dollars, or, who shall have neglected, or refused to pay any tax assessed upon him in any town or city or district, for one year preceding the * * meeting at which he shall offer to vote, shall be entitled to vote on any question of taxation, or the expenditure of any public moneys * *

Sec. 7. There shall be a strict registration of all qualified voters * * * and no person shall be permitted to vote whose name has not been entered upon the list of voters before the polls are opened.

It thus appears that the people of Rhode Island have at last adopted an amendment to the Constitution, more liberal in its qualifications of electors, than the terms asked by Mr. Dorr, in 1842. . . . All that was asked by Mr. Dorr, and even by those of his party, more radical than himself, has been granted, and even more. And yet they were denounced with every species of vile epithet as Free Suffrage Men."—S. S. Rider, *The End of a great Political Struggle in Rhode Island* (*Book Notes, v.* 5, *pp.* 53–57).

RHODES.—The island of Rhodes, with its picturesque capital city identical in name, lying in the Ægean Sea, near the southwestern corner of Asia Minor, has a place alike notable in the history of ancient and mediæval times; hardly less of a place, too, in prehistoric legends and myths. It has been famed in every age for a climate almost without defect. Among the ancients its Doric people [see ASIA MINOR: THE GREEK COLONIES] were distinguished for their enterprise in commerce, their rare probity, their courage, their refinement, their wealth, their liberality to literature and the arts. In the middle ages all this had disappeared, but the island and the city had become the seat of the power of the Knights of St. John — the last outpost of European civilization in the east, held stoutly against the Turks until 1522. The unsuccessful siege of Rhodes, B. C. 305 or 304, by Demetrius, the son of Antigonus, was one of the great events of ancient military history. It "showed not only the power but the virtues of this merchant aristocracy. They rebuilt their shattered city with great magnificence. They used the metal of Demetrius's abandoned engines for the famous Colossus [see below], a bronze figure of the sun about 100 feet high, which, however, was thrown down and broken by the earthquake of B. C. 227, and lay for centuries near the quays, the wonder of all visitors. . . . It is said that the Saracens sold the remnants of this statue for old metal when they captured Rhodes. . . . It was doubtless during the same period that Rhodes perfected that system of marine mercantile law which was accepted not only by all Hellenistic states, but acknowledged by the Romans down to the days of the empire. . . . We do not know what the detail of their mercantile system was, except that it was worked by means of an active police squadron, which put down piracy, or confined it to shipping outside their confederacy, and also that their persistent neutrality was only abandoned when their commercial interests were directly attacked. In every war they appear as mediators and peace-makers. There is an allusion in the 'Mercator' of Plautus to young men being sent to learn business there, as they are now sent to Hamburg or Genoa. The wealth and culture of the people, together with the stately plan of their city, gave much incitement and scope to artists in bronze and marble, as well as to painters, and the names of a large number of Rhodian artists have survived on the pedestals of statues long since destroyed. But two famous works — whether originals or copies seems uncertain — still attest the genius of the school, the 'Laocoon,' now in the Vatican, and the 'Toro Farnese.'"—J. P. Mahaffy, *Story of Alexander's Empire, ch.* 20, *with foot-note.*

B. C. 412. — Revolt from Athens. See GREECE: B. C. 413–412.

B. C. 378-357.—In the new Athenian Confederacy.—Revolt and secession.—The Social War. See ATHENS: B. C. 378–357.

B. C. 305-304.—Siege by Demetrius Poliorcetes.—One of the memorable sieges of antiquity was that in which the brave, free citizens of Rhodes held their splendid town (B. C. 305) for one whole year against the utmost efforts of Demetrius, called Poliorcetes, or "the Besieger," son of Antigonus, the would-be successor of Alexander (see MACEDONIA: B. C. 310–301). Demetrius was a remarkable engineer, for his age, and constructed machinery for the siege which was the wonder of the Grecian world. His masterpiece was the Helepolis, or "city-taker,"—a wooden tower, 150 feet high, sheathed with iron, travelling on wheels and moved by the united strength of 3,400 men. He also assailed the walls of Rhodes with battering rams, 150 feet long, each driven by 1,000 men. But

all his ingenious appliances failed and he was forced in the end to recognize the independence of the valiant Rhodians.—C. Torr, *Rhodes in Ancient Times, pp.* 13–14, 44.

ALSO IN: C. Thirlwall, *Hist. of Greece, ch.* 59.

B. C. 191.—Alliance with Rome.—War with Antiochus the Great.—Acquisition of territory in Caria and Lycia. See SELEUCIDÆ: B. C. 224–187.

B. C. 88.—Besieged by Mithridates.—At the beginning of his first war with the Romans, B. C. 88, Mithridates made a desperate attempt to reduce the city of Rhodes, which was the faithful ally of Rome. But the Rhodians repelled all his assaults, by sea and by land, and he was forced to abandon the siege.—G. Long, *Decline of the Roman Republic, v.* 2, *ch.* 20.

A. D. 1310.—Conquest and occupation by the Knights Hospitallers of St. John. See HOSPITALLERS OF ST. JOHN: A. D. 1310.

A. D. 1480.—Repulse of the Turks. See TURKS (THE OTTOMANS): A. D. 1451–1481.

A. D. 1522.—Siege and conquest by the Turks.—Surrender and withdrawal of the Knights of St. John. See HOSPITALLERS OF ST. JOHN: A. D. 1522.

RHODES, The Colossus of.—"In the elementary works for the instruction of young people, we find frequent mention of the Colossus of Rhodes. The statue is always represented with gigantic limbs, each leg resting on the enormous rocks which face the entrance to the principal port of the Island of Rhodes; and ships in full sail passed easily, it is said, between its legs; for, according to Pliny the ancient, its height was 70 cubits. This Colossus was reckoned among the seven wonders of the world, the six others being, as is well known, the hanging gardens of Babylon, devised by Nitocris, wife of Nebuchadnezzar; the pyramids of Egypt; the statue of Jupiter Olympus; the Mausoleum of Halicarnassus; the temple of Diana at Ephesus; and the Pharos of Alexandria, completely destroyed by an earthquake in 1303. Nowhere has any authority been found for the assertion that the Colossus of Rhodes spanned the entrance to the harbour of the island and admitted the passage of vessels in full sail between its wide-stretched limbs. . . . The following is the real truth concerning the Colossus." After the abandonment of the siege of Rhodes, in 305, by Demetrius Poliorcetes, "the Rhodians, inspired by a sentiment of piety, and excited by fervent gratitude for so signal a proof of the divine favour, commanded Charès to erect a statue to the honour of their deity [the sun-god Helios]. An inscription explained that the expenses of its construction were defrayed out of the sale of the materials of war left by Demetrius on his retreat from the island of Rhodes. This statue was erected on an open space of ground near the great harbour, and near the spot where the pacha's seraglio now stands; and its fragments, for many years after its destruction, were seen and admired by travellers."—O. Delepierre, *Historical Difficulties, ch.* 1.

RHODES, Knights of.—During their occupation of the island, the Knights Hospitallers of St. John of Jerusalem were commonly called Knights of Rhodes, as they were afterwards called Knights of Malta. See HOSPITALLERS OF ST. JOHN.

RI, The.—"The Ri or king, who was at the head of the tribe [the 'tuath,' or tribe, in ancient Ireland], held that position not merely by election, but as the representative in the senior line of the common ancestor, and had a hereditary claim to their obedience. As the supreme authority and judge of the tribe he was the Ri or king. This was his primary function. . . . As the leader in war he was the 'Toisech' or Captain."—W. F. Skene, *Celtic Scotland, v.* 3, *p.* 140. —See, also, TUATH, THE.

RIALTO: Made the seat of Venetian government. See VENICE: A. D. 697–810.

RIBBON SOCIETIES.—RIBBONISM. See IRELAND: A. D. 1820–1826.

RIBCHESTER, Origin of. See COCCIUM.

RICH MOUNTAIN, Battle of. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1861 (JUNE—JULY: WEST VIRGINIA).

RICHARD (of Cornwall), King of Germany, A. D. 1256–1271.....Richard I. (called Cœur de Leon), King of England, 1189–1199..... Richard II. King of England, 1377–1399..... Richard III. King of England, 1483–1485.

RICHBOROUGH, England, Roman origin of. See RUTUPIÆ.

RICHELIEU, The Ministry of. See FRANCE: A. D. 1610–1619, to 1642–1643.

RICHMOND, Va.: Powhatan's residence. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: POWHATAN CONFEDERACY.

A. D. 1781.—Lafayette's defense of the city. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1781 (JANUARY—MAY).

A. D. 1861.—Made the capital of the Southern Confederacy. See VIRGINIA: A. D. 1861 (JULY).

A. D. 1862.—McClellan's Peninsular Campaign against the Confederate capital. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1862 (MARCH—MAY: VIRGINIA); (MAY: VIRGINIA); (JUNE: VIRGINIA); (JUNE—JULY: VIRGINIA); and (JULY—AUGUST: VIRGINIA).

A. D. 1864 (March).—Kilpatrick's and Dahlgren's Raid. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1864 (FEBRUARY—MARCH: VIRGINIA).

A. D. 1864 (May).—Sheridan's Raid to the city lines. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1864 (MAY: VIRGINIA) SHERIDAN'S RAID.

A. D. 1865 (April).—Abandonment by the Confederate army and government.—Destructive conflagration.—President Lincoln in the city. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1865 (APRIL: VIRGINIA).

RICIMER, Count, and his Roman imperial puppets. See ROME: A. D. 455–476.

RICOS HOMBRES, of Aragon. See CORTES, THE EARLY SPANISH.

RIDGEWAY, Battle of. See CANADA: A.D. 1866–1871.

RIDINGS OF YORKSHIRE.—The name Ridings is a corruption of the word Trithings, or 'Thirds,' which was applied to the large divisions of Yorkshire and Lincolnshire (England) in the time of the Angles.—T. P. Taswell-Langmead, *English Const. Hist., ch.* 1, *note.*

RIEL'S REBELLION. See CANADA: A.D. 1869–1873.

RIENZI'S REVOLUTION. See ROME: A. D. 1347–1354.

RIGA: A. D. 1621.—Siege and capture by Gustavus Adolphus of Sweden. See SCANDINAVIAN STATES (SWEDEN): A. D. 1611–1629.

A. D. 1700.—Unsuccessful siege by the King of Poland. See SCANDINAVIAN STATES (SWEDEN): A. D. 1697–1700.

"RIGHT," "LEFT," AND "CENTER," The.—In France, and several other continental European countries, political parties in the legislative bodies are named according to the positions of the seats which they occupy in their respective chambers. The extreme conservatives gather at the right of the chair of the presiding officer, and are known, accordingly, as "The Right." The extreme radicals similarly collected on the opposite side of the chamber, are called "The Left." Usually, there is a moderate wing of each of these parties which partially detaches itself and is designated, in one case, "The Right Center," and in the other, "The Left Center"; while, midway between all these divisions, there is a party of independents who take the name of "The Center."

RIGHT OF SEARCH, The. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1804–1809; and 1812.

RIGHTS, Declaration and Bill of. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1689 (JANUARY—FEBRUARY), and (OCTOBER).

RIGSDAG, The.—The legislative assembly of Denmark and Sweden. See SCANDINAVIAN STATES (DENMARK—ICELAND): A. D. 1849–1874; and CONSTITUTION OF SWEDEN.

RIGSRET. See CONSTITUTION OF NORWAY.

RIGVEDA, The. See INDIA: THE IMMIGRATION AND CONQUESTS OF THE ARYAS.

RIMINI, Origin of the city. See ROME: B. C. 295–191.

The Malatesta family. See MALATESTA FAMILY.

A. D. 1275.—Sovereignty of the Pope confirmed by Rodolph of Hapsburg. See GERMANY: A. D. 1273–1308.

RIMMON.—"The name of Rimmon, which means 'pomegranate,' occurs frequently in the topography of Palestine, and was probably derived from the culture of this beautiful tree."—J. Kenrick, *Phœnicia, ch.* 2.

RIMNIK, Battle of (1789). See TURKS: A. D. 1776–1792.

RINGGOLD, Battle of. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1863 (OCTOBER—NOVEMBER: TENNESSEE).

RINGS OF THE AVARS. See AVARS, RINGS OF THE.

RIOTS, Draft. See NEW YORK: A. D. 1863.

RIPON, Lord, The Indian administration of. See INDIA: A. D. 1880–1893.

RIPON, Treaty of. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1640.

RIPUARIAN FRANKS, The. See FRANKS.

RIPUARIANS, Law of the.—"On the death of Clovis, his son, Theodoric, was king of the eastern Franks; that is to say, of the Ripuarian Franks; he resided at Metz. To him is generally attributed the compilation of their law. . . . According to this tradition, then, the law of the Ripuarians should be placed between the years 511 and 534. It could not have, like the Salic, the pretension of ascending to the right-hand bank of the Rhine, and to ancient Germany. . . . I am inclined to believe that it was only under Dagobert I., between the years 628 and 638, that it took the definite form under which it has reached us."—F. Guizot, *Hist. of Civilization, v.* 2 (*France, v.* 1), *lect.* 10.

RIVOLI, Battle of (1797). See FRANCE: A. D. 1796–1797 (OCTOBER—APRIL).

ROAD OF THE SWANS, The. See NORMANS: NAME AND ORIGIN.

ROANOKE: A. D. 1585-1590.—The first attempts at English settlement in America.—The lost colony. See AMERICA: A. D. 1584–1586; and 1587–1590.

A. D. 1862.—Capture by Burnside's Expedition. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1862 (JANUARY—APRIL: NORTH CAROLINA).

ROBE, La Noblesse de la. See PARLIAMENT OF PARIS.

ROBERT, Latin Emperor at Constantinople (Romania), A. D. 1221–1228.....Robert, King of Naples, 1309–1343.....Robert I., King of France, 922–923.....Robert I. (Bruce), King of Scotland, 1306–1329.....Robert II., King of France, 996–1031.....Robert II. (first of the Stuarts), King of Scotland, 1370–1390..... Robert III., King of Scotland, 1390–1406.

ROBERTSON, James, and the early settlement of Tennessee. See TENNESSEE: A. D. 1769–1772, to 1785–1796.

ROBESPIERRE, and the French Revolution. See FRANCE: A. D. 1789 (AUGUST—OCTOBER), to 1794 (JULY).

ROBINSON, John, and his Congregation. See INDEPENDENTS: A. D. 1604–1617; and MASSACHUSETTS: A. D. 1620.

ROBOGDII, The. See IRELAND, TRIBES OF EARLY CELTIC INHABITANTS.

ROCCA SECCA, Battle of (1411). See ITALY (SOUTHERN): A. D. 1386–1414.

ROCHAMBEAU, Count de, and the War of the American Revolution. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1780 (JULY); 1781 (JANUARY—MAY); 1781 (MAY—OCTOBER).

ROCHE-ABEILLE, La, Battle of (1569). See FRANCE: A. D. 1563–1570.

ROCHELLE: Early Importance.—Expulsion of the English.—Grant of Municipal independence.—"Rochelle had always been one of the first commercial places of France; it was well known to the English under the name of the White Town, as they called it, from its appearance when the sun shone and was reflected from its rocky coasts. It was also much frequented by the Netherlanders. . . . The town had . . . enjoyed extraordinary municipal franchises ever since the period of the English wars [see FRANCE: A. D. 1337–1360, and 1360–1380]. It had by its own unaided power revolted from the English dominion [1372], for which Charles V., in his customary manner, conferred upon the townsfolk valuable privileges,—among others, that of independent jurisdiction in the town and its liberties. The design of Henry II. to erect a citadel within their walls they had been enabled fortunately to prevent, through the favour of the Chatillons and the Montmorencies. Rochelle exhibited Protestant sympathies at an early period."—L. von Ranke, *Civil Wars and Monarchy in France, in the 16th and 17th Centuries, ch.* 14.

ALSO IN: H. M. Baird, *Hist. of the Rise of the Huguenots of France, v. 2, pp.* 270–273.

A. D. 1568.—Becomes the headquarters of the Huguenots.—Arrival of the Queen of Navarre. See FRANCE: A. D. 1563–1570.

A. D. 1573.—Siege and successful defense. See FRANCE: A. D. 1572–1573.

A. D. 1620-1622.—Huguenot revolt in support of Navarre and Béarn.—The unfavorable Peace of Montpelier. See FRANCE: A. D. 1620–1622.

A. D. 1625-1626.—Renewed revolt.—Second treaty of Montpelier. See FRANCE: A. D. 1624–1626.

A. D. 1627-1628.—Revolt in alliance with England.—Siege and surrender.—Richelieu's dyke.—The decay of the city. See FRANCE: A. D. 1627–1628.

ROCHESTER, England: Origin.—One of two Roman towns in Britain called Durobrivæ is identified in site with the modern city of Rochester. It derived its Saxon name—originally "Hrofescester"—"according to Bede, from one of its early rulers or prefects named Hrof, who, for some circumstance or other, had probably gained greater notoriety than most persons of his class and rank."—T. Wright, *Celt, Roman and Saxon, ch.* 5 *and* 16.

ROCKINGHAM MINISTRIES, The. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1765–1768; and 1782–1783.

ROCROI: A. D. 1643.—Siege and Battle. See FRANCE: A. D. 1642–1643.

A. D. 1653.—Siege by Condé in the Spanish service. See FRANCE: A. D. 1653–1656.

A. D. 1659.—Recovered by France. See FRANCE: A. D. 1659–1661.

RODNEY'S NAVAL VICTORY. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1780–1782.

RODOALDUS, King of the Lombards, A. D. 654–659.

RODOLPH. See RUDOLPH.

ROESKILDE, Treaty of (1658). See SCANDINAVIAN STATES (SWEDEN): A. D. 1644–1697.

ROGATION.—With reference to the legislation of the Romans, "the word Rogatio is frequently used to denote a Bill proposed to the people. . . . After a Rogatio was passed it became a Lex; but in practice Rogatio and Lex were used as convertible terms, just as Bill and Law are by ourselves."—W. Ramsay, *Manual of Roman Antiq., ch.* 4.

ROGER I., Count of Sicily, A. D. 1072–1101.....Roger II., Count of Sicily, 1106–1129; King of Naples and Sicily, 1129–1154.

ROGUE RIVER INDIANS, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: MODOCS, &C.

ROHAN, Cardinal-Prince de, and the Diamond Necklace. See FRANCE: A. D. 1784–1785.

ROHILLA WAR, The. See INDIA: A. D. 1773–1785.

ROIS FAINÉANS. See FRANKS: A. D. 511–752.

ROLAND, Madame, and the Girondists. See FRANCE: A. D. 1791 (OCTOBER), to 1793 (SEPTEMBER—DECEMBER).

ROLAND, The great Bell. See GHENT: A. D. 1539–1540.

ROLIÇA, Battle of (1808). See SPAIN: A. D. 1808–1809 (AUGUST—JANUARY).

ROLLO, Duke, The conquest of Normandy by. See NORMANS: A. D. 876–911; and NORMANDY: A. D. 911–1000.

ROLLS OF THE PIPE.—ROLLS OF THE CHANCERY. See EXCHEQUER.

ROMA QUADRATA. See PALATINE HILL.

ROMAGNA.—The old exarchate of Ravenna, "as having been the chief seat of the later Imperial power in Italy, got the name of Romania, Romandiola, or Romagna."—E. A. Freeman, *Hist. Geog. of Europe, pp.* 234 *and* 238.

ROMAGNANO, Battle of (1524). See FRANCE: A. D. 1523–1525.

ROMAN AUGURS. See AUGURS.

ROMAN CALENDAR.—ROMAN YEAR. See CALENDAR, JULIAN.

ROMAN CAMPAGNA, OR CAMPANIA. See CAMPAGNA.

ROMAN CATACOMBS, The. See CATACOMBS.

ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH. See PAPACY, and CATHOLICS.

ROMAN CITIZENSHIP, under the Republic. See CIVES ROMANI; also, QUIRITES.

Under the Empire.—"While Pompeius, Cæsar, Augustus and others extended the Latin rights to many provincial communities, they were careful to give the full Roman qualification [the 'privileges of Quiritary proprietorship, which gave not merely the empty title of the suffrage, but the precious immunity from tribute or land-tax'] to persons only. Of such persons, indeed, large numbers were admitted to citizenship by the emperors. The full rights of Rome were conferred on the Transalpine Gauls by Claudius, and the Latin rights on the Spaniards by Vespasian; but it was with much reserve that any portions of territory beyond Italy were enfranchised, and rendered Italic or Quiritary soil, and thus endowed with a special immunity. . . . The earlier emperors had, indeed, exercised a jealous reserve in popularizing the Roman privileges; but from Claudius downwards they seem to have vied with one another in the facility with which they conferred them as a boon, or imposed them as a burden. . . . The practice of purchasing Civitas was undoubtedly common under Claudius. . . . Neither Hadrian, as hastily affirmed by St. Chrysostom, nor his next successor, as has been inferred from a confusion of names, was the author of the decree by which the Roman franchise was finally communicated to all the subjects of the empire. Whatever the progress of enfranchisement may have been, this famous consummation was not effected till fifty years after our present date, by the act of Antoninus Caracalla [A. D. 211–217]."—C. Merivale, *Hist. of the Romans, ch.* 67, *with foot-note.*

ROMAN CITY FESTIVAL.—The "Roman chief festival or festival of the city (ludi maximi, Romani) . . . was an extraordinary thanksgiving festival celebrated in honour of the Capitoline Jupiter and the gods dwelling along with him, ordinarily in pursuance of a vow made by the general before battle, and therefore usually observed on the return home of the burgess-force in autumn. A festal procession proceeded toward the Circus staked off between the Palatine and Aventine. . . . In each species of contest there was but one competition, and

that between not more that two competitors."—T. Mommsen, *Hist. of Rome, bk.* 1, *ch.* 15.

ROMAN COINAGE AND MONEY. See MONEY AND BANKING: ROME.

ROMAN COMITIA. See COMITIA CENTURIATA, AND COMITIA CURIATA.

ROMAN CONSULS. See CONSUL.

ROMAN CONTIONES. See CONTIONES.

ROMAN DECEMVIRS. See DECEMVIRS.

ROMAN EDUCATION. See EDUCATION, ROMAN.

ROMAN EMPIRE: B. C. 31.—Its beginning, and after. See ROME: B. C. 31, and after.

A. D. 476.—Interruption of the line of Emperors in the West. See ROME: A. D. 455–476.

A. D. 800.—Charlemagne's restoration of the Western Empire. See GERMANY: A. D. 800.

A. D. 843-951.—Dissolution of the Carolingian fabric. See ITALY: A. D. 843–951.

ROMAN EMPIRE, THE HOLY: A. D. 963.—Founded by Otto the Great.—Later Origin of the Name.—"The Holy Roman Empire, taking the name in the sense which it commonly bore in later centuries, as denoting the sovereignty of Germany and Italy vested in a Germanic prince, is the creation of Otto the Great. Substantially, it is true, as well as technically, it was a prolongation of the Empire of Charles [Charlemagne]; and it rested (as will be shewn in the sequel) upon ideas essentially the same as those which brought about the coronation of A. D. 800. . . . This restored Empire, which professed itself a continuation of the Carolingian, was in many respects different. It was less wide, including, if we reckon strictly, only Germany proper and two-thirds of Italy; or counting in subject but separate kingdoms, Burgundy, Bohemia, Moravia, Poland, Denmark, perhaps Hungary. Its character was less ecclesiastical. Otto exalted indeed the spiritual potentates of his realm, and was earnest in spreading Christianity among the heathen: he was master of the Pope and Defender of the Holy Roman Church. But religion held a less important place in his mind and his administration. . . . It was also less Roman. . . . Under him the Germans became not only a united nation, but were at once raised on a pinnacle among European peoples as the imperial race, the possessors of Rome and Rome's authority. While the political connection with Italy stirred their spirit, it brought with it a knowledge and culture hitherto unknown." It was not until the reign of Frederick Barbarossa that the epithet "Holy" was prefixed to the title of the revived Roman Empire. "Of its earlier origin, under Conrad II (the Salic), which some have supposed, there is no documentary trace, though there is also no proof to the contrary. So far as is known it occurs first in the famous Privilege of Austria, granted by Frederick in the fourth year of his reign, the second of his empire. . . . Used occasionally by Henry VI and Frederick II, it is more frequent under their successors, William, Richard, Rudolf, till after Charles IV's time it becomes habitual, for the last few centuries indispensable. Regarding the origin of so singular a title many theories have been advanced. . . . We need not, however, be in any great doubt as to its true meaning and purport. . . . Ever since Hildebrand had claimed for the priesthood exclusive sanctity and supreme jurisdiction, the papal party had not ceased to speak of the civil power as being, compared with that of their own chief, merely secular, earthly, profane. It may be conjectured that, to meet this reproach, no less injurious than insulting, Frederick or his advisers began to use in public documents the expression 'Holy Empire'; thereby wishing to assert the divine institution and religious duties of the office he held. . . . It is almost superfluous to observe that the beginning of the title 'Holy' has nothing to do with the beginning of the Empire itself. Essentially and substantially, the Holy Roman Empire was, as has been shewn already, the creation of Charles the Great. Looking at it more technically, as the monarchy, not of the whole West, like that of Charles, but of Germany and Italy, with a claim, which was never more than a claim, to universal sovereignty, its beginning is fixed by most of the German writers, whose practice has been followed in the text, at the coronation of Otto the Great. But the title was at least one, and probably two centuries later."—J. Bryce, *The Holy Roman Empire, ch.* 6, 9 *and* 12, *with foot-note.*—Otto, or Otho, the Great, the second of the Saxon line of Germanic kings, crossed the Alps and made himself master of the distracted kingdom of Italy in 951, on the invitation of John XII, who desired his assistance against the reigning king of Italy, Berengar II, and who offered him the imperial coronation (there had been no acknowledged emperor for forty years) as his reward. He easily reduced Berengar to vassalage, and, after receiving the imperial crown from Pope John, he did not scruple to depose that licentious and turbulent pontiff, by the voice of a synod which he convoked in St. Peter's, and to seat another in his place. Three revolts in the city of Rome, which were stirred up by the deposed pope, the emperor suppressed with a heavy hand, and he took away from the city all its forms of republican liberty, entrusting the government to the pope as his viceroy.—The same, *ch.* 9.

ALSO IN: H. Hallam, *The Middle Ages, ch.* 3, *pt.* 1.—See, also, ITALY: A. D. 843–951; GERMANY: A. D. 936–973; and ROMANS: KING OF THE.

12th Century.—Rise of the College of Electors. See GERMANY: A. D. 1125–1152.

13th Century.—Its degradation after the fall of the Hohenstaufen.—The Great Interregnum.—Election of Rudolf of Hapsburg. See GERMANY: A. D. 1250–1272.

15th Century.—Its character. See GERMANY: A. D. 1347–1493.

A. D. 1806.—Its end. See GERMANY: A. D. 1805–1806.

ROMAN EQUESTRIAN ORDER. See EQUESTRIAN ORDER.

ROMAN FAMILY AND PERSONAL NAMES. See GENS.

ROMAN FETIALES. See FETIALES.

ROMAN INDICTION. See INDICTIONS.

ROMAN LAW, and its lasting influence.—"Roman Law as taught in the writings of the Roman jurists is a science, a science of great perfection, a science so perfect as to almost approach the harmonious finish of art. But Roman Law is not only a marvellous system of the legal customs and concepts of the Romans; its value

is not restricted to students of Roman Law; it has an absolute value for students of any law whatever. In other words the Romans outstripped all other nations, both ancient and modern, in the scientific construction of legal problems. They alone offer that curious example of one nation's totally eclipsing the scientific achievements of all other nations. By law, however, we here understand not all branches of law, as constitutional, criminal, pontifical, and private law, together with jurisprudence. By Roman Law we mean exclusively Roman Private Law. The writings of Roman jurists on constitutional and criminal law have been superseded and surpassed by the writings of more modern jurists. Their writings on questions of Private Law, on the other hand, occupy a unique place; they are, to the present day, considered as the inexhaustible fountain-head, and the inimitable pattern of the science of Private Law. . . . A Roman lawyer, and even a modern French or German lawyer — French and German Private Law being essentially Roman Law — were, and are, never obliged to ransack whole libraries of precedents to find the law covering a given case. They approach a case in the manner of a physician: carefully informing themselves of the facts underlying the case, and then eliciting the legal spark by means of close meditation on the given data according to the general principles of their science. The Corpus juris civilis is one stout volume. This one volume has sufficed to cover billions of cases during more than thirteen centuries. The principles laid down in this volume will afford ready help in almost every case of Private Law, because they emanate from Private Law alone, and have no tincture of non-legal elements."—E. Reich, *Graeco-Roman Institutions, pp.* 3–13.—"'The Responsa prudentum,' or answers of the learned in the law, consisted of explanations of authoritative written documents. It was assumed that the written law was binding, but the responses practically modified and even overruled it. A great variety of rules was thus supposed to be educed from the Twelve Tables [see Rome: B. C. 451–449], which were not in fact to be found there. They could be announced by any jurisconsult whose opinions might, if he were distinguished, have a binding force nearly equal to enactments of the legislature. The responses were not published by their author, but were recorded and edited by his pupils, and to this fact the world is indebted for the educational treatises, called Institutes or Commentaries, which are among the most remarkable features of the Roman system. The distinction between the 'responses' and the 'case law' of England should be noticed. The one consists of expositions by the bar, and the other by the bench. It might have been expected that such a system would have popularized the law. This was not the fact. Weight was only attached to the responses of conspicuous men who were masters of the principles as well as details of jurisprudence. The great development of legal principles at Rome was due to this method of producing law. Under the English system no judge can enunciate a principle until an actual controversy arises to which the rule can be applied; under the Roman theory, there was no limit to the question to which a response might be given, except the skill and ingenuity of the questioner. Every possible phase of a legal principle could thus be examined, and the result would show the symmetrical product of a single master mind. This method of developing law nearly ceased at the fall of the republic. The Responses were systematized and reduced into compendia. The right to make responses was limited by Augustus to a few jurisconsults. The edict of the Prætor became a source of law, and a great school of jurists, containing such men as Ulpian, Paulus, Gaius, and Papinian, arose, who were authors of treatises rather than of responses."—T. W. Dwight, *Introd. to Maine's "Ancient Law."*—"Apart from the more general political conditions on which jurisprudence also, and indeed jurisprudence especially depends, the causes of the excellence of the Roman civil law lie mainly in two features: first, that the plaintiff and defendant were specially obliged to explain and embody in due and binding form the grounds of the demand and of the objection to comply with it; and secondly, that the Romans appointed a permanent machinery for the edictal development of their law, and associated it immediately with practice. By the former the Romans precluded the pettifogging practices of advocates, by the latter they obviated incapable law-making, so far as such things can be prevented at all; and by means of both in conjunction they satisfied, as far as is possible, the two conflicting requirements, that law shall constantly be fixed, and that it shall constantly be in accordance with the spirit of the age. . . . This state [Rome], which made the highest demands on its burgesses and carried the idea of subordinating the individual to the interest of the whole further than any state before or since has done, only did and only could do so by itself removing the barriers to intercourse and unshackling liberty quite as much as it subjected it to restriction. In permission or in prohibition the law was always absolute. . . . A contract did not ordinarily furnish a ground of action, but where the right of the creditor was acknowledged, it was so all-powerful that there was no deliverance for the poor debtor, and no humane or equitable consideration was shown towards him. It seemed as if the law found a pleasure in presenting on all sides its sharpest spikes, in drawing the most extreme consequences, in forcibly obtruding on the bluntest understanding the tyrannic nature of the idea of right. The poetical form and the genial symbolism, which so pleasingly prevail in the Germanic legal ordinances, were foreign to the Roman; in his law all was clear and precise; no symbol was employed, no institution was superfluous. It was not cruel; everything necessary was performed without tedious ceremony, even the punishment of death; that a free man could not be tortured was a primitive maxim of Roman law, to obtain which other peoples have had to struggle for thousands of years. Yet this law was frightful in its inexorable severity, which we cannot suppose to have been very greatly mitigated by humanity in practice, for it was really the law of the people; more terrible than Venetian piombi and chambers of torture was that series of living entombments which the poor man saw yawning before him in the debtors' towers of the rich. But the greatness of Rome was involved in, and was based upon, the fact that the Roman people ordained for itself and endured a system of law, in which the eternal principles of freedom and

of subordination, of property and of legal redress, reigned and still at the present day reign unadulterated and unmodified."—T. Mommsen, *History of Rome, bk.* 1, *ch.* 8 *and* 11 (*v.* 1).—"Though hard to realise, and especially so for Englishmen, it is true that modern Europe owes to the Romans its ancient inherited sense of the sacredness of a free man's person and property, and its knowledge of the simplest and most rational methods by which person and property may be secured with least inconvenience to the whole community. The nations to come after Rome were saved the trouble of finding out all this for themselves; and it may be doubted whether any of them had the requisite genius. We in England, for example, owe the peculiar cumbrousness of our legal system to the absence of those direct Roman influences, which, on the continent, have simplified and illuminated the native legal material."—W. W. Fowler, *The City-State of the Greeks and Romans, p.* 209.—"In all the lands which had obeyed Rome, and were included in the nominal supremacy of the revived Western Empire, it [Roman Law] acquired a prevalence and power not derived from the sanction of any distinct human authority. No such authority was for the time being strong enough to compete in men's esteem and reverence with the shadow of majesty that still clung to the relics of Roman dominion. Thus the Roman law was not merely taken as (what for many purposes and in many states it really was) a common groundwork of institutions, ideas, and method, standing towards the actual rules of a given community somewhat in the same relation as in the Roman doctrine ius gentium to ius civile; but it was conceived as having, by its intrinsic reasonableness, a kind of supreme and eminent virtue, and as claiming the universal allegiance of civilised mankind. If I may use a German term for which I cannot find a good English equivalent, its principles were accepted not as ordained by Cæsar, but as in themselves binding on the Rechtsbewusstsein of Christendom. They were part of the dispensation of Roman authority to which the champions of the Empire in their secular controversy with the Papacy did not hesitate to attribute an origin no less divine than that of the Church itself. Even in England (though not in English practice, for anything I know) this feeling left its mark. In the middle of the thirteenth century, just when our legal and judicial system was settling into its typical form, Bracton copied whole pages of the Bolognese glossator Azo. On the Continent, where there was no centralised and countervailing local authority, the Roman law dwarfed everything else. Yet the law of the Corpus Juris and the glossators was not the existing positive law of this or that place: the Roman law was said to be the common law of the Empire, but its effect was always taken as modified by the custom of the country or city. 'Stadtrecht bricht Landrecht, Landrecht bricht gemein Recht.' Thus the main object of study was not a system of actually enforced rules, but a type assumed by actual systems as their exemplar without corresponding in detail to any of them. Under such conditions it was inevitable that positive authority should be depreciated, and the method of reasoning, even for practical purposes, from an ideal fitness of things, should be exalted, so that the distinction between laws actually administered and rules elaborated by the learned as in accordance with their assumed principles was almost lost sight of."—Sir F. Pollock, *Oxford Lectures, pp.* 30–32.—"In some of the nations of modern Continental Europe (as, for example, in France), the actual system of law is mainly of Roman descent; and in others of the same nations (as, for example in the States of Germany), the actual system of law, though not descended from the Roman, has been closely assimilated to the Roman by large importations from it. Accordingly, in most of the nations of modern Continental Europe, much of the substance of the actual system, and much of the technical language in which it is clothed, is derived from the Roman Law, and without some knowledge of the Roman Law, the technical language is unintelligible; whilst the order or arrangement commonly given to the system, imitates the exemplar of a scientific arrangement which is presented by the Institutes of Justinian. Even in our own country, a large portion of the Ecclesiastical and Equity, and some (though a smaller) portion of the Common, Law, is derived immediately from the Roman Law, or from the Roman through the Canon. Nor has the influence of the Roman Law been limited to the positive law of the modern European nations. For the technical language of this all-reaching system has deeply tinctured the language of the international law or morality which those nations affect to observe. . . . Much has been talked of the philosophy of the Roman Institutional writers. Of familiarity with Grecian philosophy there are few traces in their writings, and the little that they have borrowed from that source is the veriest foolishness: for example, their account of Jus naturale, in which they confound law with animal instincts; law, with all those wants and necessities of mankind which are causes of its institution. Nor is the Roman law to be resorted to as a magazine of legislative wisdom. The great Roman Lawyers are, in truth, expositors of a positive or technical system. Not Lord Coke himself is more purely technical. Their real merits lie in their thorough mastery of that system; in their command of its principles; in the readiness with which they recall, and the facility and certainty with which they apply them. In support of my own opinion of these great writers I shall quote the authority of two of the most eminent Jurists of modern times. 'The permanent value of the Corpus Juris Civilis,' says Falck, 'does not lie in the Decrees of the Emperors, but in the remains of juristical literature which have been preserved in the Pandects. Nor is it so much the matter of these juristical writings, as the scientific method employed by the authors in explicating the notions and maxims with which they have to deal, that has rendered them models to all succeeding ages, and pre-eminently fitted them to produce and to develope those qualities of the mind which are requisite to form a Jurist.' And Savigny says, 'It has been shown above, that, in our science, all results depend on the possession of leading principles; and it is exactly this possession upon which the greatness of the Roman jurists rests. The notions and maxims of their science do not appear to them to be the creatures of their own will; they are actual beings, with whose existence and genealogy they have become familiar from long and intimate intercourse. Hence their

whole method of proceeding has a certainty which is found nowhere else except in mathematics, and it may be said without exaggeration that they calculate with their ideas. If they have a case to decide, they begin by acquiring the most vivid and distinct perception of it, and we see before our eyes the rise and progress of the whole affair, and all the changes it undergoes. It is as if this particular case were the germ whence the whole science was to be developed. Hence, with them, theory and practice are not in fact distinct; their theory is so thoroughly worked out as to be fit for immediate application, and their practice is uniformly ennobled by scientific treatment. In every principle they see a case to which it may be applied; in every case, the rule by which it is determined; and in the facility with which they pass from the general to the particular and the particular to the general, their mastery is indisputable.' In consequence of this mastery of principles, of their perfect consistency ('elegantia') and of the clearness of the method in which they are arranged, there is no positive system of law which it is so easy to seize as a whole. The smallness of its volume tends to the same end."—J. Austin, *Lectures on Jurisprudence, v.* 3, *pp.* 358–361.—"A glance at the history of those countries in Europe that did not adopt Roman Law will prove and illustrate the political origin of the 'reception' of this law in Germany and France still more forcibly. The Kingdom of Hungary never adopted the theory or practice of Roman Law. This seems all the more strange since Hungary used Latin as the official language of her legislature, laws, and law-courts down to the first quarter of this century. A country so intensely imbued with the idiom of Rome would seem to be quite likely to adopt also the law of Rome. This, however, the Hungarians never did. Their law is essentially similar to the common law of England, in that it is derived mainly from precedents and usage. The unwillingness of the Hungarians to adopt Roman Law was based on a political consideration. Roman Law, they noticed, requires a professional and privileged class of jurists who administer law to the exclusion of all other classes. In German territories the privileged class of civilians were in the service of the rulers. But it so happened that ever since 1526 the ruler, or at least the nominal head of Hungary, was a foreigner: the Archduke of Austria, or Emperor of Germany. Hence to introduce Roman Law in Hungary would have been tantamount to surrendering the law of the country to the administration of foreigners, or of professors, who had a vital interest to work in the interest of their foreign employer, the Archduke of Austria. Consequently the Hungarians prudently abstained from the establishment of numerous Universities, and persistently refused to adopt Roman Law, the scientific excellence of which they otherwise fully acknowledged. For, the Hungarians always were, and to the present moment still are, the only nation on the continent who maintained an amount of political liberty and self-government quite unknown to the rest of continental Europe, particularly in the last two centuries. The same reason applies to England. England never adopted Roman Law, because it was against the interests of English liberty to confide the making and interpretation of law to the hands of a privileged class of jurists. As said before, Roman Law cannot be adopted unless you adopt a privileged class of professional jurists into the bargain. The hatred of the English was not so much a hatred of civil law, but of the civilians. These jurists develop law on the strength of theoretical principles, and actual cases are not decided according to former judgments given in similar cases, but by principles obtained through theoretico-practical speculation. Hence there is no division of questions of law and fact in civil cases; nor is there, in a system of Roman Private Law, any room for juries, and thus law is taken completely out of the hands of the people. This, however, the English would not endure, and thus they naturally fell to confiding their law to their judges. English common law is judge-made law."—E. Reich, *Graeco-Roman Institutions, pp.* 62–63.—See, also, Corpus Juris Civilis; and Education, Mediæval: Italy.

ROMAN LEGION. See Legion, Roman.

ROMAN LIBRARIES. See Libraries, Ancient: Rome.

ROMAN MEDICAL SCIENCE. See Medical Science: 1st Century, and 2d Century.

ROMAN PEACE.—"The benefits conferred upon the world by the universal dominion of Rome were of quite inestimable value. First of these benefits, . . . was the prolonged peace that was enforced throughout large portions of the world where chronic warfare had hitherto prevailed. The 'pax romana' has perhaps been sometimes depicted in exaggerated colours; but as compared with all that had preceded, and with all that followed, down to the beginning of the nineteenth century, it deserved the encomiums it has received."—J. Fiske, *American Political Ideas viewed from the Standpoint of Universal History, lect.* 2.

ROMAN PONTIFICES. See Augurs.

ROMAN PRÆTORS. See Consul.

ROMAN PROCONSUL AND PROPRÆTOR. See Proconsul.

ROMAN QUESTION, The. See Italy: A. D. 1862–1866.

ROMAN ROADS IN BRITAIN.—"Four principal lines of road have been popularly known as 'the four Roman ways.' In the time of Edward the Confessor, and probably much earlier, there were four roads in England protected by the king's peace. These were called Watlinge-strete, Fosse, Hickenilde-strete, and Ermine-strete. Watling-street runs from London to Wroxeter. The Fosse from the sea coast near Seaton in Devonshire to Lincoln. The Ikenild-street from Iclingham near Bury St. Edmund's in Suffolk, to Wantage in Berkshire, and on to Cirencester and Gloucester. The Ermingstreet ran through the Fenny district of the east of England. These streets seem to have represented a combination of those portions of the Roman roads which in later times were adopted and kept in repair for the sake of traffic. . . . The name of 'Watling-street' became attached to other roads, as the Roman road beyond the Northumbrian wall, which crossed the Tyne at Corbridge and ran to the Frith of Forth at Cramond, bears that name; and the Roman road beyond Uriconium (Wroxeter) to Bravinium (Leintwarden) Salop, is also called Watlingstreet. The street in Canterbury through which the road from London to Dover passes is known

as Watling-street, and a street in London also bears that name. . . . Two lines of road also bear the name of the Icknield-street, or Hikenilde-street; but there is some reason to believe that the Icknield-street was only a British trackway and never became a true Roman road."—H. M. Scarth, *Roman Britain, ch.* 13.—"In the fifth year after the Conquest, inquisition was made throughout the kingdom into the ancient laws and customs of England. . . . From this source we learn, that there were at that time in England four great roads protected by the King's Peace, of which two ran lengthways through the island, and two crossed it, and that the names of the four were respectively, Watlinge-strete, Fosse, Hikenilde-strete and Ermingstrete. These are the roads which are popularly but incorrectly known as 'the four Roman ways.' . . . The King's Peace was a high privilege. Any offence committed on these highways was tried, not in the local court, where local influence might interfere with the administration of justice, but before the king's own officers."—E. Guest, *Origines Celticae, v.* 2: *The Four Roman Ways.*—See, also, WATLING STREET.

ROMAN ROADS IN ITALY. See ÆMILIAN WAY; APPIAN WAY; AURELIAN ROAD; CASSIAN ROAD; POSTUMIAN ROAD; and ROME: B. C. 295–191.

ROMAN SENATE. See SENATE, ROMAN.

ROMAN VESTALS. See VESTAL VIRGINS.

ROMAN WALLS IN BRITAIN.—There were two great fortified walls constructed by the Romans in Britain, but the name is most often applied to the first one, which was built under the orders of the Emperor Hadrian, from the Solway to the Tyne, 70 miles long and from 18 to 19 feet high, of solid masonry, with towers at intervals and with ditches throughout. In the reign of Antoninus Pius a second fortified line, farther to the north, extending from the Forth to the Clyde, was constructed. This latter was a rampart of earth connecting numerous forts. Hadrian's wall was strengthened at a later time by Severus and is sometimes called by his name. Popularly it is called "Graham's Dike." Both walls were for the protection of Roman Britain from the wild tribes of Caledonia.—E. Guest, *Origines Celticae, v.* 2, *pp.* 88–94.

ALSO IN: C. Merivale, *Hist. of the Romans, ch.* 66–67.

ROMANCE LANGUAGE, Earliest Monument of. See STRASBURG: A. D. 842.

ROMANIA, The Empire of.—The new feudal empire, constituted by the Crusaders and the Venetians, after their conquest of Constantinople, and having the great and venerable but half ruined capital of the Byzantines for its seat, received the name of the Empire of Romania. The reign of its first emperor, the excellent Baldwin of Flanders, was brought to a tragical end in little more than a year from his coronation. Summoned to quell a revolt at Adrianople, he was attacked by the king of Bulgaria, defeated, taken prisoner and murdered within a year by his savage captor. He was succeeded on the throne by his brother Henry, a capable, energetic and valiant prince; but all the ability and all the vigor of Henry could not give cohesion and strength to an empire which was false in its constitution and predestined to decay. On Henry's death, without children (A. D. 1216), his sister Yoland's husband, Peter of Courtenay, a French baron, was elected emperor; but that unfortunate prince, on attempting to reach Constantinople by a forced march through the hostile Greek territory of Epirus, was taken captive and perished in an Epirot prison. His eldest son, Philip of Namur, wisely refused the imperial dignity; a younger son, Robert, accepted it, and reigned feebly until 1228, when he died. Then the venerable John de Brienne, ex-king of Jerusalem, was elected emperor-regent for life, the crown to pass on his death to Baldwin of Courtenay, a young brother of Robert. "John de Brienne died in 1237, after living to witness his empire confined to a narrow circuit round the walls of Constantinople. Baldwin II. prolonged the existence of the empire by begging assistance from the Pope and the king of France; and he collected the money necessary for maintaining his household and enjoying his precarious position, by selling the holy relics preserved by the Eastern Church [such, for example, as the crown of thorns, the bonds, the sponge and the cup of the crucifixion, the rod of Moses, etc.]. He was fortunate in finding a liberal purchaser in St. Louis. . . . At length, in the year 1261, a division of the Greek army [of the empire of Nicæa] surprised Constantinople, expelled Baldwin, and put an end to the Latin power [see GREEK EMPIRE OF NICÆA: A. D. 1204–1261], without the change appearing to be a revolution of much importance beyond the walls of the city."—G. Finlay, *Hist. of Greece from its Conquest by the Crusaders, ch.* 4.—In the last days of the sham empire, Baldwin II. maintained his court "by tearing the copper from the domes of the public buildings erected by the Byzantine emperors, which he coined into money, and by borrowing gold from Venetian bankers, in whose hands he placed his eldest son Philip as a pledge."—G. Finlay, *Hist. of the Byzantine and Greek Empires, from* 716 *to* 1453, *bk.* 4, *ch.* 1, *sect.* 3 (*v.* 2).

ALSO IN: E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, ch.* 61.—See, also, for an account of the creation of the Empire of Romania, BYZANTINE EMPIRE: A. D. 1204–1205.

ROMANOFFS, Origin of the dynasty of the. See RUSSIA: A. D. 1533–1682.

ROMANS, King of the.—Henry II., —St. Henry by canonization—the last of the German emperors of the House of Saxony (A. D. 1002–1024), abstained from styling himself "Emperor," for some years, until he had gone to Rome and received the imperial crown from the hands of the Pope. Meantime he invented and assumed the title of King of the Romans. His example was followed by his successors. The King of the Romans in later history was Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire in embryo.—S. A. Dunham, *Hist. of the Germanic Empire, bk.* 1, *ch.* 2 (*v.* 1).—"It was not till the reign of Maximilian that the actual coronation at Rome was dispensed with, and the title of Emperor taken immediately after the election."—H. Hallam, *The Middle Ages, ch.* 3, *pt.* 1.

ROMANUS, Pope, A. D. 897–898.....Romanus I. (colleague of Constantine VII.), Emperor in the East (Byzantine, or Greek), 919–944.....Romanus II., Emperor in the East (Byzantine, or Greek), 959–963.....Romanus III., Emperor in the East (Byzantine, or Greek), 1028–1034.....Romanus IV., Emperor in the East (Byzantine, or Greek), A. D. 1067–1071.

A Logical Outline of Roman History

In which the Dominant Conditions and Influences are Distinguished by Colors.

Physical or material.
Social and political.
Intellectual, moral and religious.

Three Latin and Sabine tribes of an early day established their settlements on neighboring hills, by the banks of the Tiber, in the midland of Italy, which is the midland of the Mediterranean or midland sea. They were throned, as it were, at the center of the only wide dominion in which a virile and energetic civilization could rise in ancient times. *Geographical position.*

The union of these three tribes formed the patrician nucleus of Rome. Around them gathered another population of kindred blood, which acquired a certain footing of association with them, but not immediately on equal terms. The precedence and superiority of the primal families, in rank and in rights, was jealously maintained, and the later-coming plebs were received into a pseudo-citizenship which carried more burdens than privileges with it. *Patricians and Plebeians.*

By what impulse of character, or through what favor of circumstance, at the beginning, this infant city-state grew masterful in war, over all its neighbors, none can tell. But as it did so, the sturdy plebeian populace which fought its battles resented more and more the greedy monopoly of offices and of conquered lands to which the patricians clung, and a struggle between classes occurred which shaped the domestic politics of Rome for more than two centuries.

Before that contest came to the surface of history, the oligarchy of the city had cast out the kings which were its early chiefs, and had put two yearly-chosen consuls in their place, thus founding the great Roman Republic, with a purely aristocratic constitution. Then the battle of the plebs for equality of rights and powers was promptly opened, and the long, significant process of the democratizing of the state began. By their first victory the commons secured, for their own leadership and defense, a remarkable magistracy, protected by sanctities and armed with powers which never have been used in government elsewhere, before or since. With that great tribunician authority, invincible when capably and boldly wielded, they won their way, step by step, to equality in the high offices and sacred colleges of the state; to legislative equality in their assembly; to legality of intermarriage with the patrician class; and to participation in the public lands.

B. C. 509. Founding of the Republic.

B. C. 492. Tribunes of the Plebs.

But while plebs and patricians thus strove with each other at home, they were united against their neighbors in many wars, which seldom turned to their disadvantage. Æquians, Volscians, Etruscans, Latin allies, Samnites, Gauls, Greeks of south Italy, yielded in turn to their arms, until the whole Italian peninsula had been brought under Roman rule. Then followed intrusion in Sicily, collision with Carthage in that island, and the half century of Punic wars, which tried the Republic to the extremity of its powers, but which left it with no rival in the Mediterranean world. From that time the conquest was rapidly pursued in widening fields. Sicily, Spain, Greece, Macedonia, Asia Minor, Southern

B. C. 489–275. Conquest of Italy.

B. C. 264–202. Punic Wars.

B. C. 214–146. Expanding dominion.

tition; the small farms of rural Rome had been swallowed up in great slave-worked estates; the public lands had been drawn, by one trick of law or another, into private hands. The greater mass of the common people had degenerated to a worthless mob. The democratic power which their ancestors won still belonged to them, but they had lost the sense and the spirit to exercise it, except fitfully and threateningly, for purposes that were generally base. A new nobility had risen out of the plebeian ranks; the senate, reinforced by it, and helped by the exigencies of the long period of war, had recovered control of government, keeping ascendancy over the mob by political arts and bribes.

Social and political degeneration.

Thus came the fatal time when demagogues played with the passions of that fickle mob which bore the awful sovereignty of Rome in its keeping; and when patriots were forced to be as demagogues, if they sought to lift Roman citizenship from its muddy degradation. In the undertakings of the Gracchi, perhaps something of both demagogue and patriot was combined; but what they did only shook the decaying political fabric and unsettled it more. The extension of Roman citizenship to the Italian allies, which Caius Gracchus contended for, and which might have grounded the Republic on broad bases of nationality, was yielded in the next generation, but too late, and after a ruinous war. From the embers of that fiery Social War broke the flames of civil strife in which the old constitution was finally consumed. Marius, Sulla, Pompeius, Cæsar, were distinguished among its destroyers; Cicero and Cato earned their immortality in its defense.

B. C. 133–121.
The Gracchi.

B. C. 90–88.
The Social War.

B. C. 88–45.
Civil Wars.

By the genius of Cæsar a new sovereignty — an imperial autocracy — was founded, on the ruins of the shattered Republic. By the shrewdness of his wise nephew, Octavius, its enduring organization was shaped. The mighty fabric of the Roman Empire which then arose, to dominate the world for centuries, and to dominate the history of the world perhaps forever, owed its greatness altogether to the effective organization of government which it embodied. It inherited all the corruptions and diseases in society which had sickened and destroyed the Republic; but it extinguished factions at the seat of power, established authority there, and perfected a radiating mechanism of provincial administration such as had not been known in human experience before. Hence, emperors might be madmen or fiends or fools, as many among them were, and Rome might be a sink of all vices and miseries, as it commonly was, and the whole Empire might be grievously oppressed, as it seldom failed to be; but the working of the administrative system went on, with little disturbance or change,—so mighty and irresistible in its machinery that it seemed to mankind like a part of the natural world, and they lost the ability to think of any different political state.

B. C. 45–A. D. 476.
The Empire.

Christianity, springing up in Judæa within the first century of the Empire, spread through and around it like an interlacing vine,—sweet and wholesome in its early fruits, strong as a bond, powerful as a regenerating influence. But when the ecclesiasticism of a politically fashioned Church had been grafted on the Christian vine, it bore then the evil seeds of new corruption, new discord, new maladies for the Roman world.

Christianity.

So there came, at last, a time when the long-enduring frame of Roman government could no longer bear the increasing dead-weight of social paralysis within and the increasing pressure of barbaric enemies from without. Of real vitality in the Empire there had been little for half-a-century before its fall in the West.

A. D. 476.
Fall of the Empire in the West.

It survived in the East, because its Greek capital was more impregnable, and more commandingly placed for the continued centralization of a waning power; and because habit and routine have more potency in the Eastern than in the Western world.

A. D. 476–1453.
Survival of the Eastern Empire.

Even Western Europe obeyed again, after more than four centuries, the obstinate habit of homage to Rome, when it restored the Empire of the Cæsars, though less in fact than in name.

A. D. 800.
Revival of the Western Empire.

ROME.

The beginning of the City-State and the origin of its name.—The three tribes of original Romans who formed the Patrician order.—The Plebs and their inferior citizenship.— "About fourteen miles up from the mouth of the river Tiber, hills of moderate elevation rise on both banks of the stream, higher on the right, lower on the left bank. With the latter group there has been closely associated for at least two thousand five hundred years the name of the Romans. We are unable, of course, to tell how or when that name arose; this much only is certain, that in the oldest form of it known to us the inhabitants of the canton are called not Romans, but (by a shifting of sound that frequently occurs in the earlier period of a language, but fell very early in abeyance in Latin) Ramnians (Ramnes), a fact which constitutes an expressive testimony to the immemorial antiquity of the name. Its derivation cannot be given with certainty; possibly Ramnes may mean 'foresters,' or 'bushmen.' But they were not the only dwellers on the hills by the bank of the Tiber. In the earliest division of the burgesses of Rome a trace has been preserved of the fact that that body arose out of the amalgamation of three cantons once probably independent, the Ramnians, Tities, and Luceres, into a single commonwealth—in other words, out of such a 'synoikismos' as that from which Athens arose in Attica. The great antiquity of this threefold division of the community is perhaps best evinced by the fact that the Romans, in matters especially of constitutional law, regularly used the forms tribuere ('to divide into three') and tribus ('a third') in the general sense of 'to divide' and 'a part,' and the latter expression (tribus) like our 'quarter,' early lost its original signification of number. . . . That the Ramnians were a Latin stock cannot be doubted, for they gave their name to the new Roman commonwealth, and therefore must have substantially determined the nationality of the united community. Respecting the origin of the Luceres nothing can be affirmed, except that there is no difficulty in the way of our assigning them, like the Ramnians, to the Latin stock. The second of these communities, on the other hand, is with one consent derived from Sabina. . . . And, as in the older and more credible traditions, without exception, the Tities take precedence of the Ramnians, it is probable that the intruding Tities compelled the older Ramnians to accept the 'synoikismos.'. . . Long, in all probability, before an urban settlement arose on the Tiber, these Ramnians, Tities, and Luceres, at first separate, afterwards united, had their stronghold on the Roman hills, and tilled their fields from the surrounding villages. The 'wolf festival' (Lupercalia), which the gens of the Quinctii celebrated on the Palatine hill, was probably a tradition from these primitive ages—a festival of husbandmen and shepherds, which more than any other preserved the homely pastimes of patriarchal simplicity, and, singularly enough, maintained itself longer than all the other heathen festivals in Christian Rome. From these settlements the later Rome arose."—T. Mommsen, *Hist. of Rome, bk.* 1, *ch.* 4.—"Rome did not seem to be a single city; it appeared like a confederation of several cities, each one of which was attached by its origin to another confederation. It was the centre where the Latins, Etruscans, Sabellians, and Greeks met. Its first king was a Latin; the second, a Sabine; the fifth was, we are told, the son of a Greek; the sixth was an Etruscan. Its language was composed of the most diverse elements. The Latin predominated, but Sabellian roots were numerous, and more Greek radicals were found in it than in any other of the dialects of Central Italy. As to its name, no one knew to what language that belonged. According to some, Rome was a Trojan word; according to others, a Greek word. There are reasons for believing it to be Latin, but some of the ancients thought it to be Etruscan. The names of Roman families also attest a great diversity of origin. . . . The effect of this mixing of the most diverse nations was, that from the beginning Rome was related to all the peoples that it knew. It could call itself Latin with the Latins, Sabine with the Sabines, Etruscan with the Etruscans, and Greek with the Greeks. Its national worship was also an assemblage of several quite different worships, each one of which attached it to one of these nations."—Fustel de Coulanges, *The Ancient City, bk.* 5, *ch.* 2.—"The whole history of the world has been determined by the geological fact that at a point a little below the junction of the Tiber and the Anio the isolated hills stand nearer to one another than most of the other hills of Latium. On a site marked out above all other sites for dominion, the centre of Italy, the centre of Europe, as Europe then was, a site at the junction of three of the great nations of Italy, and which had the great river as its highway to lands beyond the bounds of Italy, stood two low hills, the hill which bore the name of Latin Saturn, and the hill at the meaning of whose name of Palatine scholars will perhaps guess for ever. These two hills, occupied by men of two of the nations of Italy, stood so near to one another that a strait choice indeed was laid on those who dwelled on them. They must either join together on terms closer than those which commonly united Italian leagues, or they must live a life of border warfare more ceaseless, more bitter, than the ordinary warfare of Italian enemies. Legend, with all likelihood, tells us that warfare was tried; history, with all certainty, tells us that the final choice was union. The two hills were fenced with a single wall; the men who dwelled on them changed from wholly separate communities into tribes of a single city. Changes of the same kind took place on not a few spots of Greece and Italy; not a few of the most famous cities of both lands grew on this wise out of the union of earlier detached settlements. But no other union of the kind, not even that which called Sparta into being out of five villages of an older day, could compare in its effects on all later time with the union of those two small hill-fortresses into a single city. For that city was Rome; the hill of Saturn became the site of Rome's capitol, the scene of her triumphs, the home of her patron gods. The hill on the other side of the swampy dale became the dwelling-place of Rome's Cæsars, and handed on its name of Palatium as the name for the homes of all the kings of the earth. Around those hills as a centre,

Latium, Italy, Mediterranean Europe, were gathered in, till the world was Roman, or rather till the world was Rome. . . . Three tribes, settlers on three hills, were the elements of which the original commonwealth was made. Whether there was anything like a nobility within the tribes themselves, whether certain houses had any precedence, any preferences in the disposal of offices, we have no means of judging. That certain houses are far more prominent in legend and history than others may suggest such a thought, but does not prove it. But one thing is certain; these three tribes, these older settlers, were the original Roman people, which for a while numbered no members but themselves. They were the patres, the fathers, a name which in its origin meant no more than such plain names as goodman, housefather, and the like. In the Roman polity the father only could be looked on as a citizen in the highest sense; his children, his grand-children, were in his power, from which, just like slaves, they could be released only by his own special act. Such was the origin of the name fathers, patres, patricians, a name round which such proud associations gathered, as the three tribes who had once been the whole Roman people shrank up into a special noble class in the midst of a new Roman people which grew up around them, but which they did not admit to the same rights as themselves. The incorporation of a third tribe marks the end of the first period of Roman history. These were the Luceres of the Cœlian, admitted perhaps at first with rights not quite on a level with those of the two earlier tribes, the Ramnes of the Palatine, the oldest Romans of all, and the Tities of the Capitoline or hill of Saturn. The oldest Roman people was now formed. No fourth tribe was ever admitted; the later tribes of Rome, it must be remembered, are a separate division which have nothing to do with these old patrician tribes. And it must have been a most rare favour for either individuals or whole houses to be received into any of the three original tribes. . . . Now, if the privileged body of citizens is small, and if circumstances tend to make the settlement of non-privileged residents large, here is one of the means by which a privileged order in the narrower sense, a nobility in the midst of a nation or people may arise. An order which takes in few or no new members tends to extinction; if it does not die out, it will at least sensibly lessen. But there is no limit to the growth of the non-privileged class outside. Thus the number of the old burghers will be daily getting smaller, the number of the new residents will be daily getting larger, till those who once formed the whole people put on step by step the character of an exclusive nobility in the midst of the extended nation which has grown up around them. By this time they have acquired all the attributes of nobility, smallness of numbers, antiquity, privilege. And their possession of the common land—a possession shared constantly by a smaller number—is likely to give them a fourth attribute which, vulgarly at least, goes to swell the conception of nobility, the attribute of wealth. . . . Thus around the original people of Rome, the populus, the patres, the three ancient tribes, the settlers on the three earliest hills of Rome, arose a second people, the plebs. The whole history of Rome is a history of incorporation. The first union between the Capitoline and Palatine hills was the first stage of the process which at last made Romans of all the nations round the Mediterranean sea. But the equal incorporation of which that union was the type had now ceased, not to begin again for ages. Whatever amount of belief we give to the legends of Roman wars and conquests under the kings, we can hardly doubt that the territory of several neighbouring towns was incorporated with the Roman state, and that their people, whether they removed to Rome or went on occupying their own lands elsewhere, became Romans, but not as yet full Romans. They were Romans in so far as they ceased to be members of any other state, in so far as they obeyed the laws of Rome, and served in the Roman armies. But they were not Romans in the sense of being admitted into the original Roman body; they had no votes in the original Roman assembly; they had no share in its public land; they were not admissible to the high offices of the state. They had an organization of their own; they had their own assemblies, their own magistrates, their own sacred rights, different in many things from those of the older Roman People. And we must remember that, throughout the Roman history, when any town or district was admitted to any stage, perfect or imperfect, of Roman citizenship, its people were admitted without regard to any distinctions which had existed among them in their elder homes. The patricians of a Latin town admitted to the Roman franchise became plebeians at Rome. Thus from the beginning, the Roman plebs contained families which, if the word 'noble' has any real meaning, were fully as noble as any house of the three elder tribes. Not a few too of the plebeians were rich; rich and poor, they were the more part land-owners; no mistake can be greater than that which looks on the Roman plebs as the low multitude of a town. As we first see them, the truest aspect of them is that of a second nation within the Roman state, an inferior, a subject, nation, shut out from all political power, subject in many things to practical oppression, but which, by its very organization as a subject nation, was the more stirred up to seek, and the better enabled to obtain, full equality with the elder nation to which it stood side by side as a subject neighbour."—E. A. Freeman, *The Practical Bearings of European History* (*Lectures to American Audiences*), *pp.* 278–279, *and* 285–292.—See, also, ITALY, ANCIENT; LATIUM; ALBA; and SABINES.

Early character and civilization of the Romans.—Opposing theories.—"That the central position of Rome, in the long and narrow peninsula of Italy, was highly favourable to her Italian dominion, and that the situation of Italy was favourable to her dominion over the countries surrounding the Mediterranean, has been often pointed out. But we have yet to ask what launched Rome in her career of conquest, and, still more, what rendered that career so different from those of ordinary conquerors? . . . About the only answer that we get to these questions is race. The Romans, we are told, were by nature a peculiarly warlike race. 'They were the wolves of Italy,' says Mr. Merivale, who may be taken to represent fairly the state of opinion on this subject. . . . But the further we inquire, the more reason there appears to be for believing that peculiarities of race are themselves origi-

nally formed by the influence of external circumstances on the primitive tribe; that, however marked and ingrained they may be, they are not congenital and perhaps not indelible. . . . Thus, by ascribing the achievements of the Romans to the special qualities of their race, we should not be solving the problem, but only stating it again in other terms. . . .What if the very opposite theory to that of the she-wolf and her foster-children should be true? What if the Romans should have owed their peculiar and unparalleled success to their having been at first not more warlike, but less warlike than their neighbours? It may seem a paradox, but we suspect that in their imperial ascendency is seen one of the earliest and not least important steps in that gradual triumph of intellect over force, even in war, which has been an essential part of the progress of civilization. The happy day may come when Science in the form of a benign old gentleman with a bald head and spectacles on nose, holding some beneficent compound in his hand, will confront a standing army, and the standing army will cease to exist. That will be the final victory of intellect. But in the meantime, our acknowledgements are due to the primitive inventors of military organization and military discipline. They shivered Goliath's spear. A mass of comparatively unwarlike burghers, unorganized and undisciplined, though they may be the hope of civilization from their mental and industrial qualities, have as little of collective as they have of individual strength in war; they only get in each other's way, and fall singly victims to the prowess of a gigantic barbarian. He who first thought of combining their force by organization, so as to make their numbers tell, and who taught them to obey officers, to form regularly for action, and to execute united movements at the word of command, was, perhaps, as great a benefactor of the species as he who grew the first corn, or built the first canoe. What is the special character of the Roman legends, so far as they relate to war? Their special character is that they are legends not of personal prowess but of discipline. Rome has no Achilles. The great national heroes, Camillus, Cincinnatus, Papirius Cursor, Fabius Maximus, Manlius, are not prodigies of personal strength and valour, but commanders and disciplinarians. The most striking incidents are incidents of discipline. The most striking incident of all is the execution by a commander of his own son for having gained a victory against orders. 'Disciplinam militarem,' Manlius is made to say, 'qua stetit ad hanc diem Romana res.' Discipline was the great secret of Roman ascendency in war. . . . But how came military discipline to be so specially cultivated by the Romans? . . . Dismissing the notion of occult qualities of race, we look for a rational explanation in the circumstances of the plain which was the cradle of the Roman Empire. It is evident that in the period designated as that of the kings, when Rome commenced her career of conquest, she was, for that time and country, a great and wealthy city. This is proved by the works of the kings, the Capitoline Temple, the excavation for the Circus Maximus, the Servian Wall, and above all the Cloaca Maxima. Historians have indeed undertaken to give us a very disparaging picture of the ancient Rome. . . . But the Cloaca Maxima is in itself conclusive evidence of a large population, of wealth, and of a not inconsiderable degree of civilization. Taking our stand upon this monument, and clearing our vision entirely of Romulus and his asylum, we seem dimly to perceive the existence of a deep prehistoric background, richer than is commonly supposed in the germs of civilization,—a remark which may in all likelihood be extended to the background of history in general. Nothing surely can be more grotesque than the idea of a set of wolves, like the Norse pirates before their conversion to Christianity, constructing in their den the Cloaca Maxima. That Rome was comparatively great and wealthy is certain. We can hardly doubt that she was a seat of industry and commerce, and that the theory which represents her industry and commerce as having been developed subsequently to her conquests is the reverse of the fact. Whence, but from industry and commerce, could the population and the wealth have come? Peasant farmers do not live in cities, and plunderers do not accumulate. Rome had around her what was then a rich and peopled plain; she stood at a meeting-place of nationalities; she was on a navigable river, yet out of the reach of pirates; the sea near her was full of commerce, Etruscan, Greek, and Carthaginian. . . . Her patricians were financiers and money-lenders. . . . Even more decisive is the proof afforded by the early political history of Rome. . . . The institutions which we find existing in historic times must have been evolved by some such struggle between the orders of patricians and plebeians as that which Livy presents to us. And these politics, with their parties and sections of parties, their shades of political character, the sustained interest which they imply in political objects, their various devices and compromises, are not the politics of a community of peasant farmers, living apart each on his own farm and thinking of his own crops: they are the politics of the quick-witted and gregarious population of an industrial and commercial city. . . . Of course when Rome had once been drawn into the career of conquest, the ascendency of the military spirit would be complete; war, and the organization of territories acquired in war, would then become the great occupation of her leading citizens; industry and commerce would fall into disesteem, and be deemed unworthy of the members of the imperial race. . . . Even when the Roman nobles had become a caste of conquerors and pro-consuls, they retained certain mercantile habits; unlike the French aristocracy, and aristocracies generally, they were careful keepers of their accounts, and they showed a mercantile talent for business, as well as a more than mercantile hardness, in their financial exploitation of the conquered world. Brutus and his contemporaries were usurers like the patricians of the early times. No one, we venture to think, who has been accustomed to study national character, will believe that the Roman character was formed by war alone: it was manifestly formed by war combined with business."—Goldwin Smith, *The Greatness of the Romans* (*Contemp. Rev.*, *May*, 1878).—A distinctly contrary theory of the primary character and early social state of the Romans is presented in the following: "The Italians were much more backward than the Greeks, for their land is turned to the west, to Spain, to Gaul, to Africa, which could teach them nothing, while Greece is turned to

the east, to the coasts along which the civilisations of the Nile and the Tigris spread through so many channels. Besides, the country itself is far less stimulating to its inhabitants: compared to Greece, Italy is a continental country whose inhabitants communicate more easily by land than by sea, except in the two extreme southern peninsulas, which characteristically were occupied by Greek colonies whose earlier development was more brilliant than that of the mother country. . . . The equable fertility of the land was itself a hindrance. As far back as we can form any conjecture, the bulk of the people were shepherds or husbandmen; we cannot trace a time like that reflected in the Homeric poems, when high-born men of spirit went roving in their youth by land and sea, and settled down in their prime with a large stock of cattle and a fair stud of horses, to act as referees in peace and leaders in war to the cottars around. . . . Other differences less intelligible to us were not less weighty: the volcanic character of the western plain of central Italy, the want of a fall to the coast (which caused some of the watercourses to form marshes, and made the Tiber a terror to the Romans for its floods), told in ways as yet untraced on the character of the inhabitants. For one thing the ancient worship of Febris and Mefitis indicates a constant liability to fever; then the air of Greece is lighter than the air of Italy, and this may be the reason that it was more inspiring. . . . Italian indigenous literature was of the very scantiest; its oldest element was to be found in hymns, barely metrical, and so full of repetitions as to dispense with metre. The hymns were more like spells than psalms, the singers had an object to gain rather than feelings to express. The public hymns were prayers for blessing: there were private chants to charm crops out of a neighbour's field, and bring other mischief to pass against him. Such 'evil songs' were a capital offence, though there was little, perhaps, in their form to suggest a distinction whether the victim was being bewitched or satirised. The deliberate articulate expression of spite seemed a guilt and power of itself. Besides these there were dirges at funerals, ranging between commemoration of the deceased and his ancestors, propitiation of the departed spirit, and simple lamentation. There were songs at banquets in praise of ancient worthies. . . . We find no trace of any poet who composed what free-born youths recited at feasts; probably they extemporised without training and attained no mastery. If a nation has strong military instincts, we find legendary or historical heroes in its very oldest traditions; if a nation has strong poetical instincts, we find the names of historical or legendary poets. In Italy we only meet with nameless fauns and prophets, whose inspired verses were perhaps on the level of Mother Shipton."—G. A. Simcox, *A History of Latin Literature, v. 1, introd.*

Struggle with the Etruscans. See ETRUSCANS.

B. C. 753.—Era of the foundation of the city.—"Great doubts have been entertained, as well by ancient historians as by modern chronologists, respecting this era. Polybius fixes it to the year B. C. 751; Cato, who has been followed by Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Solinus, and Eusebius, to B. C. 752; Fabius Pictor, to B. C. 747; Archbishop Usher, to B. C. 748; and Newton, to B. C. 627: Terentius Varro, however, refers it to B. C. 753; which computation was adopted by the Roman emperors, and by Plutarch, Tacitus, Dion, Aulus Gellius, Censorinus, Onuphrius, Baroius, bishop Beveridge, Stranchius, Dr. Playfair, and by most modern chronologists: Livy, Cicero, Pliny, and Velleius Paterculus occasionally adopted both the Varronian and Catonian computations. Dr. Hales has, however, determined, from history and astronomy, that the Varronian computation is correct, viz. B. C. 753."—Sir H. Nicolas, *Chronology of History, p. 2.*

B. C. 753-510.—The legendary period of the kings.—Credibility of the Roman annals.—Probable Etruscan domination.—"It may . . . be stated, as the result of this inquiry, that the narrative of Roman affairs, from the foundation of the city to the expulsion of the Tarquins, is formed out of traditionary materials. At what time the oral traditions were reduced into writing, and how much of the existing narrative was the arbitrary supplement of the historians who first framed the account which has descended to us, it is now impossible to ascertain. . . . The records of them, which were made before the burning of Rome, 390 B. C., were doubtless rare and meagre in the extreme; and such as there were at this time chiefly perished in the conflagration and ruin of the city. It was probably not till after this period—that is to say, about 120 years after the expulsion of the kings—and above 350 years after the era assigned for the foundation of the city, that these oral reports—these hearsay stories of many generations—began to be entered in the registers of the pontifices. . . . The history of the entire regal period, as respects both its external attestation and its internal probability, is tolerably uniform in its character. . . . Niebuhr, indeed, has drawn a broad line between the reigns of Romulus and Numa on the one hand, and those of the five last kings on the other. The former he considers to be purely fabulous and poetical; the latter he regards as belonging to the mythico-historical period, when there is a narrative resting on a historical basis, and most of the persons mentioned are real. But it is impossible to discover any ground, either in the contents of the narrative, or in its external evidence, to support this distinction. Romulus, indeed, from the form of his name, appears to be a mere personification of the city of Rome, and to have no better claim to a real existence than Hellen, Danaus, Ægyptus, Tyrrhenus, or Italus. But Numa Pompilius stands on the same ground as the remaining kings, except that he is more ancient; and the narrative of all the reigns, from the first to the last, seems to be constructed on the same principles. That the names of the kings after Romulus are real, is highly probable; during the latter reigns, much of the history seems to be in the form of legendary explanations of proper names. . . . Even with respect to the Tarquinian family, it may be doubted whether the similarity of their name to that of the city of Tarquinii was not the origin of the story of Demaratus and the Etruscan origin. The circumstance that the two king Tarquins were both named Lucius, and that it was necessary to distinguish them by the epithets of Priscus and Superbus, raises a presumption that the names were real. Müller indeed regards the names of the two Tarquins as merely represent-

ing the influence exercised by the Etruscan city of Tarquinii in Rome at the periods known as their reigns. . . . The leading feature of the government during this period is that its chief was a king, who obtained his office by the election of the people, and the confirmation of the Senate, in the same manner in which consuls and other high magistrates were appointed after the abolition of royalty; but that, when once fully elected, he retained his power for life. In the mode of succession, the Roman differed from the early Greek kings, whose office was hereditary. The Alban kings, likewise, to whom the Roman kings traced their origin, are described as succeeding by inheritance and not by election. . . . The predominant belief of the Romans concerning their regal government was, that the power of the kings was limited by constitutional checks; that the chief institutions of the Republic, namely, the Senate and the Popular Assembly, existed in combination with the royalty, and were only suspended by the lawless despotism of the second Tarquin. Occasionally, however, we meet with the idea that the kings were absolute."—Sir G. C. Lewis, *Inquiry into the Credibility of Early Roman History, ch.* 11, *sect.* 39–40 (*v.* 1).—"Of the kings of Rome we have no direct contemporary evidence; we know them only from tradition, and from the traces they left behind them in the Republican constitution which followed. But the 'method of survivals' has here been applied by a master-hand [Mommsen]; and we can be fairly sure, not only of the fact that monarchy actually existed at Rome, but even of some at least of its leading characteristics. Here we have kingship no longer denoting, as in Homer, a social position of chieftaincy which bears with it certain vaguely-conceived prerogatives, but a clearly defined magistracy within the fully realised State. The rights and duties of the Rex are indeed defined by no documents, and the spirit of the age still seems to be obedience and trust; but we also find the marks of a formal customary procedure, which is already hardening into constitutional practice, and will in time further harden into constitutional law. The monarchy has ceased to be hereditary, if it ever was so; and the method of appointment, though we are uncertain as to its exact nature, is beyond doubt regulated with precision, and expressed in technical terms."—W. W. Fowler, *The City-State of the Greeks and Romans, pp.* 74–75.—"The analogy of other states, no less than the subsequent constitution of Rome, which always retained the marks of its first monarchical complexion, leaves us in no doubt that kings once reigned in Rome, and that by a determined uprising of the people they were expelled, leaving in the Roman mind an ineradicable hatred of the very name. We have to be content with these hard facts, extracted from those thrilling stories with which Livy adorns the reign and the expulsion of Tarquinius Superbus."—R. F. Horton, *Hist. of the Romans, ch.* 2.—The names of the kings, with the dates assigned to them, are as follows: Romulus, B. C. 753–717; Numa Pompilius, B. C. 715–673; Tullus Hostilius, B. C. 673–642; Ancus Martius, B. C. 641–617; Lucius Tarquinius Priscus, B. C. 616–579; Servius Tullius, B. C. 578–535; Tarquinius Superbus, B. C. 534–510.—According to the legend of early Rome, Romulus attracted inhabitants to the city he had founded by establishing within its walls a sanctuary or refuge, for escaped slaves, outlaws and the like. But he could not in a fair way procure wives for these rough settlers, because marriage with them was disdained by the reputable people of neighboring cities. Therefore he arranged for an imposing celebration of games at Rome, in honor of the god Consus, and invited his neighbors, the Sabines, to witness them. These came unsuspectingly with their wives and daughters, and, when they were absorbed in the show, the Romans, at a given signal, rushed on them and carried off such women as they chose to make captive. A long and obstinate war ensued, which was ended by the interposition of the women concerned, who had become reconciled to their Roman husbands and satisfied to remain with them.—Livy, *History, ch.* 9.—"We cannot . . . agree with Niebuhr, who thinks he can discover some historical facts through this legendary mist. As he supposes, the inhabitants of the Palatine had not the right of intermarriage ('connubium') with their Sabine neighbours on the Capitoline and the Quirinal. This inferiority of the Palatine Romans to the Sabines of the Capitoline and Quirinal hills caused discontent and war. The right of intermarriage was obtained by force of arms, and this historical fact lies at the bottom of the tale of the rape of the Sabines. Such a method of changing legends into history is of very doubtful utility. It seems more natural to explain the legend from the customs at the Roman marriage ceremonies"—in which the pretence of forcible abduction was enacted.—W. Ihne, *Hist. of Rome, bk.* 1, *ch.* 2.—"With the reign of the fifth king, Tarquinius Priscus, a marked change takes place. The traditional accounts of the last three kings not only wear a more historical air than those of the first four, but they describe something like a transformation of the Roman city and state. Under the rule of these latter kings the separate settlements were for the first time enclosed with a rampart of colossal size and extent. The low grounds were drained, and a forum and circus elaborately laid out; on the Capitoline Mount a temple was erected, the massive foundations of which were an object of wonder even to Pliny. . . . The kings increase in power and surround themselves with new splendour. Abroad, Rome suddenly appears as a powerful state ruling far and wide over southern Etruria and Latium. These startling changes are, moreover, ascribed to kings of alien descent, who one and all ascend the throne in the teeth of established constitutional forms. Finally, with the expulsion of the last of them—the younger Tarquin—comes a sudden shrinkage of power. At the commencement of the republic Rome is once more a comparatively small state, with hostile and independent neighbours at her very doors. It is difficult to avoid the conviction that the true explanation of this phenomenon is to be found in the supposition that Rome during this period passed under the rule of powerful Etruscan lords. Who the people were whom the Romans knew as Etruscans and the Greeks as Tyrrhenians is a question, which, after centuries of discussion, still remains unanswered; nor in all probability will the answer be found until the lost key to their language has been discovered. That they were regarded by the Italic tribes, by Umbrians, Sabellians, and Latins, as intruders is certain. Entering Italy, as they

probably did from the north or north-east, they seem to have first of all made themselves masters of the rich valley of the Po and of the Umbrians who dwelt there. Then crossing the Apennines, they overran Etruria proper as far south as the banks of the Tiber, here too reducing to subjection the Umbrian owners of the soil. In Etruria they made themselves dreaded, like the Northmen of a later time, by sea as well as by land. . . . We find the Etruscan power encircling Rome on all sides, and in Rome itself a tradition of the rule of princes of Etruscan origin. The Tarquinii come from South Etruria; their name can hardly be anything else than the Latin equivalent of the Etruscan Tarchon, and is therefore possibly a title (='lord' or 'prince') rather than a proper name. . . . That Etruria had, under the sway of Etruscan lords, forged ahead of the country south of the Tiber in wealth and civilisation is a fact which the evidence of remains has placed beyond doubt. It is therefore significant that the rule of the Tarquins in Rome is marked by an outward splendour which stands in strong contrast to the primitive simplicity of the native kings. . . . These Etruscan princes are represented, not only as having raised Rome for the time to a commanding position in Latium, and lavished upon the city itself the resources of Etruscan civilisation, but also the authors of important internal changes. They are represented as favouring new men at the expense of the old patrician families, and as reorganising the Roman army on a new footing, a policy natural enough in military princes of alien birth."—H. F. Pelham, *Outlines of Roman Hist., bk.* 1, *ch.* 3.

Also in: F. W. Newman, *Regal Rome.*—T. H. Dyer, *Hist. of the Kings of Rome.*

B. C. 510.—Expulsion of Tarquin the Proud.—The story from Livy.—Lucius Tarquinius Superbus, or Tarquin the Proud, son of Tarquinius Priscus and son-in-law of Servius Tullius, brought about the assassination of the latter, and mounted the throne. "Lucius Tarquin, having thus seized the kingdom (for he had not the consent either of the Senators or of the Commons to his deed), bare himself very haughtily, so that men called him Tarquin the Proud. First, lest some other, taking example by him, should deal with him as he had dealt with Tullius, he had about him a company of armed men for guards. And because he knew that none loved him, he would have them fear him. To this end he caused men to be accused before him. And when they were so accused, he judged them by himself, none sitting with him to see that right was done. Some he slew unjustly, and some he banished, and some he spoiled of their goods. And when the number of the Senators was greatly diminished by these means (for he laid his plots mostly against the Senators, as being rich men and the chief of the State), he would not choose any into their place, thinking that the people would lightly esteem them if there were but a few of them. Nor did he call them together to ask their counsel, but ruled according to his own pleasure, making peace and war, and binding treaties or unbinding, with none to gainsay him. Nevertheless, for a while he increased greatly in power and glory. He made alliance with Octavius Mamilius, prince of Tusculum, giving him his daughter in marriage; nor was there any man greater than Mamilius in all the cities of the Latins; and Suessa Pometia, that was a city of the Volsci, he took by force, and finding that the spoil was very rich (for there were in it forty talents of gold and silver), he built with the money a temple to Jupiter on the Capitol, very great and splendid, and worthy not only of his present kingdom but also of that great Empire that should be thereafter. Also he took the city of Gabii by fraud. . . . By such means did King Tarquin increase his power. Now there was at Rome in the days of Tarquin a noble youth, by name Lucius Junius, who was akin to the house of Tarquin, seeing that his mother was sister to the King. This man, seeing how the King sought to destroy all the chief men in the State (and, indeed, the brother of Lucius had been so slain), judged it well so to bear himself that there should be nothing in him which the King should either covet or desire. Wherefore he feigned foolishness, suffering all that he had to be made a prey; for which reason men gave him the name of Brutus, or the Foolish. Then he bided his time, waiting till the occasion should come when he might win freedom for the people." In a little time "there came to Brutus an occasion of showing what manner of man he was. Sextus, the King's son, did so grievous a wrong to Lucretia, that was the wife of Collatinus, that the woman could not endure to live, but slew herself with her own hand. But before she died she called to her her husband and her father and Brutus, and bade them avenge her upon the evil house of Tarquin. And when her father and her husband sat silent for grief and fear, Brutus drew the knife wherewith she slew herself from the wound, and held it before him dripping with blood, and cried aloud, 'By this blood I swear, calling the Gods to witness, that I will pursue with fire and sword and with all other means of destruction Tarquin the Proud, with his accursed wife and all his race; and that I will suffer no man hereafter to be king in this city of Rome.' And when he had ended he bade the others swear after the same form of words. This they did and, forgetting their grief, thought only how they might best avenge this great wrong that had been done. First they carried the body of Lucretia, all covered with blood, into the market-place of Collatia (for these things happened at Collatia), and roused all the people that saw a thing so shameful and pitiful, till all that were of an age for war assembled themselves carrying arms. Some of them stayed behind to keep the gates of Collatia, that no one should carry tidings of the matter to the King, and the rest Brutus took with him with all the speed that he might to Rome. There also was stirred up a like commotion, Brutus calling the people together and telling them what a shameful wrong the young Tarquin had done. Also he spake to them of the labours with which the King wore them out in the building of temples and palaces and the like, so that they who had been in time past the conquerors of all the nations round about were now come to be but as hewers of wood and drawers of water. Also he set before them in what shameful sort King Tullius had been slain, and how his daughter had driven her chariot over the dead body of her father. With suchlike words he stirred up the people to great wrath, so that they passed a decree that there should be no more kings in Rome, and that

Lucius Tarquin with his wife and his children should be banished. After this Brutus made haste to the camp and stirred up the army against the King. And in the meanwhile Queen Tullia fled from her palace, all that saw her cursing her as she went. As for King Tarquin, when he came to the city he found the gates shut against him; thereupon he returned and dwelt at Cære that is in the land of Etruria, and two of his sons with him; but Sextus going to Gabii, as to a city which he had made his own, was slain by the inhabitants. The King and his house being thus driven out, Brutus was made consul with one Collatinus for his colleague."—*Stories from Livy; by A. J. Church, ch.* 5.

Also in: B. G. Niebuhr, *Lect's on the Hist. of Rome, lect.* 8–9 (*v.* 1).—T. H. Dyer, *Hist. of the Kings of Rome, ch.* 10.

B. C. 509.—The establishment of the Republic.—The Valerian Laws.—"However much the history of the expulsion of the last Tarquinius, 'the proud,' may have been interwoven with anecdotes and spun out into a romance, it is not in its leading outlines to be called in question. . . . The royal power was by no means abolished, as is shown by the fact that, when a vacancy occurred, a 'temporary king' (interrex) was nominated as before. The one life-king was simply replaced by two year-kings, who called themselves generals (prætores), or judges (iudices), or merely colleagues (consules) [consules are those who 'leap or dance together.' Foot-note]. The collegiate principle, from which this last—and subsequently most current—name of the annual kings was derived, assumed in their case an altogether peculiar form. The supreme power was not entrusted to the two magistrates conjointly, but each consul possessed and exercised it for himself as fully and wholly as it had been possessed and exercised by the king; and, although a partition of functions doubtless took place from the first—the one consul for instance undertaking the command of the army, and the other the administration of justice—that partition was by no means binding, and each of the colleagues was legally at liberty to interfere at any time in the province of the other [see Consul, Roman]. . . . This peculiarly Latin, if not peculiarly Roman, institution of co-ordinate supreme authorities . . . manifestly sprang out of the endeavour to retain the regal power in legally undiminished fulness. . . . A similar course was followed in reference to the termination of their tenure of office. . . . They ceased to be magistrates, not upon the expiry of the set term, but only upon their publicly and solemnly demitting their office: so that, in the event of their daring to disregard the term and to continue their magistracy beyond the year, their official acts were nevertheless valid, and in the earlier times they scarcely even incurred any other than a moral responsibility."—T. Mommsen, *Hist. of Rome, bk.* 2, *ch.* 1.—"No revolution can be undertaken and completed with success if the mass of the people is not led on by some superior intellect. At the dissolution of an existing legal authority the only authority remaining is personal and de facto, which in proportion to the danger of the position is more or less military and dictatorial. The Romans especially acknowledged the necessity, when circumstances required it, of submitting to the unlimited power of a dictator. Such a chief they found, at the time of the revolution, in Brutus. Collatinus also may, during a certain time, have stood in a similar manner at the head of the state, probably from less pure motives than Brutus, in consequence of which he succumbed to the movement which he in part may have evoked. After Brutus, Valerius Publicola was the recognised supreme head and the arbiter of events in Rome with dictatorial power, until his legislation made an end of the interregnum, and with all legal forms founded the true and genuine republic with two annual consuls. The dictatorship is found in the Latin cities as a state of transition between monarchy and the yearly prætorship; and we may conjecture that also in Rome the similar change in the constitution was effected in a similar way. In important historical crises the Romans always availed themselves of the absolute power of a dictator, as in Greece, with similar objects, Aesymnetae were chosen. . . . How long the dictatorial constitution lasted must remain undecided; for we must renounce the idea of a chronology of that time. It appears to me not impossible that the period between the expulsion of the kings and the Valerian laws, which in our authorities is represented as a year, may have embraced ten years, or much more."—W. Ihne, *Researches into the History of the Roman Constitution, p.* 61.—"The republic seems to have been first regularly established by the Valerian laws, of which, unfortunately, we can discover little more than half obliterated traces in the oldest traditions of the Romans. According to the story, P. Valerius was chosen as consul after the banishment of Tarquinius Collatinus, and remained alone in office after the death of his colleague, Brutus, without assembling the people for the election of a second consul. This proceeding excited a suspicion in the minds of the people, that he intended to take sole possession of the state, and to re-establish royal power. But these fears proved groundless. Valerius remained in office with the sole design of introducing a number of laws intended to establish the republic on a legal foundation, without the danger of any interference on the part of a colleague. The first of these Valerian laws threatened with the curse of the gods any one who, without the consent of the people, should dare to assume the highest magistracy. . . . The second law of Valerius . . . prescribe that in criminal trials, where the life of a citizen was at stake, the sentence of the consul should be subject to an appeal to the general assembly of the people. This Valerian law of appeal was the Roman Habeas Corpus Act."—W. Ihne, *Hist. of Rome, bk.* 2, *ch.* 1 (*v.* 1).—See, also, Consul, Roman; Comitia Curiata; Comitia Centuriata; Censors; Quæstors, Roman; Senate, Roman.

B. C. 494-492.—The first secession of the Plebs.—Origin of the Tribunes of the Plebs, and the Ædiles.—Original and acquired power of the Tribunes.—The two Roman peoples and their antagonism.—"The struggle [of plebeians against patricians in early Rome] opens with the debt question. We must realize all along how the internal history is affected by the wars without. The debtors fall into their difficulties through serving in the field during the summer; for of course the army is a citizen army and the citizens are agriculturists. Two patrician families take the side of the poor, the Horatii and the Valerii. Manius Valerius

Publicola, created dictator, promises the distressed farmers that, if they will follow him in his campaign against the Sabines, he will procure the relaxation of their burdens. They go and return victorious. But Appius Claudius (whose family had but recently migrated to Rome, a proud and overbearing Sabine stock) opposed the redemption of the dictator's promise. The victorious host, forming a seventh of the arm-bearing population, instantly marched out of the gate of the city, crossed the river Anio, and took up a station on the Sacred Mount [Mons Sacer]. They did not mean to go back again; they were weary of their haughty masters. . . . At last a peace is made — a formal peace concluded by the fetiales: they will come back if they may have magistrates of their own. This is the origin of the tribunes of the plebs [B. C. 492]. . . . The plebs who marched back that day from the Sacred Mount had done a deed which was to have a wonderful issue in the history of the world; they had dropped a seed into the soil which would one day spring up into the imperial government of the Cæsars. The 'tribunicia potestas,' with which they were clothing their new magistrates, was to become a more important element in the claims of the emperors than the purple robe of the consuls."— R. F. Horton, *Hist. of the Romans, ch.* 3.—"The tribunes of the people were so essentially different from all the other magistrates that, strictly speaking, they could hardly be called magistrates at all. They were originally nothing but the official counsel of the plebs — but counsel who possessed a veto on the execution of any command or any sentence of the patrician authorities. The tribune of the people had no military force at his disposal with which to inforce his veto. . . . There is no more striking proof of the high respect for law which was inherent in the Roman people, than that it was possible for such a magistracy to exercise functions specially directed against the governing class. . . . To strengthen an official authority which was so much wanting in physical strength, the Romans availed themselves of the terrors of religion. . . . The tribunes were accordingly placed under the special protection of the Deity. They were declared to be consecrated and inviolable ('sacrosancti'), and whoever attacked them, or hindered them in the exercise of their functions, fell a victim to the avenging Deity, and might be killed by anyone without fear of punishment."—W. Ihne, *Hist. of Rome, bk.* 2, *ch.* 2, *and bk.* 6, *ch.* 8.—"The tribune had no political authority. Not being a magistrate, he could not convoke the curies or the centuries [see Comitia Curiata and Comitia Centuriata]. He could make no proposition in the senate; it was not supposed, in the beginning, that he could appear there. He had nothing in common with the real city — that is to say, with the patrician city, where men did not recognize any authority of his. He was not the tribune of the people; he was the tribune of the plebs. There were then, as previously, two societies in Rome — the city and the plebs; the one strongly organized, having laws, magistrates, and a senate; the other a multitude, which remained without rights and laws, but which found in its inviolable tribunes protectors and judges. In succeeding years we can see how the tribunes took courage, and what unexpected powers they assumed. They had no authority to convoke the people, but they convoked them. Nothing called them to the senate; they sat at first at the door of the chamber; later they sat within. They had no power to judge the patricians; they judged them and condemned them. This was the result of the inviolability attached to them as sacrosancti. Every other power gave way before them. The patricians were disarmed the day they had pronounced, with solemn rites, that whoever touched a tribune should be impure. The law said, 'Nothing shall be done against a tribune.' If, then, this tribune convoked the plebs, the plebs assembled, and no one could dissolve this assembly, which the presence of the tribune placed beyond the power of the patricians and the laws. If the tribune entered the senate, no one could compel him to retire. If he seized a consul, no one could take the consul from his hand. Nothing could resist the boldness of a tribune. Against a tribune no one had any power, except another tribune. As soon as the plebs thus had their chiefs, they did not wait long before they had deliberative assemblies. These did not in any manner resemble those of the patricians. The plebs, in their comitia, were distributed into tribes; the domicile, not religion or wealth, regulated the place of each one. The assembly did not commence with a sacrifice; religion did not appear there. They knew nothing of presages, and the voice of an augur, or a pontiff, could not compel men to separate. It was really the comitia of the plebs, and they had nothing of the old rules, or of the religion of the patricians. True, these assemblies did not at first occupy themselves with the general interests of the city; they named no magistrates, and passed no laws. They deliberated only on the interests of their own order, named the plebeian chiefs, and carried plebiscita. There was at Rome, for a long time, a double series of decrees — senatusconsulta for the patricians, plebiscita for the plebs. The plebs did not obey the senatusconsulta, nor the patricians the plebiscita. There were two peoples at Rome. These two peoples, always in presence of each other, and living within the same walls, still had almost nothing in common. A plebeian could not be consul of the city, nor a patrician tribune of the plebs. The plebeian did not enter the assembly by curies, nor the patrician the assembly of the tribes. They were two peoples that did not even understand each other, not having — so to speak — common ideas. . . . The patricians persisted in keeping the plebs without the body politic, and the plebs established institutions of their own. The duality of the Roman population became from day to day more manifest. And yet there was something which formed a tie between these two peoples: this was war. The patricians were careful not to deprive themselves of soldiers. They had left to the plebeians the title of citizens, if only to incorporate them into the legions. They had taken care, too, that the inviolability of the tribunes should not extend outside of Rome, and for this purpose had decided that a tribune should never go out of the city. In the army, therefore, the plebs were under control; there was no longer a double power; in presence of the enemy Rome became one."— N. D. Fustel de Coulanges, *The Ancient City, bk.* 4, *ch.* 7.— It is supposed that the tribunes were originally two in number; but later there were five, and, finally,

ten. The law which created their office was "deposited in a temple, under the charge of two plebeian magistrates specially appointed for the purpose and called Aediles or 'housemasters.' These aediles were attached to the tribunes as assistants, and their jurisdiction chiefly concerned such minor cases as were settled by fines."—T. Mommsen, *Hist. of the Roman Republic* (*abridged by Bryant and Hendy*), *ch.* 7.—"Besides the tribunes, who stood over against the consuls, two plebeian ædiles were appointed, who might balance the patrician quæstors. Their name seems borrowed from the temple (Ædes Cereris) which is now built on the cattle market between the Palatine and the river to form a religious centre for the plebeian interest, as the ancient temple of Saturn was already a centre for the patrician interest. The goddess of bread is to preside over the growth of the democracy. The duty of ædiles is, in the first instance, to keep the public buildings in repair; but they acquire a position not unlike that of police-officers."—R. F. Horton, *Hist. of the Romans, ch.* 3.—The office of the curule ædiles (two in number, who were elected in "comitia tributa") was instituted in 366 B. C. These were patricians at first; but in 304 B. C. the office was thrown open in alternate years to the plebeians, and in 91 B. C. all restrictions were removed. The curule ædiles had certain judicial functions, and formed with the plebeian ædiles a board of police and market administration, having oversight also of the religious games.—*The same, App. A.*

Also in: Sir G. C. Lewis, *Credibility of Early Roman History, ch.* 12, *pt.* 1.—B. G. Niebuhr, *Lect's on the History of Rome, lect.* 16.—T. Mommsen, *Hist. of Rome, bk.* 2, *ch.* 2 (*v.* 1).

B. C. 493.—League with the Latins. See below: B. C. 339-338.

B. C. 489-450.—Volscian Wars.— The wars of the Romans with the neighboring Volscians stretched over a period of some forty years (B. C. 489-450) and ended in the disappearance of the latter from history. The legend of Coriolanus (Caius Marcius, on whom the added name was bestowed because of his valiant capture of the Volscian town of Corioli) is connected with these wars; but modern critics have stripped it of all historic credit and left it only a beautiful romance.—W. Ihne, *Hist. of Rome, bk.* 2, *ch.* 4 (*v.* 1).

Also in: A. J. Church, *Stories from Livy, ch.* 7.

B. C. 472-471.—The Publilian Law of Volero.—Exclusion of Patricians from the Comitia Tributa.—"Volero Publilius was chosen one of the Tribunes for . . . [B. C. 472]; and he straightway proposed a law, by which it was provided that the Tribunes and Ædiles of the plebs should be elected by the plebeians themselves at the Assembly of the Tribes in the Forum, not at the Assembly of the Centuries in the Field of Mars. This is usually called the Publilian Law of Volero. For a whole year the patricians succeeded in putting off the law. But the plebeians were determined to have it."—H. G. Liddell, *Hist. of Rome, bk.* 2, *ch.* 8 (*v.* 1).—"The immediate consequence of the tribuneship of the people was the organisation of the assembly of tribes, the 'comitia tributa,' whereby they lost their former character as factional or party meetings and were raised to the dignity and functions of assemblies of the Roman people. . . . The circumstances which, in 471 B. C., led to the passing of the Publilian law, seem to indicate that even at that time the attempt was made by the patricians to change the original character of the tribuneship of the people, and to open it to the patrician class. The patricians intruded themselves in the assembly of the plebeians, surely not for the purpose of making a disturbance as it is represented, but to enforce a contested right, by which they claimed to take part in the comitia of tribes. . . . This question was decided by the Publilian law, which excluded the patricians from the comitia tributa and specified the privileges of these comitia, now admitted to be purely plebeian. . . . These were the right of meeting together unmolested in separate purely plebeian comitia, the right of freely and independently electing their representatives, the right of discussing and settling their own affairs, and in certain matters of passing resolutions [plebiscita] which affected the whole community. These resolutions were, of course, not binding on the state, they had more the character of petitions than enactments, but still they were the formal expression of the will of a great majority of the Roman people, and as such they could not easily be set aside or ignored by the patrician government."—W. Ihne, *Hist. of Rome, bk.* 2, *ch.* 8, *and bk.* 6, *ch.* 1.

Also in: B. G. Niebuhr, *Lect's on Hist. of Rome, lect.* 20.

B. C. 466-463.—The Plague.— In the war of the Romans with the Volscians, the former were so hard pressed that "it became necessary to receive men and cattle within the walls of Rome, just as at Athens in the Peloponnesian war; and this crowding together of men and beasts produced a plague [B. C. 466-463]. . . . It is probable that the great pestilence which, thirty years later, broke out in Greece and Carthage, began in Italy as early as that time. The rate of mortality was fearful; it was a real pestilence, and not a mere fever. . . . Both consuls fell victims to the disease, two of the four augurs, the curio maximus, the fourth part of the senators, and an immense number of citizens of all classes."—B. G. Niebuhr, *Lect's on the Hist. of Rome, lect.* 21.

Also in: T. Arnold, *Hist. of Rome, ch.* 11.

B. C. 458.—Conquest of the Æqui.—"Alternating with the raids [of the Romans] against the Volsci are the almost yearly campaigns with the Æqui, who would pour down their valleys and occupy Mount Algidus, threatening Tusculum and the Latin Way which led to Rome. It was on one of these occasions, when the republic too was engaged with Sabines to the north, and Volscians to the south, that the Consul Minucius [B. C. 458] found himself hemmed in on the mountain-side by the Æqui. Very beautiful and very characteristic is the legend which veils the issue of the danger. L. Quinctius Cincinnatus, ruined by a fine imposed upon his son, is tilling his little farm across the Tiber, when the messengers of the Senate come to announce that he is made dictator. With great simplicity he leaves his plough, conquers the Æqui, and returns to his furrows again."—R. F. Horton, *Hist. of the Romans, ch.* 4.

Also in: A. J. Church, *Stories from Livy, ch.* 9.

B. C. 456.—The Icilian Law.—The early process of legislation illustrated.—Persuasiveness of Plebeian Petitions.—"The process of

legislation in early times has been preserved to us in a single instance in which Dionysius has followed the account derived by him from an ancient document. The case is that of the Lex Icilia de Aventino publicando (B. C. 456), an interlude in the long struggle over the Terentilian law [see below: B. C. 451–449]. This Lex Icilia was preserved, as Dionysius tells us, on a brazen column in the temple of Diana on the Aventine. It seems unlikely that the original tablet in such a situation should have survived the burning of the city by the Gauls. Yet a record so important to the plebs would doubtless be at once restored, and the restoration would show at least the belief prevalent at this very early period (B. C. 389) as to the proper procedure in case of such a law. 'Icilius,' says Dionysius (X. 31), 'approached the consuls then in office and the senate, and requested them to pass the preliminary decree for the law that he proposed, and to bring it before the people.' By threatening to arrest the consuls he compelled them to assemble the senate, and Icilius addressed the senate on behalf of his bill. Finally the senate consented . . . (Dionys. X. 32). Then, after auspices and sacrifices, 'the law was passed by the comitia centuriata, which were convened by the consuls.' . . . Now here we have an order of proceeding under which the plebs have a practical initiative in legislation, and in which, nevertheless, each of the powers of the state acts in a perfectly natural and constitutional manner. . . . The formal legislative power lies solely with the populus Romanus. The vote of the corporation of the plebs is not then in early times strictly a legislative process at all. It is merely a strong and formal petition, an appeal to the sovereign assembly to grant their request. But this sovereign assembly can only be convened and the question put to it by a consul. If the consuls are unfavourable to the bill, they can refuse to put it to the vote at all. In any case, unless, like Sp. Cassius, they were themselves revolutionists, they would not think of doing so save on the recommendation of their authorised advisers. . . . The senate is assembled and freely discusses the law. An adverse vote justifies the consuls in their resistance. Then follow tedious manœuvres. The senate treat with members of the college of tribunes to procure their veto; they urge the necessity of a military expedition, or, as a last resource, advise the appointment of a dictator. Such is the general picture we get from Livy's story. If by these means they can tide over the tribune's year of office, the whole process has to be gone through again. The senate have the chance of a lucky accident in getting one of the new tribunes subservient to them; or sometimes (as in the case of the proposal to remove to Veii) they may persuade the plebs itself to throw out the tribunician rogatio when again introduced (Livy, v. 30). On the other hand the tribunes may bring to bear their reserved power of impeding all public business; and the ultima ratio lies with the plebeians, who have the power of secession in their hands. In practice, however, the senate is nearly always wise enough to yield before the plebs is driven to play this its last card. Their yielding is expressed by their backing the petition of the plebs and recommending the consuls to put the question of its acceptance to the populus. With this recommendation on the part of the senate the struggle is generally at an end. It is still in the strict right of the consuls to refuse to put the question to the comitia. Livy (iii. 19) gives us one instance in the matter of the Terentilian law, when the senate is disposed to yield, and the consul 'non in plebe coercendâ quam senatu castigando vehementior fuit.' But a consul so insisting on his right would incur enormous personal responsibility, and expose himself, unsheltered by public opinion, to the vengeance of the plebs when he went out of office. When the consul too has yielded, and the question is actually put to the vote of the sovereign (generally in its comitia centuriata), the controversy has been long ago thoroughly threshed out. Though it is only at this stage that legislation in the strict sense of the word commences, yet no instance is recorded of a refusal on the part of the sovereign people to assent to the petition of the plebs backed by the recommendation of the senate."—J. L. Strachan-Davidson, *Plebeian Privilege at Rome* (*English Historical Rev., April*, 1886).—On the bearings of this proceeding on the subsequently adopted Valerio-Horatian, Publilian, and Hortensian laws, see below: B. C. 286.

B. C. 451-449.—The Terentilian Law.—The Decemvirs and the Twelve Tables.—Not long after the establishment of the tribuneship, "the plebeians felt the necessity of putting an end to the exclusive possession of the laws which the patricians enjoyed, and to make them the common property of the whole nation. This could only be done by writing them down and making them public. A proposal was accordingly made in the assembly of the tribes by the tribune C. Terentilius Arsa (462 B. C.) to appoint a commission for the purpose of committing to writing the whole of the laws. . . . It is not wonderful that the patricians opposed with all their strength a measure which would wrest a most powerful weapon out of their hands. . . . The contest for the passing of the bill of Terentilius lasted, according to tradition, not less than ten years, and all means of open and secret opposition and of partial concession were made use of to elude the claims of the popular party. . . . After a ten years' struggle it [the motion for a commission] was passed into law. It proposed that a commission of ten men, being partly patricians and partly plebeians, should be appointed, for the purpose of arranging the existing law into a code. At the same time the consular constitution was to be suspended, and the ten men to be intrusted with the government and administration of the commonwealth during the time that they acted as legislators. By the same law the plebeian magistracy of the tribunes of the people ceased likewise, and the ten men became a body of magistrates intrusted with unlimited authority. . . . The patricians did not act entirely in good faith. . . . They carried the election of ten patricians. . . . Having, however, obtained this advantage over the credulity of their opponents, the patricians made no attempt to use it insolently as a party victory. The decemvirs proceeded with wisdom and moderation. Their administration, as well as their legislation, met with universal approval. They published on ten tables the greater part of the Roman law, and after these laws had met with the approbation of the people, they were declared by a decision of the people to be binding. Thus the first year of the decemvirate passed, and so far the

traditional story is simple and intelligible." The part of the tradition which follows is largely rejected by modern critical historians. It relates that when decemvirs were chosen for another year, to complete their work, Appius Claudius brought about the election, with himself, of men whom he could control, and then established a reign of terror which surpassed the worst tyranny of the kings, refusing to abdicate when the year expired. The tragic story of Virginia connects itself with this terrible oppression, and with the legend of its downfall. In the end, the Roman people delivered themselves, and secured the permanent authority of the code of laws, which had been enlarged from ten to twelve Tables.—W. Ihne, *Hist. of Rome, bk.* 2, *ch.* 9 *and* 10.—"The Twelve Tables were considered as the foundation of all law, and Cicero always mentions them with the utmost reverence. But only fragments remain."—H. G. Liddell, *Hist of Rome, bk.* 2, *ch.* 11.—"The most celebrated system of jurisprudence known to the world begins, as it ends, with a code. From the commencement to the close of its history, the expositors of Roman Law consistently employed language which implied that the body of their system rested on the Twelve Decemviral Tables, and therefore on a basis of written law. Except in one particular, no institutions anterior to the Twelve Tables were recognised at Rome. The theoretical descent of Roman jurisprudence from a code, the theoretical ascription of English law to immemorial unwritten tradition, were the chief reasons why the development of their system differed from the development of ours. Neither theory corresponded exactly with the facts, but each produced consequences of the utmost importance. . . . The ancient Roman code belongs to a class of which almost every civilised nation in the world can show a sample, and which, so far as the Roman and Hellenic worlds were concerned, were largely diffused over them at epochs not widely distant from one another. They appeared under exceedingly similar circumstances, and were produced, to our knowledge, by very similar causes. . . . In Greece, in Italy, on the Hellenised sea-board of Western Asia, these codes all made their appearance at periods much the same everywhere, not, I mean, at periods identical in point of time, but similar in point of the relative progress of each community. Everywhere, in the countries I have named, laws engraven on tablets and published to the people take the place of usages deposited with the recollection of a privileged oligarchy. . . . The ancient codes were doubtless originally suggested by the discovery and diffusion of the art of writing. It is true that the aristocracies seem to have abused their monopoly of legal knowledge; and at all events their exclusive possession of the law was a formidable impediment to the success of those popular movements which began to be universal in the western world. But, though democratic sentiment may have added to their popularity, the codes were certainly in the main a direct result of the invention of writing. Inscribed tablets were seen to be a better depositary of law, and a better security for its accurate preservation, than the memory of a number of persons however strengthened by habitual exercise. . . . Among the chief advantages which the Twelve Tables and similar codes conferred on the societies which obtained them, was the protection which they afforded against the frauds of the privileged oligarchy and also against the spontaneous depravation and debasement of the national institutions. The Roman Code was merely an enunciation in words of the existing customs of the Roman people. Relatively to the progress of the Romans in civilization, it was a remarkably early code, and it was published at a time when Roman society had barely emerged from that intellectual condition in which civil obligation and religious duty are inevitably confounded."—H. S. Maine, *Ancient Law, ch.* 1.

B. C. 449.—The Valerio-Horatian Laws.—On the overthrow of the tyranny of the Decemvirs, at Rome, B. C. 449, L. Valerius Potitus and M. Horatius Barbatus, being elected consuls, brought about the passage of certain laws, known as the Valerio-Horatian Laws. These renewed an old law (the Valerian Law) which gave to every Roman citizen an appeal from the supreme magistrate to the people, and they also made the plebiscita, or resolutions of the assembly of the tribes, authoritative laws, binding on the whole body politic.—H. G. Liddell, *Hist. of Rome, bk.* 2, *ch.* 10.—See a discussion of the importance of the last mentioned of these laws, in its relations to the subsequent Publilian and Hortensian laws, below: B. C. 286.

B. C. 445-400.—The Canuleian Law.—Creation of the Consular Tribunes.—Progress of the Plebs toward Political Equality.—"The year 449 had not taken from the patricians all their privileges. Rome has still two classes, but only one people, and the chiefs of the plebs, sitting in the senate, are meditating, after the struggle to obtain civil equality, to commence another to gain political equality. . . . Two things maintained the insulting distinction between the two orders: the prohibition of marriage between patricians and plebeians, and the tenure of all the magisterial officers by those who formed since the origin of Rome the sovereign people of the 'patres.' In 445 B. C. the tribune Canuleius demanded the abolition of the prohibition relative to marriages, and his colleagues, a share in the consulate. This was a demand for political equality." The Canuleian law legalizing marriages between patricians and plebeians was conceded, but not until a third "secession" of the plebeians had taken place. The plebeian demand for a share in the consulate was pacified for the time by a constitutional change which formed out of the consulate three offices: "the quæstorship, the censorship and the consular tribunate. The two former are exclusively patrician. The military [or consular] tribunes, in reality proconsuls confined, with one exception, to the command of the legions, could now be chosen without distinction, from the two orders. But the law, in not requiring that every year a fixed number of them be plebeians, allowed them to be all patricians; and they remained so for nearly fifty years. In spite of such skilful precautions, the senate did not give up the consulate. It held in reserve and pure from all taint the patrician magistracy, hoping for better days. . . . The constitution of 444 B. C. authorized the nomination of plebeians to the consular tribunate; down to 400 B. C. none obtained it; and during the seventy-eight years that this office continued, the senate twenty-four times nominated consuls, that is to say, it

attempted, and succeeded, one year in three, in re-establishing the ancient form of government. These perpetual oscillations encouraged the ambitious hopes of a rich knight, Spurius Mælius (439 B. C.). He thought that the Romans would willingly resign into his hands their unquiet liberty, and during a famine he gave very liberally to the poor. The senate became alarmed at this alms-giving which was not at all in accordance with the manners of that time, and raised to the dictatorship Cincinnatus, who, on taking office, prayed the gods not to grant that his old age should prove a cause of hurt or damage to the republic. Summoned before the tribunal of the dictator, Mælius refused to appear, and sought protection against the lictors amongst the crowd which filled the Forum. But the master of the horse, Serv. Ahala, managed to reach him, and ran him through with his sword. In spite of the indignation of the people, Cincinnatus sanctioned the act of his lieutenant, caused the house of the traitor to be demolished, and the 'præfectus annonæ,' Minucius Augurinus, sold, for an 'as' per 'modius,' the corn amassed by Mælius. Such is the story of the partisan of the nobles [Livy]; but at that epoch to have dreamt of re-establishing royalty would have been a foolish dream in which Spurius could not have indulged. Without doubt he had wished to obtain, by popular favour, the military tribunate, and in order to intimidate the plebeian candidates, the patricians overthrew him by imputing to him the accusation which Livy complacently details by the mouth of Cincinnatus, of having aimed at royalty. The crowd always can be cajoled by words, and the senate had the art of concentrating on this word 'royalty' all the phases of popular hatred. The move succeeded; during the eleven years following the people nine times allowed consuls to be nominated. There was, however, in 433 B. C. a plebeian dictator, Mamercus Æmilius, who reduced the tenure of censorship to 18 months. These nine consulships gave such confidence to the nobles that the senate itself had to suffer from the proud want of discipline shown by the consuls of the year 428 B. C. Though conquered by the Æquians, they refused to nominate a dictator. To overcome their resistance the senate had recourse to the tribunes of the people, who threatened to drag the consuls to prison. To see the tribunitian authority protecting the majesty of the senate was quite a new phenomenon. From this day the reputation of the tribunate equalled its power, and few years passed without the plebeians obtaining some new advantage. Three years earlier the tribunes, jealous of seeing the votes always given to the nobles, had proscribed the white robes, which marked out from a distance, to all eyes, the patrician candidate: This was the first law against undue canvassing. In 430 a law put an end to arbitrary valuations of penalties payable in kind. In 427 the tribunes, by opposing the levies, obliged the senate to carry to the comitia centuriata the question of the war against Veii. In 423 they revived the agrarian law, and demanded that the tithe should be more punctually paid in the future by the occupiers of domain land, and applied to the pay of the troops. They miscarried this time; but in 421 it seemed necessary to raise the number of quæstors from two to four; the people consented to it only on the condition that the quæstorship be accessible to the plebeians. Three years later 3,000 acres of the lands of Labicum were distributed to fifteen hundred plebeian families. It was very little: so the people laid claim in 414 to the division of the lands of Bola, taken from the Æquians. A military tribune, Postumius, being violently opposed to it, was slain in an outbreak of the soldiery. This crime, unheard of in the history of Roman armies, did harm to the popular cause; there was no distribution of lands, and for five years the senate was able to nominate the consuls. The patrician reaction produced another against it which ended in the thorough execution of the constitution of the year 444. An Icilius in 412, a Mænius in 410 B. C. took up again the agrarian law, and opposed the levy. The year following three of the Icilian family were named as tribunes. It was a menace to the other order. The patricians understood it, and in 410 three plebeians obtained the quæstorship. In 405 pay was established for the troops, and the rich undertook to pay the larger portion of it. Finally, in 400, four military tribunes out of six were plebeians. The chiefs of the people thus obtained the public offices and even places in the senate, and the poor obtained an indemnity which supported their families while they served with the colours. All ambitions, all desires, are at present satisfied. Calm and union returned to Rome; we can see it in the vigour of the attacks on external foes." —V. Duruy, *History of Rome, v.* 1, *pp.* 231–239.

B. C. 406-396.—The Veientine wars.—Proposed removal to Veii.—"Veii lay about ten miles from Rome, between two small streams which meet a little below the city and run down into the Tiber, falling into it nearly opposite to Castel Giubileo, the ancient Fidenæ. Insignificant in point of size, these little streams, however, like those of the Campagna generally, are edged by precipitous rocky cliffs, and thus are capable of affording a natural defence to a town built on the table-land above and between them. The space enclosed by the walls of Veii was equal to the extent of Rome itself, so long as the walls of Servius Tullius were the boundary of the city. . . . In the magnificence of its public and private buildings Veii is said to have been preferred by the Roman commons to Rome: and we know enough of the great works of the Etruscans to render this not impossible."—T. Arnold, *Hist. of Rome, ch.* 12 (*v.* 1).—"Rome and Veii, equals in strength and size, had engaged in periodical conflicts from time immemorial. . . . But the time had come for the final struggle with Veii. . . . How the siege lasted for ten years [B. C. 406–396]; how, at the bidding of a captured Tuscan seer, the Alban Lake was drained (and is not the tunnel which drained it visible to-day?); how Camillus, the dictator, by a tunnel underground took the city, and forestalled the sacrifice; how Juno came from Veii, and took up her abode upon the Aventine; how Camillus triumphed; and how the nemesis fell upon him, and he was banished—all this and more is told by Livy in his matchless way. It is an epic, and a beautiful epic."—R. F. Horton, *Hist. of the Romans, ch.* 4.—At the time of the conquest of Veii, there was a proposal that half the inhabitants of Rome should remove to the empty city, and found a new state. It was defeated with difficulty. A little later, when the Gauls had destroyed Rome, its citizens, having

found Veii a strong and comfortable place of refuge, were nearly persuaded to remain there and not rebuild their former home. Thus narrowly was the "Eternal City" saved to history. —H. G. Liddell, *Hist. of Rome, bk.* 2, *ch.* 13 *and* 15.

B. C. 390-347.—Invasions by the Gauls.—Destruction of the city.—"Before the time we are now speaking of, there had been a great movement in these Celtic nations [of Gael and Cymri]. Two great swarms went out from Gaul. Of these, one crossed the Alps into Italy; the other, moving eastward, in the course of time penetrated into Greece. . . . It is supposed that the Gael who dwelt in the eastern parts of Gaul, being oppressed by Cymric tribes of the west and north, went forth to seek new homes in distant lands. . . . At all events, it is certain that large bodies of Celts passed over the Alps before and after this time, and having once tasted the wines and eaten the fruits of Italy, were in no hurry to return from that fair land into their own less hospitable regions. We read of one swarm after another pressing into the land of promise; parties of Lingones, whose fathers lived about Langres in Champagne; Boians, whose name is traced in French Bourbon and Italian Bologna; Senones, whose old country was about Sens, and who have left record of themselves in the name of Senigaglia (Sena Gallica) on the coast of the Adriatic. . . . They overran the rich plains of Northern Italy, and so occupied the territory which lies between the Alps, the Apennines and the Adriatic [except Liguria] that the Romans called this territory Gallia Cisalpina, or Hither Gaul. The northern Etruscans gave way before these fierce barbarians, and their name is heard of no more in those parts. Thence the Gauls crossed the Apennines into southern Etruria, and while they were ravaging that country they first came in contact with the sons of Rome. The common date for this event is 390 B. C. . . . The tribe which took this course were of the Senones, as all authors say, and therefore we may suppose they were Gaelic; but it has been thought they were mixed with Cymri, since the name of their king or chief was Brennus, and Brenhin is Cymric for a king." The Romans met the invaders on the banks of the Alia, a little stream from the Sabine Hills which flows into the Tiber, and were terribly defeated there. The Gauls entered Rome and found, as the ancient story is, only a few venerable senators, sitting in their chairs and robes of state, whom they slew, because one of the senators resented the stroking of his beard by an insolent barbarian. The remaining inhabitants had withdrawn into the Capitol, or taken refuge at Veii and Cære. After pillaging and burning the city, the Gauls laid siege to the Capitol, and strove desperately for seven months to overcome its defenders by arms or famine. In the end they retreated, without success, but whether bribed, or driven, or weakened by sickness, is matter of uncertainty. The Romans cherished many legends connected with the siege of the Capitol,—like that, for example, of the sentinel and the sacred geese. "Thirty years after the first irruption (361 B. C.), we hear that another host of Senonian Gauls burst into Latium from the north, and, in alliance with the people of Tibur, ravaged the lands of Rome, Latium and Campania. For four years they continued their ravages, and then we hear of them no more. A third irruption followed, ten years later [B. C. 347], of still more formidable character. At that time, the Gauls formed a stationary camp on the Alban Hills and kept Rome in perpetual terror. . . . After some months they poured southwards, and disappear from history."—H. G. Liddell, *Hist. of Rome, bk.* 2, *ch.* 14 (*v.* 1).

Also in: T. Mommsen, *Hist. of Rome, bk.* 2, *ch.* 4.—A. J. Church, *Stories from Livy, ch.* 13–14.

B. C. 376-367.—The Licinian Laws.—"C. Licinius Stolo and L. Sextius . . . being Tribunes of the Plebs together in the year 376 B. C. promulgated the three bills which have ever since borne the name of the Licinian Rogations. These were: I. That of all debts on which interest had been paid, the sum of the interest paid should be deducted from the principal, and the remainder paid off in three successive years. II. That no citizen should hold more than 500 jugera (nearly 320 acres) of the Public Land, nor should feed on the public pastures more than 100 head of larger cattle and 500 of smaller, under penalty of a heavy fine. III. That henceforth Consuls, not Consular Tribunes, should always be elected, and that one of the two Consuls must be a Plebeian." The patricians made a desperate resistance to the adoption of these proposed enactments for ten years, during most of which long period the operations of government were nearly paralyzed by the obstinate tribunes, who inflexibly employed their formidable power of veto to compel submission to the popular demand. In the end they prevailed, and the Licinian rogations became Laws.—H. G. Liddell, *Hist. of Rome, bk.* 2, *ch.* 15 (*v.* 1).—"Licinius evidently designed reuniting the divided members of the plebeian body. Not one of them, whether rich or poor, but seems called back by these bills to stand with his own order from that time on. If this supposition was true, then Licinius was the greatest leader whom the plebeians ever had up to the time of Cæsar. But from the first he was disappointed. The plebeians who most wanted relief cared so little for having the consulship opened to the richer men of their estate that they would readily have dropped the bill concerning it, lest a demand should endanger their own desires. In the same temper the more eminent men of the order, themselves among the creditors of the poor and the tenants of the domain, would have quashed the proceedings of the tribunes respecting the discharge of debt and the distribution of land, so that they carried the third bill only, which would make them consuls without disturbing their possessions. While the plebeians continued severed from one another, the patricians drew together in resistance to the bills. Licinius stood forth demanding, at once, all that it had cost his predecessors their utmost energy to demand, singly and at long intervals, from the patricians. . . . The very comprehensiveness of his measures proved the safeguard of Licinius. Had he preferred but one of these demands, he would have been unhesitatingly opposed by the great majority of the patricians. On the other hand he would have had comparatively doubtful support from the plebs." In the end, after a struggle of ten years duration, Licinius and Sextius carried their three bills, together with a fourth, brought forward later, which opened to the plebeians the office of the duumvirs, who con-

sulted the Sibyline books. "It takes all the subsequent history of Rome to measure the consequences of the Revolution achieved by Licinius and Sextius; but the immediate working of their laws could have been nothing but a disappointment to their originators and upholders. . . . For some ten years the law regarding the consulship was observed, after which it was occasionally violated, but can still be called a success. The laws of relief, as may be supposed of all such sumptuary enactments, were violated from the first. No general recovery of the public land from those occupying more than five hundred jugera ever took place. Consequently there was no general division of land among the lackland class. Conflicting claims and jealousy on the part of the poor must have done much to embarrass and prevent the execution of the law. No system of land survey to distinguish between 'ager publicus' and 'ager privatus' existed. Licinius Stolo himself was afterwards convicted of violating his own law. The law respecting debts met with much the same obstacles. The causes of embarrassment and poverty being much the same and undisturbed, soon reproduced the effects which no reduction of interest or installment of principal could effectually remove. . . . These laws, then, had little or no effect upon the domain question or the re-distribution of land. They did not fulfil the evident expectation of their author in uniting the plebeians into one political body. This was impossible. What they did do was to break up and practically abolish the patriciate. Henceforth were the Roman people divided into rich and poor only."—A. Stephenson, *Public Lands and Agrarian Laws of the Roman Republic* (*Johns Hopkins Univ. Studies, 9th ser., nos.* 7–8).

Also in: T. Mommsen, *Hist. of Rome, bk.* 2, *ch.* 3 (*v.* 1).—S. Eliot, *The Liberty of Rome, bk.* 2, *ch.* 7 (*v.* 1).

B. C. 366.—Institution of the Prætorship.—"By the establishment of the prætorship (366 B. C.) the office of chief judge was separated as a distinct magistracy from the consulship. . . . The prætor was always looked upon as the colleague of the consuls. He was elected in the same manner as the consuls by centuriate comitia, and, moreover, under the same auspices. He was furnished with the imperium, had lictors and fasces. He represented the consuls in town by assembling the senate, conducting its proceedings, executing its decrees. . . . Up to the time of the first Punic war one prætor only was annually elected. Then a second was added to conduct the jurisdiction between citizens and foreigners. A distinction was now made between the city prætor (prætor urbanus), who was always looked upon as having a higher dignity, and the foreign prætor (prætor peregrinus). On the final establishment of the two provinces of Sicily and Sardinia, probably 227 B. C., two new prætors were appointed to superintend the regular government of those provinces, and still later on two more were added for the two provinces of Spain. The number of annual prætors now amounted to six, and so it remained until the legislation of Sulla."—W. Ihne, *Hist. of Rome, bk.* 6, *ch.* 5.—See, also, Consul, Roman.

B. C. 343-290.—The Samnite Wars.—When the Romans had made themselves dominant in middle Italy, and the Samnites [see Samnites] in southern Italy, the question which of the two peoples should be masters of the peninsula at large was sure to demand settlement. About the middle of the fourth century, B. C., it began to urge the two rivals into collision, and the next two generations of Romans were busied chiefly with Samnite Wars, of which they fought three, with brief intervals to divide them, and at the end of which the Samnite name had been practically erased from history. The first hostilities grew out of a quarrel between the Samnites of the mountains and their degenerate countrymen of Capua and Campania. The latter sought help from the Romans, and, according to the Romans, surrendered their city to them in order to secure it; but this is obviously untrue. The First Samnite War, which followed this (B. C. 343–341), had no definite result, and seems to have been brought to an end rather abruptly by a mutiny in the Roman army and by trouble between Rome and her Latin allies. According to the Roman annals there were three great battles fought in this war, one on Mount Gaurus, and two elsewhere; but Mommsen and other historians entirely distrust the historic details as handed down. The Second or Great Samnite War occurred after an interval of fifteen years, during which time the Romans had conquered all Latium, reducing their Latin kinsmen from confederates to subjects. That accomplished, the Romans were quite ready to measure swords again with their more important rivals in the south. The long, desperate and doubtful war which ensued was of twenty-two years duration (B. C. 326–304). In the first years of this war victory was with the Romans and the Samnites sued for peace; but the terms offered were too hard for them and they fought on. Then Fortune smiled on them and gave them an opportunity to inflict on their haughty enemy one of the greatest humiliations that Rome in all her history ever suffered. The entire Roman army, commanded by the two consuls of the year, was caught in a mountain defile (B. C. 321), at a place called the Caudine Forks, and compelled to surrender to the Samnite general, C. Pontius. The consuls and other officers of the Romans signed a treaty of peace with Pontius, and all were then set free, after giving up their armor and their cloaks and passing "under the yoke." But the Roman senate refused to ratify the treaty, and gave up those who had signed it to the Samnites. The latter refused to receive the offered prisoners and vainly demanded a fulfilment of the treaty. Their great victory had been thrown away, and, although they won another important success at Lautulæ, the final result of the war which they were forced to resume was disastrous to them. After twenty-two years of obstinate fighting they accepted terms (B. C. 304) which stripped them of all their territory on the sea-coast, and required them to acknowledge the supremacy of Rome. The peace so purchased lasted less than six years. The Samnites were tempted (B. C. 298) while the Romans had a war with Etruscans and Gauls on their hands, to attempt the avenging of their humiliations. Their fate was decided at the battle of Sentinum (B. C. 295), won by the old consul, Q. Fabius Maximus, against the allied Samnites and Gauls, through the heroic self-sacrifice of his colleague, P. Decius Mus [imitating his father, of the same name—see below: B. C. 339–338]. The Samnites struggled hopelessly on some five years

longer and submitted finally in 290 B. C. Their great leader, Pontius, was put to death in the dungeons of the state prison under the Capitoline.—J. Michelet, *Hist. of the Roman Republic, bk.* 2, *ch.* 1.

Also in: H. G. Liddell, *Hist. of Rome, bk.* 2, *ch.* 19, *and* 21-24.—T. Mommsen, *Hist. of Rome, bk.* 2, *ch.* 6.

B. C. 340.—The Publilian Laws.—"In the second year of the Latin war (340 B. C.) the Plebeian Consul, Q. Publilius Philo, being named Dictator by his Patrician colleague for some purpose now unknown, proposed and carried three laws still further abridging the few remaining privileges of the Patrician Lords. The first Publilian law enacted that one of the Censors, as one of the Consuls, must be a Plebeian. . . . The second gave fuller sanction to the principle already established, that the Resolutions of the Plebeian Assembly should have the force of law. The third provided that all laws passed at the Comitia of the Centuries or of the Tribes should receive beforehand the sanction of the Curies."—H. G. Liddell, *Hist. of Rome, bk.* 3, *ch.* 20 (*v.* 1).—See a discussion of these laws in their relation to the preceding Valerio-Horatian law, and the subsequent Hortensian laws, below: B. C. 286.

B. C. 339-338.—Subjugation of the Latins.—Grant of pseudo-citizenship.—The real concession of the next century and its effects.—A league between the Romans and their kinsmen and neighbors, the Latins, of Tibur, Prænestе, Lanuvium, Aricia, Velitræ, and other towns, as well as with the Hernicans, existed during a century and a half, from the treaty of Sp. Cassius, B. C. 493, according to the Roman annals. At first, the members of the league stood together on fairly equal terms fighting successful wars with the Volscians, the Æquians and the Etruscans. But all the time the Romans contrived to be the greater gainers by the alliance, and as their power grew their arrogance increased, until the Latin allies were denied almost all share in the conquests and the spoils which they helped to win. The discontent which this caused fermented to an outbreak after the first of the Samnite wars. The Latins demanded to be admitted to Roman citizenship and to a share in the government of the state. Their demand was haughtily and even insultingly refused, and a fierce, deadly war between the kindred peoples ensued (B. C. 339-338). The decisive battle of the war was fought under Mount Vesuvius, and the Romans were said to have owed their victory to the self-sacrifice of the plebeian consul, P. Decius Mus, who, by a solemn ceremony, devoted himself and the army of the enemy to the infernal gods, and then threw himself into the thick of the fight, to be slain. The Latin towns were all reduced to dependence upon Rome,—some with a certain autonomy left to them, some with none. "Thus, isolated, politically powerless, socially dependent on Rome, the old towns of the Latins, once so proud and so free, became gradually provincial towns of the Roman territory. . . . The old Latium disappeared and a new Latium took its place, which, by means of Latin colonies, carried the Roman institutions, in the course of two centuries, over the whole peninsula."—W. Ihne, *Hist. of Rome, bk.* 3, *ch.* 6 (*v.* 1).—"The Latins, being conquered, surrendered,—that is to say, they gave up to the Romans their cities, their worships, their laws, and their lands. Their position was cruel. A consul said in the senate that, if they did not wish Rome to be surrounded by a vast desert, the fate of the Latins should be settled with some regard to clemency. Livy does not clearly explain what was done. If we are to trust him, the Latins obtained the right of Roman citizenship without including in the political privileges the right of suffrage, or in the civil the right of marriage. We may also note, that these new citizens were not counted in the census. It is clear that the senate deceived the Latins in giving them the name of Roman citizens. This title disguised a real subjection, since the men who bore it had the obligations of citizens without the rights. So true is this, that several Latin cities revolted, in order that this pretended citizenship might be withdrawn. A century passed, and, without Livy's notice of the fact, we might easily discover that Rome had changed her policy. The condition of the Latins having the rights of citizens, without suffrage and without connubium, no longer existed. Rome had withdrawn from them the title of citizens, or, rather, had done away with this falsehood, and had decided to restore to the different cities their municipal governments, their laws, and their magistracies. But by a skilful device Rome opened a door which, narrow as it was, permitted subjects to enter the Roman city. It granted to every Latin who had been a magistrate in his native city the right to become a Roman citizen at the expiration of his term of office. This time the gift of this right was complete and without reserve; suffrage, magistracies, census, marriage, private law, all were included. . . . By being a citizen of Rome, a man gained honor, wealth, and security. The Latins, therefore, became eager to obtain this title, and used all sorts of means to acquire it. One day, when Rome wished to appear a little severe, she found that 12,000 of them had obtained it through fraud. Ordinarily, Rome shut her eyes, knowing that by this means her population increased, and that the losses of war were thus repaired. But the Latin cities suffered; their richest inhabitants became Roman citizens, and Latium was impoverished. The taxes, from which the richest were exempt as Roman citizens, became more and more burdensome, and the contingent of soldiers that had to be furnished to Rome was every year more difficult to fill up."—N. D. Fustel de Coulanges, *The Ancient City, bk.* 5, *ch.* 2.

B. C. 326-304 ?—Abolition of personal slavery for debt. See Debt, Roman Law concerning.

B. C. 312.—The censorship of Appius Claudius.—His admission of the freedmen to the Tribes.—The building of the Appian Way.—"Appius Claudius, . . . afterwards known as Appius the Blind, . . . was elected Censor [B. C. 312], . . . and, as was usual, entered, with his colleague, Plautius Decianus, upon the charge of filling the vacancies which had occurred within the Senate since the last nominations to that body by the preceding Censors. The new elections were always made, it appears, from certain lists of citizens who had either borne great offices or possessed high rank; but Appius, determined from the beginning to secure his authority, either for his own sake or for that of his faction, through any support he could command, now named several of the lowest men in Rome as Senators, amongst whom he even admitted

some sons of freedmen, who, as such, were scarcely to be considered to be absolutely free, much less to be worthy of any political advancement. The nomination, backed by a powerful party, out of rather than in the Senate, and vainly, if not feebly, opposed by Plautius Decianus, who resigned his office in disgust at his colleague, was carried, but was set aside in the following year by the Consuls, who could call such Senators as they pleased, and those only, as it seems, to their sessions. Appius, still keeping his place, was soon after assailed by some of the Tribunes, now the representatives, as must be remembered, of the moderate party, rather than of the Plebeian estate. At this the Censor admitted all the freedmen in Rome to the Tribes, amongst which he distributed them in such a manner as promised him the most effectual support. Appius, however, was not wholly absorbed in mere political intrigues. A large portion of his energy and his ambition was spent upon the Way [Appian Way] and the Aqueduct which have borne his name to our day, and which, in his own time, were undertakings so vast as to obtain for him the name of 'the Hundred-handed.' He was an author, a jurist, a philosopher, and a poet, besides. . . . Cneius Flavius, the son of a freedman, one, therefore, of the partisans on whom the Censor and his faction were willing to lavish pretended favor in return for unstinted support, was employed by Appius near his person, in the capacity of private secretary. Appius, who, as already mentioned, was a jurist and an author, appears to have compiled a sort of manual concerning the business-days of the Calendar and the forms of instituting or conducting a suit before the courts; both these subjects being kept in profound concealment from the mass of the people, who were therefore obliged, in case of any legal proceeding, to resort first to the Pontiff to learn on what day, and next to the Patrician jurist to inquire in what form, they could lawfully manage their affairs before the judicial tribunals. This manual was very likely given to Flavius to copy; but it could scarcely have been with the knowledge, much less with the desire, of his employer, that it was published. . . . But Flavius stood in a position which tempted him, whether he were generous or designing, to divulge the secrets of the manual he had obtained; and it may very well have been from a desire to conciliate the real party of the Plebeians, which ranked above him, as a freedman, that he published his discoveries. He did not go unrewarded, but was raised to various offices, amongst them to the tribuneship of the Plebeians, and finally to the curule ædileship, in which his disclosures are sometimes represented as having been made. . . . The predominance of the popular party is plainly attested in the same year by the censorship of Fabius Rullianus and Decius Mus, the two great generals, who, succeeding to Appius Claudius, removed the freedmen he had enrolled amongst all the Tribes into four Tribes by themselves."—S. Eliot, *The Liberty of Rome: Rome, bk.* 2, *ch.* 8 (*v.* 2).

B. C. 300.—The Ogulnian Law.—In the year 300 B. C., "Quintus and Cneius Ogulnius appear in the tribuneship, as zealous champions of the popular party against the combination of the highest and the lowest classes. Instead, however, of making any wild attack upon their adversaries, the Tribunes seem to have exerted themselves in the wiser view of detaching the populace from its Patrician leaders, in order to unite the severed forces of the Plebeians upon a common ground. . . . A bill to increase the number of the Pontiffs by four, and that of the Augurs by five new incumbents, who should then, and, as was probably added, thenceforward, be chosen from the Plebeians, was proposed by the Tribunes. . . . Though some strenuous opposition was made to its passage, it became a law. The highest places of the priesthood, as well as of the civil magistracies, were opened to the Plebeians, whose name will no longer serve us as it has done, so entirely have the old distinctions of their estate from that of the Patricians been obliterated. The Ogulnii did not follow up the success they had gained, and the alliance between the lower Plebeians and the higher Patricians was rather cemented than loosened by a law professedly devised to the advantage of the upper classes of the Plebeians."—S. Eliot, *Liberty of Rome: Rome, bk.* 2, *ch.* 9 (*v.* 2).

B. C. 295-191.—Conquest of the Cisalpine Gauls.—Early in the 3d century B. C. the Gauls on the southern side of the Alps, being reinforced from Transalpine Gaul, again entered Roman territory, encouraged and assisted by the Samnites, who were then just engaging in their third war with Rome. A Roman legion which first encountered them in Etruria, under Scipio Barbatus, was annihilated, B. C. 295. But the vengeance of Rome overtook them before that year closed, at Sentinum, where the consuls Fabius and Decius ended the war at one blow. The Gauls were quiet after this for ten years; but in 285 B. C. the Senonian tribes invaded Etruria again and inflicted an alarming defeat on the Romans at Arretium. They also put to death some Roman ambassadors who were sent to negotiate an exchange of prisoners; after which the war of Rome against them was pushed to extermination. The whole race was destroyed or reduced to slavery and Roman colonies were established on its lands. The Boian Gauls, between the Apennines and the Po, now resented this intrusion on Gallic territory, but were terribly defeated at the Vadimonian Lake and sued for peace. This peace was maintained for nearly sixty years, during which time the Romans were strengthening themselves beyond the Apennines, with a strong colony at Ariminum (modern Rimini) on the Adriatic Sea, with thick settlements in the Senonian country, and with a great road—the Via Flaminia—in process of construction from Rome northwards across the Apennines, through Umbria and along the Adriatic coast to Ariminum. The Boians saw that the yoke was being prepared for them, and in 225 B. C. they made a great effort to break it. In the first encounter with them the Romans were beaten, as in previous wars, but at the great battle of Telamon, fought soon afterwards, the Gallic hosts were almost totally destroyed. The next year the Boians were completely subjugated, and in 223 and 222 B. C. the Insubrians were likewise conquered, their capital Mediolanum (Milan) occupied, and all north Italy to the Alps brought under Roman rule, except as the Ligurians in the mountains were still unsubdued and the Cenomanians and the Veneti retained a nominal independence as allies of Rome. But Hannibal's invasion of Italy, occurring soon

after, interrupted the settlement and pacification of the Gallic country and made a reconquest necessary after the war with the Carthaginians had been ended. The new Roman fortified colony of Placentia was taken by the Gauls and most of the inhabitants slain. The sister colony of Cremona was besieged, but resisted until relieved. Among the battles fought, that of Comum, B. C. 196, appears to have been the most important. The war was prolonged until 191 B. C., after which there appears to have been no more resistance to Roman rule among the Cisalpine Gauls.—W. Ihne, *Hist. of Rome, bk.* 3, *ch.* 12–13; *bk.* 4, *ch.* 5; *bk.* 5, *ch.* 7.

B. C. 286.— The last Secession of the Plebs.—The Hortensian Laws.—"About the year 286 B. C. the mass of the poorer citizens [of Rome], consisting (as may be guessed) chiefly of those who had lately been enfranchised by Appius, left the city and encamped in an oak-wood upon the Janiculum. To appease this last Secession, Q. Hortensius was named Dictator, and he succeeded in bringing back the people by allowing them to enact several laws upon the spot. One of these Hortensian laws was probably an extension of the Agrarian law of Curius, granting not seven but fourteen jugera (about 9 acres) to each of the poorer citizens. Another provided for the reduction of debt. But that which is best known as the Hortensian law was one enacting that all Resolutions of the Tribes should be law for the whole Roman people. This was nearly in the same terms as the law passed by Valerius and Horatius at the close of the Decemvirate, and that passed by Publilius Philo the Dictator, after the conquest of Latium. Hortensius died in his Dictatorship,—an unparalleled event, which was considered ominous. Yet with his death ended the last Secession of the People."—H. G. Liddell, *Hist. of Rome, bk.* 3, *ch.* 25 (*v.*1).—"It is impossible to suppose that the assembly of the plebs advanced at a single step from the meeting of a private corporation to be the delegated alter ego of the sovereign populus Romanus. We may be sure that the right of the plebs to legislate for the nation was accorded under checks and qualifications, long before they were invested with this absolute authority. We find, in fact, two occasions prior to the Hortensian law, on which the legislative competency of the plebs is said to have been recognised. The first of these is the Valerio-Horatian Law of B. C. 449 [see above: B. C. 449], the year after the decemvirate, the second the law of the dictator Publilius Philo, B. C. 339 [see above: B. C. 340]. Unfortunately the historians describe these laws in words which merely repeat the contents of the Hortensian law. . . . Some modern writers have been disposed to get over the difficulty by the conjecture that the laws of Publilius Philo and Hortensius were only re-enactments of that of Valerius and Horatius, and that the full powers of the plebs date back to the year B. C. 449. Mommsen's arguments against this view appear to me conclusive. Why should the jurists universally refer the powers exercised by the plebs to a mere re-enactment, rather than to the original source of their authority? . . . Niebuhr believes that the law of Valerius and Horatius gave the plebs legislative authority, subject to the consent of a sort of upper house, the general assembly of the patrician body; he identifies this assembly with the 'comitia curiata.' . . . Mommsen's method of dealing with the question" is to strike out the Valerio-Horatian law and that of Publilius Philo from the series of enactments relating to the plebs. "He believes that both these laws regulated the proceedings of the 'comitia populi tributa,' and are transferred by a mere blunder of our authorities to the 'concilium plebis tributum.'. . . But the supposition of a possible blunder is too small a foundation on which to establish such an explanation. . . . I believe that, for the purpose of showing how the legislative power of the plebs may gradually have established itself, the known powers of the sovereign 'populus,' of the magistrates of the Roman people, and of the senate, will supply us with sufficient material; and that the assumptions of the German historians are therefore unnecessary. . . . I imagine . . . that the law of Valerius and Horatius simply recognised de jure the power which Icilius [see above: B. C. 456] had exercised de facto: that is to say, it ordered the consul to bring any petition of the plebs at once to the notice of the senate, and empowered the tribune to plead his cause before the senate; perhaps it went further and deprived the consul of his right of arbitrarily refusing to accede to the recommendation of the senate, if such were given, and directed that he should in such case convene the comitia and submit the proposal to its vote. If this restriction of the power of the consul removed the first obstacle in the way of tribunician bills supported by the vote of the plebs, another facility still remained to be given. The consul might be deprived of the opportunity of sheltering himself behind the moral responsibility of the senate. Does it not suggest itself as a plausible conjecture that the law of Publilius Philo struck out the intervening senatorial deliberation and compelled the consul to bring the petition of the plebs immediately before the 'comitia populi Romani'? If such were the tenor of the Publilian law, it would be only a very slight inaccuracy to describe it as conferring legislative power on the plebs. . . . The Hortensian law which formally transferred the sovereign power to the plebs would thus be a change greater de jure than de facto. . . . This power, if the theory put forward in these pages be correct, was placed within the reach of the plebeians by the law of Valerius and Horatius, and was fully secured to them by the law of Publilius Philo."—J. L. Strachan-Davidson, *The Growth of Plebeian Privilege at Rome* (*English Historical Rev., April,* 1886).—"With the passing of the Lex Hortensia the long struggle between the orders came to an end. The ancient patrician gentes remained, but the exclusive privileges of the patriciate as a ruling order were gone. For the great offices of state and for seats in the senate the plebeians were by law equally eligible with patricians. The assemblies, whether of people or plebs, were independent of patrician control. In private life inter-marriages between patricians and plebeians were recognised as lawful, and entailed no disabilities on the children. Finally, great as continued to be the prestige attaching to patrician birth, and prominent as was the part played in the subsequent history by individual patricians and by some of the patrician houses, the plebs were now in numbers and even in wealth the preponderant section of the people. Whatever struggles might arise in

the future, a second struggle between patricians and plebeians was an impossibility. Such being the case, it might have been expected that the separate organisation, to which the victory of the plebs was largely due, would, now that the reason for its existence was gone, have disappeared. Had this happened, the history of the republic might have been different. As it was, this plebeian machinery — the plebeian tribunes, assemblies, and resolutions—survived untouched, and lived to play a decisive part in a new conflict, not between patricians and plebeians, but between a governing class, itself mainly plebeian, and the mass of the people, and finally to place at the head of the state a patrician Cæsar. Nor was the promise of a genuine democracy, offered by the opening of the magistracies and the Hortensian law, fulfilled. For one hundred and fifty years afterwards the drift of events was in the opposite direction, and when the popular leaders of the first century B. C. endeavoured to make government by the people a reality, it was already too late."—H. F. Pelham, *Outlines of Roman Hist., bk.* 2, *ch.* 1.

B. C. 282-275. — War with Tarentum and Pyrrhus.—The conquest of the Samnites by the Romans, which was completed in 290 B. C., extended the power of the latter to the very gates of the Greek cities on the Tarentine gulf, of which Tarentum was the chief. At once there arose a party in Tarentum which foresaw the hopelessness of resistance to Roman aggression and favored a spontaneous submission to the supremacy of the formidable city on the Tiber. The patriotic party which opposed this humiliation looked abroad for aid, and found an eager ally in the Molossian king of Epirus, the adventurous and warlike Pyrrhus (see EPIRUS), who sprang from the family of Olympias, mother of Alexander the Great. In the autumn of 282 B. C., the inevitable war between Rome and Tarentum broke out, and early in 280 B. C. Pyrrhus landed a powerful army in Italy, comprising 20,000 heavy-armed foot-soldiers, 3,000 horse, 2,000 archers and 20 elephants. The Romans met him soon after at Heraclea, on the coast. It was the first collision of the Roman legion and the Macedonian phalanx, and the first encounter of the Latin soldier with the huge war-beast of the Asiatics. Pyrrhus won a bloody victory, but won it at such cost that it terrified him. He tried at once to arrange a peace, but the proud Romans made no terms with an invader. Next year he inflicted another great defeat upon them near Asculum, in Apulia; but nothing seemed to come of it, and the indomitable Romans were as little conquered as ever. Then the restless Epirot king took his much shaken army over to Sicily and joined the Greeks there in their war with the Carthaginians. The latter were driven out of all parts of the island except Lilybæum; but failing, after a long siege, to reduce Lilybæum, Pyrrhus lost the whole fruits of his success. The autumn of 276 B. C. found him back again in Italy, where the Romans, during his absence of three years, had recovered much ground. Next year, in the valley of Beneventum, they had their revenge upon him for Heraclea and Asculum, and he was glad to take the shattered remains of his army back to Greece. His career of ambition and adventure was ended three years afterwards (see MACEDONIA: B. C. 277–244), under the walls of Argos, by a tile which a woman flung down upon his head. In due time all Magna Græcia succumbed to the dominion of Rome, and the commerce and wealth of Tarentum passed over under Roman auspices to the new port of Brundisium, on the Adriatic side of the same promontory.—T. Arnold, *Hist. of Rome, ch.* 36–37 (*v.* 2).

ALSO IN: W. Ihne, *Hist. of Rome, bk.* 3, *ch.* 14–17.

B. C. 275. — Union of Italy under the sovereignty of the republic. — Differing relations of the subject communities to the sovereign state.—Roman citizenship as variously qualified.—"For the first time Italy was united into one state under the sovereignty of the Roman community. What political privileges the Roman community on this occasion withdrew from the various other Italian communities and took into its own sole keeping, or in other words, what conception of political power is to be associated with this sovereignty of Rome, we are nowhere expressly informed. . . . The only privileges that demonstrably belonged to it were the right of making war, of concluding treaties, and of coining money. No Italian community could declare war against any foreign state, or even negotiate with it, or coin money for circulation. On the other hand, every war and every state-treaty resolved upon by the Roman people were binding in law on all the other Italian communities, and the silver money of Rome was legally current throughout all Italy. It is probable that formerly the general rights of the leading community extended no further. But to these rights there was necessarily attached a prerogative of sovereignty that practically went far beyond them. The relations, which the Italians sustained to the leading community, exhibited in detail great inequalities. In this point of view, in addition to the full burgesses of Rome, there were three different classes of subjects to be distinguished. The full franchise itself, in the first place, was extended as far as was possible, without wholly abandoning the idea of an urban commonwealth in the case of the Roman commune. Not only was the old burgess-domain extended by individual assignation far into Etruria on the one hand and into Campania on the other, but, after the example was first set in the case of Tusculum, a great number of communities more or less remote were gradually incorporated with the Roman state and merged in it completely. . . . Accordingly the Roman burgess-body probably extended northward as far as the neighbourhood of Caere, eastward to the Apennines, and southward as far as, or beyond, Formiae. In its case, however, we cannot use the term 'boundaries' in a strict sense. Isolated communities within this region, such as Tibur, Praeneste, Signia, and Norba, had not the Roman franchise; others beyond its bounds, such as Sena, possessed it; and it is probable that families of Roman farmers were already dispersed throughout all Italy, either altogether isolated or associated in villages. Among the subject communities the most privileged and most important class was that of the Latin towns, which now embraced but few of the original participants in the Alban festival (and these, with the exception of Tibur and Praeneste, altogether insignificant communities), but on the other hand obtained accessions equally numerous and important in the autonomous communi-

ties founded by Rome in and even beyond Italy — the Latin colonies, as they were called — and was always increasing in consequence of new settlements of the same nature. These new urban communities of Roman origin, but with Latin rights, became more and more the real buttresses of the Roman rule. These Latins, however, were by no means those with whom the battles of the lake Regillus and Trifanum had been fought. . . . The Latins of the later times of the republic, on the contrary, consisted almost exclusively of communities, which from the beginning had honoured Rome as their capital and parent city; which, settled amidst peoples of alien language and of alien habits, were attached to Rome by community of language, of law, and of manners; which, as the petty tyrants of the surrounding districts, were obliged doubtless to lean on Rome for their very existence, like advanced posts leaning upon the main army. . . . The main advantage enjoyed by them, as compared with other subjects, consisted in their equalization with burgesses of the Roman community so far as regarded private rights — those of traffic and barter as well as those of inheritance. The Roman franchise was in future conferred only on such citizens of these townships as had filled a public magistracy in them: in that case, however, it was, apparently from the first, conferred without any limitation of rights. . . . The two other classes of Roman subjects, the subject Roman burgesses and the non-Latin allied communities, were in a far inferior position. The communities having the Roman franchise without the privilege of electing or being elected (civitas sine suffragio), approached nearer in form to the full Roman burgesses than the Latin communities that were legally autonomous. Their members were, as Roman burgesses, liable to all the burdens of citizenship, especially to the levy and taxation, and were subject to the Roman census; whereas, as their very designation indicates, they had no claim to its honorary rights. They lived under Roman laws, and had justice administered by Roman judges; but the hardship was lessened by the fact that their former common law was, after undergoing revision by Rome, restored to them as Roman local law, and a 'deputy' (praefectus) annually nominated by the Roman praetor was sent to them to conduct its administration. In other respects these communities retained their own administration, and chose for that purpose their own chief magistrates. . . . Lastly, the relations of the non-Latin allied communities were subject, as a matter of course, to very various rules, just as each particular treaty of alliance had defined them. Many of these perpetual treaties of alliance, such as that with the Hernican communities and those with Neapolis, Nola, and Heraclea, granted rights comparatively comprehensive, while others, such as the Tarentine and Samnite treaties, probably approximated to despotism. . . . The central administration at Rome solved the difficult problem of preserving its supervision and control over the mass of the Italian communities liable to furnish contingents, partly by means of the four Italian quaestors, partly by the extension of the Roman censorship over the whole of the dependent communities. The quaestors of the fleet, along with their more immediate duty, had to raise the revenues from the newly acquired domains and to control the contingents of the new allies; they were the first Roman functionaries to whom a residence and district out of Rome were assigned by law, and they formed the necessary intermediate authority between the Roman senate and the Italian communities. . . . Lastly, with this military administrative union of the whole peoples dwelling to the south of the Apennines, as far as the Iapygian promontory and the straits of Rhegium, was connected the rise of a new name common to them all — that of 'the men of the toga' (togati), which was their oldest designation in Roman state law, or that of the 'Italians,' which was the appellation originally in use among the Greeks and thence became universally current. . . . As the Gallic territory down to a late period stood contrasted in law with the Italian, so the 'men of the toga' were thus named in contrast to the Celtic 'men of the hose' (braccati); and it is probable that the repelling of the Celtic invasions played an important diplomatic part as a reason or pretext for centralizing the military resources of Italy in the hands of the Romans. . . . The name Italia, which originally and even in the Greek authors of the 5th century — in Aristotle for instance — pertained only to the modern Calabria, was transferred to the whole land of these wearers of the toga. The earliest boundaries of this great armed confederacy led by Rome, or of the new Italy, reached on the western coast as far as the district of Leghorn south of the Arnus, on the east as far as the Aesis north of Ancona. . . . The new Italy had thus become a political unity; it was also in the course of becoming a national unity."—T. Mommsen, *Hist. of Rome, bk.* 2, *ch.* 7 (*v.* 1).

B. C. 264-241.—The first Punic War.—Conquest of Sicily.—"The ten years preceding the First Punic War were probably a time of the greatest physical prosperity which the mass of the Roman people ever knew. Within twenty years two agrarian laws had been passed on a most extensive scale, and the poorer citizens had received besides what may be called a large dividend in money out of the lands which the state had conquered. In addition to this, the farming of the state domains, or of their produce, furnished those who had money with abundant opportunities of profitable adventure. . . . No wonder, then, that war was at this time popular. . . . But our 'pleasant vices' are ever made instruments to scourge us; and the First Punic War, into which the Roman people forced the senate to enter, not only in its long course bore most heavily upon the poorer citizens, but, from the feelings of enmity which it excited in the breast of Hamilcar, led most surely to that fearful visitation of Hannibal's sixteen years' invasion of Italy, which destroyed for ever, not indeed the pride of the Roman dominion, but the well-being of the Roman people."—T. Arnold, *Hist. of Rome, pp.* 538-540.—"The occasion of the First Punic War was dishonourable to Rome. Certain mercenary soldiers had seized Messana in Sicily, destroyed the citizens, and held possession against the Syracusans, 284 B. C. They were beaten in the field, and blockaded in Messana by Hiero, king of Syracuse, and then, driven to extremity, sent a deputation to Rome, praying that 'the Romans, the sovereigns of Italy, would not suffer an Italian people to be destroyed by Greeks and Carthaginians,' 264 B. C. It was singular that such a request should be made to

the Romans, who only six years before had chastised the military revolt of their brethren Mamertines in Rhegium, taking the city by storm, scourging and beheading the defenders, and then restoring the old inhabitants (270 B. C.). The senate was opposed to the request of the Messana deputation; but the consuls and the people of Rome, already jealous of Carthaginian influence in Sicily and the Mediterranean, resolved to protect the Mamertine buccaneers and to receive them as their friends and allies. Thus dishonestly and disgracefully did the Romans depart from their purely Italian and continental policy, which had so well succeeded, to enter upon another system, the results of which no one then could foresee. Some excuse may be found in the fact that the Carthaginians had been placed by their partisans in Messana in possession of the citadel, and this great rival power of Carthage was thus brought unpleasantly near to the recent conquered territory of Rome. The fear of Carthaginian influence overcame the natural reluctance to an alliance with traitors false to their military oath, the murderers and plunderers of a city which they were bound to protect. Thus began 'the First Punic War, which lasted, without intermission, 22 years, a longer space of time than the whole period occupied by the wars of the French Revolution.' In this war Duilius won the first naval battle near Mylæ (Melarro). Regulus invaded Africa proper, the territory of Carthage, with great success, until beaten and taken prisoner at Zama, 256–255 B. C. The war was carried on in Sicily and on the sea until 241 B. C., when peace was made on conditions that the Carthaginians should evacuate Sicily and make no war upon Hiero, king of Sicily (the ally of the Romans), that they should pay 3,200 Euboic talents (about £110,000) within ten years, 241 B. C. The effects of an exhausting war were soon overcome by ancient nations, so that both Rome and Carthage rapidly recovered, 'because wars in those days were not maintained at the expense of posterity.' Rome had to check the Illyrian pirates and to complete the conquest of Cisalpine Gaul and the Ligurians 238–221 B. C. Meanwhile the Carthaginians, hampered by a three years' rebellion of its mercenary troops, quietly permitted the Romans to take possession of Corsica and Sardinia, and agreed to pay 1,200 talents as compensation to Roman merchants. On the other hand, measures were in process to re-establish the Carthaginian power; the patriotic party, the Barcine family, under Hamilcar, commenced the carrying out of the extensions and consolidations of the territories in Spain."—W. B. Boyce, *Introd. to the Study of Hist., period* 4, *sect.* 4.

Also in: Polybius, *Histories, bk.* 1.—R. B. Smith, *Carthage, ch.* 4–7.—A. J. Church, *The Story of Carthage, pt.* 4, *ch.* 1–3.—See, also, Punic War, The First.

B. C. 218-211.—The Second Punic War; Hannibal in Italy.—Cannæ.—"Twenty-three years passed between the end of the first Punic War and the beginning of the second. But in the meanwhile the Romans got possession, rather unfairly, of the islands of Sardinia and Corsica, which Carthage had kept by the peace. On the other hand a Carthaginian dominion was growing up in Spain under Hamilcar Barkas, one of the greatest men that Carthage ever reared, his son-in-law Hasdrubal, and his son Hannibal, the greatest man of all, and probably the greatest general that the world ever saw. Another quarrel arose between Carthage and Rome, when Hannibal took the Spanish town of Saguntum, which the Romans claimed as an ally. War began in 218, and Hannibal carried it on by invading Italy by land. This was one of the most famous enterprises in all history. Never was Rome so near destruction as in the war with Hannibal. He crossed the Alps and defeated the Romans in four battles, the greatest of which was that of Cannae in B. C. 216."—E. A. Freeman, *Outlines of Hist. (or Gen'l Sketch of European Hist.), ch.* 3.—"The first battle was fought (218) on the river Ticinus, which runs into the Padus from the north. The Romans were driven back, and Hannibal passed the Padus. Meanwhile another Roman army had come up, and its general, the consul, Tiberius Sempronius Longus, wanted to fight at once. The little river of the Trebbia lay between the two armies, and on a cold morning the Roman general marched his soldiers through the water against Hannibal. The Romans were entirely beaten, and driven out of Gaul. All northern Italy had thus passed under Hannibal's power, and its people were his friends; so next year, 217, Hannibal went into Etruria, and marched south towards Rome itself, plundering as he went. The Roman consul, Caius Flaminius Nepos, went to meet him, and a battle was fought on the shores of the Lake Trasimenus. It was a misty day, and the Romans, who were marching after Hannibal, were surrounded by him and taken by surprise: they were entirely beaten, and the consul was killed in battle. Then the Romans were in great distress, and elected a dictator, Quintus Fabius Maximus. He saw that it was no use to fight battles with Hannibal, so he followed him about, and watched him, and did little things against him when he could: so he was called 'Cunctator,' or 'the Delayer.' But, although this plan of waiting was very useful, the Romans did not like it, for Hannibal was left to plunder as he thought fit, and there was always danger that the other Italians would join him against Rome. So next year, 216, the Romans made a great attempt to get rid of him. They sent both the consuls with an army twice as large as Hannibal's, but again they were defeated at Cannæ. They lost 70,000 men, while Hannibal only lost 6,000: all their best soldiers were killed, and it seemed as though they had no hope left. But nations are not conquered only by the loss of battles. Hannibal hoped, after the battle of Cannæ, that the Italians would all come to his side, and leave Rome. Some did so, but all the Latin cities, and all the Roman colonies held by Rome. So long as this was the case, Rome was not yet conquered. Hannibal could win battles very quickly, but it would take him a long time to besiege all the cities that still held to Rome, and for that he must have a larger army. But he could not get more soldiers,—the Romans had sent an army into Spain, and Hannibal's brother, Hasdrubal, was busy fighting the Romans there, and could not send any troops to Italy. The Carthaginians also would not send any, for they were becoming afraid of Hannibal, and they did not know anything about Italy. So they answered his letters, asking for more men, by saying, that if he had won such great battles, he

ought not to want any more troops. At Cannæ, then, Hannibal had struck his greatest blow: he could do no more. The Romans had learned to wait, and be careful: so they fought no more great battles, but every year they grew stronger and Hannibal grew weaker. The chief town that had gone over to Hannibal's side was Capua, but in 211 the Romans took it again, and Hannibal was not strong enough to prevent them. The chief men of Capua were so afraid of falling into the hands of the Romans that they all poisoned themselves. After this all the Italian cities that had joined Hannibal began to leave him again." —M. Creighton, *Hist. of Rome, ch.* 3.

Also in: T. A. Dodge, *Hannibal, ch.* 11–39.—T. Arnold, *Hist. of Rome, ch.* 43–47.—See, also, Punic War, The Second.

B. C. 214-146.—The Macedonian Wars.—Conquest of Greece. See Greece: B. C. 214–146; also 280–146.

B. C. 211.—The Second Punic War: Hannibal at the gates.—In the eighth year of the Second Punic War (B. C. 211), when fortune had begun to desert the arms of Hannibal — when Capua, his ally and mainstay in Italy was under siege by the Romans and he was powerless to relieve the doomed senators and citizens — the Carthaginian commander made a sudden march upon Rome. He moved his army to the gates of his great enemy, "not with any hope of taking the city, but with the hope that the Romans, panic-stricken at the realization of a fear they had felt for five years past, would summon the consuls from the walls of Capua. But the cool head of Fabius, who was in Rome, guessed the meaning of that manœuvre, and would only permit one of the consuls, Flaccus, to be recalled. Thus the leaguer of the rebel city was not broken. Hannibal failed in his purpose, but he left an indellible impression of his terrible presence upon the Roman mind. Looming through a mist of romantic fable, unconquerable, pitiless, he was actually seen touching the walls of Rome, hurling with his own hand a spear into the sacred Pomoerium. He had marched along the Via Latina, driving crowds of fugitives before him, who sought refuge in the city. . . . He had fixed his camp on the Anio, within three miles of the Esquiline. To realize the state of feeling in Rome during those days of panic would be to get at the very heart of the Hannibalic war. The Senate left the Curia and sat in the Forum, to reassure, by their calm composure, the excited crowds. Fabius noticed from the battlements that the ravagers spared his property. It was a cunning attempt on the part of Hannibal to bring suspicion on him; but he forthwith offered the property for sale; and such was the effect of his quiet confidence that the market price even of the land on which the camp of the enemy was drawn never fell an 'as.' . . . Hannibal marched away into the Sabine country, and made his way back to Tarentum, Rome unsacked, Capua unrelieved."—R. F. Horton, *Hist. of the Romans, ch.* 12.

Also in: T. Arnold, *Hist. of Rome, ch.* 44.—T. A. Dodge, *Hannibal, ch.* 34.

B. C. 211-202.—The Second Punic War: Defeat of Hasdrubal at the Metaurus.—The war in Africa.—The end at Zama.—Acquisition of Spain.—"The conquest of Capua was the turning point in the war. Hannibal lost his stronghold in Campania and was obliged to retire to the southern part of Italy. Rome was gaining everywhere. The Italians who had joined Hannibal began to lose confidence. Salapia and many towns in Samnium were betrayed to the Romans. But when Fulvius, the proconsul who commanded in Apulia, appeared before Herdonea, which he hoped to gain possession of by treachery, Hannibal marched from Bruttium, attacked the Roman army, and gained a brilliant victory. In the following year the Romans recovered several places in Lucania and Bruttium, and Fabius Maximus crowned his long military career with the recapture of Tarentum (B. C. 209). The inhabitants were sold as slaves; the town was plundered and the works of art were sent to Rome. The next year Marcellus, for the fifth time elected to the consulship, was surprised near Venusia and killed. . . . The war had lasted ten years, yet its favorable conclusion seemed far off. There were increasing symptoms of discontent among the allies, while the news from Spain left little doubt that the long prepared expedition of Hasdrubal over the Alps to join his brother in Italy was at last to be realized. Rome strained every nerve to meet the impending danger. The number of legions was increased from twenty-one to twenty-three. The preparations were incomplete, when the news came that Hasdrubal was crossing the Alps by the same route which his brother had taken eleven years before. The consuls for the new year were M. Livius Salinator and G. Claudius Nero. Hannibal, at the beginning of spring, after reorganizing his force in Bruttium, advanced northward, encountered the consul Nero at Grumentum, whence, after a bloody but indecisive battle, he continued his march to Canusium. Here he waited for news from his brother. The expected despatch was intercepted by Nero, who formed the bold resolution of joining his colleague in the north, and with their united armies crushing Hasdrubal while Hannibal was waiting for the expected despatch. Hasdrubal had appointed a rendezvous with his brother in Umbria, whence with their united armies they were both to advance on Narnia and Rome. Nero, selecting from his army 7,000 of the best soldiers and 1,000 cavalry, left his camp so quietly that Hannibal knew nothing of his departure. Near Sena he found his colleague Livius, and in the night entered his camp that his arrival might not be known to the Carthaginians. Hasdrubal, when he heard the trumpet sound twice from the Roman camp and saw the increased numbers, was no longer ignorant that both consuls were in front of him. Thinking that his brother had been defeated, he resolved to retire across the Metaurus and wait for accurate information. Missing his way, wandering up and down the river to find a ford, pursued and attacked by the Romans, he was compelled to accept battle. Although in an unfavorable position, a deep river in his rear, his troops exhausted by marching all night, still the victory long hung in suspense. Hasdrubal displayed all the qualities of a great general, and when he saw that all was lost, he plunged into the thickest of the battle and was slain. The consul returned to Apulia with the same rapidity with which he had come. He announced to Hannibal the defeat and death of his brother by casting Hasdrubal's head within the outposts and by sending two Carthaginian captives to give

him an account of the disastrous battle. 'I foresee the doom of Carthage,' said Hannibal sadly, when he recognized the bloody head of his brother. This battle decided the war in Italy. Hannibal withdrew his garrisons from the towns in southern Italy, retired to the peninsula of Bruttium, where for four long years, in that wild and mountainous country, with unabated courage and astounding tenacity, the dying lion clung to the land that had been so long the theatre of his glory. . . . The time had come to carry into execution that expedition to Africa which Sempronius had attempted in the beginning of the war. Publius Scipio, on his return from Spain, offered himself for the consulship and was unanimously elected. His design was to carry the war into Africa and in this way compel Carthage to recall Hannibal. . . . The senate finally consented that he should cross from his province of Sicily to Africa, but they voted no adequate means for such an expedition. Scipio called for volunteers. The whole of the year B. C. 205 passed away before he completed his preparations. Meanwhile the Carthaginians made one last effort to help Hannibal. Mago, Hannibal's youngest brother, was sent to Liguria with 14,000 men to rouse the Ligurians and Gauls to renew the war on Rome; but having met a Roman army under Quintilius Varus, and being wounded in the engagement which followed, his movements were so crippled that nothing of importance was accomplished. In the spring of B. C. 204 Scipio had completed his preparations. He embarked his army from Lilybæum, and after three days landed at the Fair Promontory near Utica. After laying siege to Utica all summer, he was compelled to fall back and entrench himself on the promontory. Masinissa had joined him immediately on his arrival. By his advice Scipio planned a night attack on Hasdrubal, the son of Gisgo, and Syphax, who were encamped near Utica. This enterprise was completely successful. A short time afterwards Hasdrubal and Syphax were again defeated. Syphax fled to Numidia, where he was followed by Lælius and Masinissa and compelled to surrender. These successes convinced the Carthaginians that with the existing forces the Roman invasion could not long be resisted. Therefore they opened negotiations for peace with Scipio, in order probably to gain time to recall their generals from Italy. The desire of Scipio to bring the war to a conclusion induced him to agree upon preliminaries of peace, subject to the approval of the Roman senate and people. . . . Meanwhile the arrival of Hannibal at Hadrumetum had so encouraged the Carthaginians that the armistice had been broken before the return of the ambassadors from Rome. All hopes of peace by negotiation vanished, and Scipio prepared to renew the war, which, since the arrival of Hannibal, had assumed a more serious character. The details of the operations which ended in the battle of Zama are but imperfectly known. The decisive battle was fought on the river Bagradas, near Zama, on the 19th of October, B. C. 202. Hannibal managed the battle with his usual skill. His veterans fought like the men who had so often conquered in Italy, but his army was annihilated. The elephants were rendered unavailing by Scipio's skillful management. Instead of the three lines of battle, with the usual intervals, Scipio arranged his companies behind each other like the rounds of a ladder. Through these openings the elephants could pass without breaking the line. This battle terminated the long struggle. . . . Hannibal himself advised peace."—R. F. Leighton, *Hist. of Rome, ch.* 23–24.—"Scipio prepared as though he would besiege the city, but his heart also inclined to peace. . . . The terms which he offered were severe enough, and had the Carthaginians only realised what they involved, they would surely have asked to be allowed to meet their fate at once. They were to retain indeed their own laws and their home domain in Africa; but they were to give up all the deserters and prisoners of war, all their elephants, and all their ships of the line but ten. They were not to wage war, either in Africa or outside of it, without the sanction of the Roman Senate. They were to recognise Massinissa as the king of Numidia, and, with it, the prescriptive right which he would enjoy of plundering and annoying them at his pleasure, while they looked on with their hands tied, not daring to make reprisals. Finally, they were to give up all claim to the rich islands of the Mediterranean and to the Spanish kingdom, the creation of the Barcides, of which the fortune of war had already robbed them; and thus shorn of the sources of their wealth, they were to pay within a given term of seven years a crushing war contribution! Henceforward, in fact, they would exist on sufferance only, and that the sufferance of the Romans. . . . The conclusion of the peace was celebrated at Carthage by a cruel sight, the most cruel which the citizens could have beheld, except the destruction of the city itself — the destruction of their fleet. Five hundred vessels, the pride and glory of the Phœnician race, the symbol and the seal of the commerce, the colonisation, and the conquests of this most imperial of Phœnician cities, were towed out of the harbour and were deliberately burned in the sight of the citizens."—R. B. Smith, *Rome and Carthage: the Punic Wars, ch.* 17.

Also in: H. G. Liddell, *Hist. of Rome, ch.* 31–34.—See, also, Punic War: The Second.

B. C. 2d Century.—Greek influences. See Hellenic genius and influence.

B. C. 191.—War with Antiochus the Great of Syria.—First conquests in Asia Minor bestowed on the king of Pergamum and the Republic of Rhodes. See Seleucidæ: B. C. 224–187.

B. C. 189-139.—Wars with the Lusitanians. See Portugal: Early history; and Lusitania.

B. C. 184-149.—The Spoils of Conquest and the Corruption they wrought.—"The victories of the last half-century seemed to promise ease and wealth to Rome. She was to live on the spoils and revenue from the conquered countries. Not only did they pay a fixed tax to her exchequer, but the rich lands of Capua, the royal domain lands of the kings of Syracuse and of Macedonia, became public property, and produced a large annual rent. It was found possible in 167 to relieve citizens from the property tax or tributum, which was not collected again until the year after the death of Iulius Caesar. But the sudden influx of wealth had the usual effect of raising the standard of expense; and new tastes and desires required increased means for their gratification. All manner of luxuries were finding their way into the city from the East. Splen-

did furniture, costly ornaments, wanton dances and music for their banquets, became the fashion among the Roman nobles; and the younger men went to lengths of debauchery and extravagance hitherto unknown. The result to many was financial embarrassment, from which relief was sought in malversation and extortion. The old standard of honour in regard to public money was distinctly lowered, and cases of misconduct and oppression were becoming more common and less reprobated. . . . The fashionable taste for Greek works of art, in the adornment of private houses, was another incentive to plunder, and in 149 it was for the first time found necessary to establish a permanent court or 'quaestio' for cases of malversation in the provinces. Attempts were indeed made to restrain the extravagance which was at the root of the evil. In 184 Cato, as censor, had imposed a tax on the sale of slaves under twenty above a certain price, and on personal ornaments above a certain value; and though the 'lex Oppia,' limiting the amount of women's jewelry, had been repealed in spite of him in 195, other sumptuary laws were passed. A 'lex Orchia' in 182 limited the number of guests, a 'lex Fannia' in 161 the amount to be spent on banquets; while a 'lex Didia' in 143 extended the operation of the law to all Italy. And though such laws, even if enforced, could not really remedy the evil, they perhaps had a certain effect in producing a sentiment; for long afterwards we find overcrowded dinners regarded as indecorous and vulgar. Another cause, believed by some to be unfavourably affecting Roman character, was the growing influence of Greek culture and Greek teachers. For many years the education of the young, once regarded as the special business of the parents, had been passing into the hands of Greek slaves or freedmen. . . . On the superiority of Greek culture there was a division of opinion. The Scipios and their party patronised Greek philosophy and literature. . . . This tendency, which went far beyond a mere question of literary taste, was opposed by a party of which M. Porcius Cato was the most striking member. . . . In Cato's view the reform needed was a return to the old ways, before Rome was infected by Greece."—E. S. Shuckburgh, *Hist. of Rome to the Battle of Actium, ch.* 32.

B. C. 159-133.—Decline of the Republic.—Social and economic causes.—The growing system of Slavery and its effects.—Monopoly of land by capitalists.—Extinction of small cultivators.—Rapid decrease of citizens.—"In the Rome of this epoch the two evils of a degenerate oligarchy and a democracy not yet developed but already cankered in the bud were interwoven in a manner pregnant with fatal results. According to their party names, which were first heard during this period, the 'Optimates' wished to give effect to the will of the best, the 'Populares' to that of the community; but in fact there was in the Rome of that day neither a true aristocracy nor a truly self-determining community. Both parties contended alike for shadows. . . . Both were equally affected by political corruption, and both were in fact equally worthless. . . . The commonwealth was politically and morally more and more unhinged, and was verging towards its total dissolution. The crisis with which the Roman revolution was opened arose not out of this paltry political conflict, but out of the economic and social relations which the Roman government allowed, like everything else, simply to take their course"; and which had brought about "the depreciation of the Italian farms; the supplanting of the petty husbandry, first in a part of the provinces and then in Italy, by the farming of large estates; the prevailing tendency to devote the latter in Italy to the rearing of cattle and the culture of the olive and vine; finally, the replacing of the free labourers in the provinces as in Italy by slaves. . . . Before we attempt to describe the course of this second great conflict between labour and capital, it is necessary to give here some indication of the nature and extent of the system of slavery. We have not now to do with the old, in some measure innocent, rural slavery, under which the farmer either tilled the field along with his slave, or, if he possessed more land than he could manage, placed the slave . . . over a detached farm. . . . What we now refer to is the system of slavery on a great scale, which in the Roman state, as formerly in the Carthaginian, grew out of the ascendancy of capital. While the captives taken in war and the hereditary transmission of slavery sufficed to keep up the stock of slaves during the earlier period, this system of slavery was, just like that of America, based on the methodically prosecuted hunting of man. . . . No country where this species of game could be hunted remained exempt from visitation; even in Italy it was a thing by no means unheard of, that the poor free man was placed by his employer among the slaves. But the Negroland of that period was western Asia, where the Cretan and Cilician corsairs, the real professional slave-hunters and slave-dealers, robbed the coasts of Syria and the Greek islands; and where, emulating their feats, the Roman revenue-farmers instituted human hunts in the client states and incorporated those whom they captured among their slaves. . . . At the great slave market in Delos, where the slave-dealers of Asia Minor disposed of their wares to Italian speculators, on one day as many as 10,000 slaves are said to have been disembarked in the morning and to have been all sold before evening. . . . In whatever direction speculation applied itself, its instrument was invariably man reduced in the eye of the law to a brute. Trades were in great part carried on by slaves, so that the proceeds belonged to the master. The levying of the public revenues in the lower departments was regularly conducted by the slaves of the associations that leased them. Servile hands performed the operations of mining, making pitch, and others of a similar kind; it became early the custom to send herds of slaves to the Spanish mines. . . . The tending of cattle was universally performed by slaves. . . . But far worse in every respect was the plantation system proper—the cultivation of the fields by a band of slaves not unfrequently branded with iron, who with shackles on their legs performed the labours of the field under overseers during the day, and were locked up together by night in the common, frequently subterranean, labourers' prison. This plantation system had migrated from the East to Carthage, . . . and seems to have been brought by the Carthaginians to Sicily. . . . The abyss of misery and woe which opens before our eyes in this most miserable of all proletariates, we

the first frumentarian law (lex frumentaria) as it was called, by which corn was bought with public money, and stored, for sale to Roman citizens at a nominal price. After three years of power, through the favor of the people, he, too, in 121 B. C. was deserted by them and the party of the patricians was permitted to put him to death, with a great number of his supporters.— G. Long, *Decline of the Roman Republic, v.* 1, *ch.* 10–13, 18–19.—"Caius, it is said, was the first Roman statesman who appointed a regular distribution of corn among the poorer citizens, requiring the state to buy up large consignments of grain from the provinces, and to sell it again at a fixed rate below the natural price. The nobles themselves seem to have acquiesced without alarm in this measure, by which they hoped to secure the city from seditious movements in time of scarcity; but they failed to foresee the discouragement it would give to industry, the crowds of idle and dissipated citizens it would entice into the forum, the appetite it would create for shows, entertainments and largesses, and the power it would thus throw into the hands of unprincipled demagogues. Caius next established customs duties upon various articles of luxury imported into the city for the use of the rich; he decreed the gratuitous supply of clothing to the soldiers, who had hitherto been required to provide themselves out of their pay; he founded colonies for the immediate gratification of the poorer citizens, who were waiting in vain for the promised distribution of lands; he caused the construction of public granaries, bridges and roads, to furnish objects of useful labour to those who were not unwilling to work. Caius himself, it is said, directed the course and superintended the making of the roads, some of which we may still trace traversing Italy in straight lines from point to point, filling up depressions and hollowing excrescences in the face of the country, and built upon huge substructions of solid masonry. Those who most feared and hated him confessed their amazement at the magnificence of his projects and the energy of his proceedings; the people, in whose interests he toiled, were filled with admiration and delight, when they saw him attended from morning to night by crowds of contractors, artificers, ambassadors, magistrates, soldiers, and men of learning, to all of whom he was easy of access, adapting his behaviour to the condition of each in turn; thus proving, as they declared, the falsehood of those who presumed to call him violent and tyrannical. . . . By these innovations Caius laid a wide basis of popularity. Thereupon he commenced his meditated attack upon the privileged classes. We possess at least one obscure intimation of a change he effected or proposed in the manner of voting by centuries, which struck at the influence of the wealthier classes. He confirmed and extended the Porcian law, for the protection of citizens against the aggression of the magistrates without a formal appeal to the people. Even the powers of the dictatorship, to which the senate had been wont to resort for the coercion of its refractory opponents, were crippled by these provisions; and we shall see that no recourse was again had to this extraordinary and odious appointment till the oligarchy had gained for a time a complete victory over their adversaries. Another change, even more important, was that by which the knights were admitted to the greater share, if not, as some suppose, to the whole, of the judicial appointments. . . . As long as the senators were the judges, the provincial governors, who were themselves senators, were secure from the consequence of impeachment. If the knights were to fill the same office, it might be expected that the publicani, the farmers of the revenues abroad, would be not less assured of impunity, whatever were the enormity of their exactions. . . . It was vain, indeed, to expect greater purity from the second order of citizens than from the first. If the senators openly denied justice to complainants, the knights almost as openly sold it. This was in itself a grievous degradation of the tone of public morality; but this was not all the evil of the tribune's reform. It arrayed the two privileged classes of citizens in direct hostility to one another. 'Caius made the republic double-headed,' was the profound remark of antiquity. He sowed the seeds of a war of an hundred years. Tiberius had attempted to raise up a class of small proprietors, who, by the simplicity of their manners and moderation of their tastes, might form, as he hoped, a strong conservative barrier between the tyranny of the nobles and the envy of the people; but Caius, on the failure of this attempt, was content to elevate a class to power, who should touch upon both extremes of the social scale,—the rich by their wealth, and the poor by their origin. Unfortunately this was to create not a new class, but a new party. . . . One direct advantage, at all events, Caius expected to derive, besides the humiliation of his brother's murderers, from this elevation of the knights: he hoped to secure their grateful co-operation towards the important object he next had in view: this was no less than the full admission of the Latins and Italians to the right of suffrage."—C. Merivale, *The Fall of the Roman Republic, ch.* 1.

Also in: Plutarch, *Tiberius Gracchus; Caius Gracchus.*—T. Mommsen, *Hist. of Rome, bk.* 4, *ch.* 2–3 (*v.* 3).—S. Eliot, *Liberty of Rome: Rome, bk.* 3, *ch.* 1.—See, also, Ager Publicus.

B. C. 125-121.—Conquest of the Salyes and Allobroges in Gaul.—Treaty of friendship with the Ædui. See Salyes; Allobroges; and Ædui.

B. C. 118-99.—Increasing corruption of government.—The Jugurthine War.—Invasion and defeat of the Cimbri and Teutones.—The power of Marius.—"After the death of Caius Gracchus, the nobles did what they pleased in Rome. They paid no more attention to the Agrarian Law, and the state of Italy grew worse and worse. . . . The nobles cared nothing for Rome's honour, but only for their own pockets. They governed badly, and took bribes from foreign kings, who were allowed to do what they liked if they could pay enough. This was especially seen in a war that took place in Africa. After Carthage had been destroyed, the greatest state in Africa was Numidia. The king of Numidia was a friend of the Roman people, and had fought with them against Carthage. So Rome had a good deal to do with Numidia, and the Numidians often helped Rome in her wars. In 118 a king of Numidia died, and left the kingdom to his two sons and an adopted son named Jugurtha. Jugurtha determined to have the kingdom all to himself, so he murdered one of the sons and made war upon the other, who

applied to Rome for help [see NUMIDIA: B. C. 118–104]. The Senate was bribed by Jugurtha, and did all it could to please him; at last, however, Jugurtha besieged his brother in Cirta, and when he took the city put him and all his army to death (112). After this the Romans thought they must interfere, but the Senate for more money were willing to let Jugurtha off very easily. He came to Rome to excuse himself before the people, and whilst he was there he had a Numidian prince, of whom he was afraid, murdered in Rome itself. But his bribes were stronger than the laws. . . . The Romans declared war against Jugurtha, but he bribed the generals, and for three years very little was done against him. At last, in 108, a good general, who would not take bribes, Quintus Metellus, went against him and defeated him. Metellus would have finished the war, but in 106 the command was taken from him by Caius Marius the consul. This Caius Marius was a man of low birth, but a good soldier. He had risen in war by his bravery, and had held magistracies in Rome. He was an officer in the army of Metellus, and was very much liked by the common soldiers, for he was a rough man like themselves, and talked with them, and lived as they did. . . . Marius left Africa and went to Rome to try and be made consul in 106. He found fault with Metellus before the people, and said that he could carry on the war better himself. So the people made him consul, and more than that, they said that he should be general in Africa instead of Metellus. . . . Marius finished the war in Africa, and brought Jugurtha in triumph to Italy in 104. . . . When it was over, Marius was the most powerful man in Rome. He was the leader of the popular party, and also the general of the army. The army had greatly changed since the time of Hannibal. The Roman soldiers were no longer citizens who fought when their country wanted them, and then went back to their work. But as wars were now constantly going on, and going on too in distant countries, this could no longer be the case, and the army was full of men who took to a soldier's life as a trade. Marius was the favourite of these soldiers: he was a soldier by trade himself, and had risen in consequence to power in the state. Notice, then, that when Marius was made consul, it was a sign that the government for the future was to be carried on by the army, as well as by the people and the nobles. Marius was soon wanted to carry on another war. Two great tribes of barbarians from the north had entered Gaul west of the Alps, and threatened to drive out the Romans, and even attack Italy. They came with their wives and children, like a wandering people looking for a home. . . . At first these Cimbri defeated the Roman generals in southern Gaul, where the Romans had conquered the country along the Rhone, and made it a province, which is still called the province, or Provence. The Romans, after this defeat, were afraid of another burning of their city by barbarians, so Marius was made consul again, and for the next five years he was elected again and again. . . . In the year 102 the Teutones and the Cimbri marched to attack Italy, but Marius defeated them in two great battles [see CIMBRI AND TEUTONES: B. C. 113–102]. Afterwards when he went back to Rome in triumph he was so powerful that he could have done what he chose in the state. The people were very grateful to him, the soldiers were very fond of him, and the nobles were very much afraid of him. But Marius did not think much of the good of the state: he thought much more of his own greatness, and how he might become a still greater man. So, first, he joined the party of the people, and one of the tribunes, Lucius Appuleius Saturninus, brought forward some laws like those of Caius Gracchus, and Marius helped him. But there were riots in consequence, and the Senate begged Marius to help them in putting down the riots. For a time Marius doubted what to do, but at last he armed the people, and Saturninus was killed (99). But now neither side liked Marius, for he was true to neither, and did only what he thought would make himself most powerful. So for the future Marius was not likely to be of much use in the troubles of the Roman state."—M. Creighton, *Hist. of Rome* (*Primer*), *ch.* 7.

ALSO IN: H. G. Liddell, *Hist. of Rome, ch.* 54–56 (*v.* 2).—V. Duruy, *Hist. of Rome, ch.* 39–41 (*v.* 2).—Plutarch, *Marius.*

B. C. 90–88.—Demands of the Italian Socii for Roman citizenship.—The Marsian or Social War.—Rise of Sulla.—"It is a most erroneous though widely prevalent opinion that the whole of Italy was conquered by the force of Roman arms, and joined to the empire [of the Republic] against its will. Roman valour and the admirable organization of the legions, it is true, contributed to extend the dominion of Rome, but they were not nearly so effective as the political wisdom of the Roman senate. . . . The subjects of Rome were called by the honourable name of allies (Socii). But the manner in which they had become allies was not always the same. It differed widely according to circumstances. Some had joined Rome on an equal footing by a free alliance ('fœdus æquum'), which implied nothing like subjection. . . . Others sought the alliance of Rome as a protection from pressing enemies or troublesome neighbours. . . . On the whole, the condition of the allies, Latin colonies as well as confederated Italians, seems to have been satisfactory, at least in the earlier period. . . . But even the right of self-government which Rome had left to the Italian communities proved an illusion in all cases where the interests of the ruling town seemed to require it. A law passed in Rome, nay, a simple senatorial decree, or a magisterial order, could at pleasure be applied to the whole of Italy. Roman law gradually took the place of local laws, though the Italians had no part in the legislation of the Roman people, or any influence on the decrees of the Roman senate and magistrates. . . . All public works in Italy, such as roads, aqueducts, and temples, were carried out solely for the benefit of Rome. . . . Not in peace only, but also in the time of war, the allies were gradually made to feel how heavily the hand of Rome weighed upon them. . . . In proportion as with the increase of their power the Romans felt more and more secure and independent of the allies, they showed them less consideration and tenderness, and made them feel that they had gradually sunk from their former position of friends to be no more than subjects." There was increasing discontent among the Italian allies, or Socii, with this state of things, especially after the time of the Gracchi, when a

proposal to extend the Roman citizenship and franchise to them was strongly pressed. In the next generation after the murder of Caius Gracchus, there arose another political reformer, Marcus Livius Drusus, who likewise sought to have justice done to the Italians, by giving them a voice in the state which owed its conquests to their arms. He, too, was killed by the political enemies he provoked; and then the allies determined to enforce their claims by war. The tribes of the Sabellian race — Marsians, Samnites, Hirpenians, Lucanians, and their fellows — organized a league, with the town of Corfinium (its name changed to Italica) for its capital, and broke into open revolt. The prominence of the Marsians in the struggle caused the war which ensued to be sometimes called the Marsian War; it was also called the Italian War, but, more commonly, the Social War. It was opened, B. C. 90, by a horrible massacre of Roman citizens residing at Asculum, Picenum,—a tragedy for the guilt of which that town paid piteously the next year, when it was taken at the end of a long siege and after a great battle fought under its walls. But the Romans had suffered many defeats before that achievement was reached. At the end of the first year of the war they had made no headway against the revolt, and it is the opinion of Ihne and other historians that "Rome never was so near her destruction," and that "her downfall was averted, not by the heroism of her citizens, as in the war of Hannibal, but by a reversal" of her "policy of selfish exclusion and haughty disdain." A law called the Julian Law, because proposed by the consul L. Julius Cæsar, was adopted B. C. 90, which gave the Roman franchise to the Latins, and to all the other Italian communities which had so far remained faithful. Soon afterward two of the new tribunes carried a further measure, the Plautio-Papirian Law, which offered the same privilege to any Italian who, within two months, should present himself before a Roman magistrate to claim it. These concessions broke the spirit of the revolt and the Roman armies began to be victorious. Sulla, who was in the field, added greatly to his reputation by successes at Nola (where his army honored him by acclaim with the title of Imperator) and at Bovianum, which he took. The last important battle of the war was fought on the old blood-drenched plain of Cannæ, and this time the victory was for Rome. After that, for another year, some desperate towns and remnants of the revolted Socii held out, but their resistance was no more than the death throes of a lost cause.—W. Ihne, *Hist. of Rome, bk.* 6, *ch.* 9, *with foot-note, and bk.* 7, *ch.* 13–14.

Also in: G. Long, *Decline of the Roman Republic, v.* 2, *ch.* 15–16.—B. G. Niebuhr, *Lect's on the Hist. of Rome, lect.* 83–84 (*v.* 2).

B. C. 88-78.—Rivalry of Marius and Sulla. —War with Mithridates.—Civil war.—Successive proscriptions and reigns of terror.—Sulla's dictatorship.—The political diseases of which the Roman Republic was dying made quick progress in the generation that passed between the murder of Caius Gracchus and the Social War. The Roman rabble which was nominally sovereign and the oligarchy which ruled actually, by combined bribery and browbeating of the populace, had both been worse corrupted and debased by the increasing flow of tribute and plunder from provinces and subject states. Rome had familiarized itself with mob violence, and the old respect for authority and for law was dead. The soldier with an army at his back need not stand any longer in awe of the fasces of a tribune or a consul. It was a natural consequence of that state of things that the two foremost soldiers of the time, Caius Marius and L. Cornelius Sulla (or Sylla, as often written,) should become the recognized chiefs of the two opposing factions of the day. Marius was old, his military glory was waning, he had enjoyed six consulships and coveted a seventh; Sulla was in the prime of life, just fairly beginning to show his surpassing capabilities and entering on his real career. Marius was a plebeian of plebeians and rude in all his tastes; Sulla came from the great Cornelian gens, and refined a little the dissoluteness of his life by studies of Greek letters and philosophy. Marius was sullenly jealous; Sulla was resolutely ambitious. A new war, which promised great prizes to ambition and cupidity, alike, was breaking out in the east,—the war with Mithridates. Both Marius and Sulla aspired to the command in it; but Sulla had been elected one of the consuls for the year 88 B. C. and, by custom and law, would have the conduct of the war assigned to him. Marius, however, intrigued with the demagogues and leaders of the mob, and brought about a turbulent demonstration and popular vote, by which he could claim to be appointed to lead the forces of the state against Mithridates. Sulla fled to his army, in camp at Nola, and laid his case before the officers and men. The former, for the most part, shrank from opposing themselves to Rome; the latter had no scruples and demanded to be led against the Roman mob. Sulla took them at their word, and marched them straight to the city. For the first time in its history (by no means the last) the great capital was forcibly entered by one of its own armies. There was some resistance, but not much. Sulla paralyzed his opponents by his energy, and by a threat to burn the city if it did not submit. Marius and his chief partisans fled. Sulla contented himself with outlawing twelve, some of whom were taken and put to death. Marius, himself, escaped to Africa, after many strange adventures, in the story of which there is romance unquestionably mixed. Sulla (with his colleague in harmony with him) fulfilled the year of his consulate at Rome and then departed for Greece to conduct the war against Mithridates. In doing so, he certainly knew that he was giving up the government to his enemies; but he trusted his future in a remarkable way, and the necessity, for Rome, of confronting Mithridates was imperative. The departure of Sulla was the signal for fresh disorders at Rome. Cinna, one of the new consuls, was driven from the city, and became the head of a movement which appealed to the "new citizens," as they were called, or the "Italian party"—the allies who had been enfranchised as the result of the Social War. Marius came back from exile to join it. Sertorius and Carbo were other leaders who played important parts. Presently there were four armies beleaguering Rome, and after some unsuccessful resistance the gates were opened to them, by order of the Roman senate. Cinna, the consul, was nominally restored to authority, but Marius was really supreme, and Marius was

implacable in his sullen rage. Rome was treated like a conquered city. The public and private enemies of Marius and of all who chose to call themselves Marians, were hunted down and slain. To stop the massacre, at last, Sertorius—the best of the new masters of Rome—was forced to turn his soldiers against the bands of the assassins and to slaughter several thousands of them. Then some degree of order was restored and there was the quiet in Rome of a city of the dead. The next year Marius realized his ambition for a seventh consulship, but died before the end of the first month of it. Meantime, Sulla devoted himself steadily to the war against Mithridates [see MITHRIDATIC WARS], watching from afar the sinister course of events at Rome, and making no sign. It was not until the spring of 83 B. C., four years after his departure from Italy and three years after the death of Marius, that he was ready to return and settle accounts with his enemies. On landing with his army in Italy he was joined speedily by Pompey, Crassus, and other important chiefs. Cinna had been killed by mutinous soldiers; Carbo and young Marius were the leaders of the "Italian party." There was a fierce battle at Sacriportus, near Prænestе, with young Marius, and a second with Carbo at Clusium. Later, there was another furious fight with the Samnites, under the walls of Rome, at the Colline Gate, where 50,000 of the combatants fell. Then Sulla was master of Rome. Every one of his suspected friends in the senate had been butchered by the last orders of young Marius. His retaliation was not slow; but he pursued it with a horrible deliberation. He made lists, to be posted in public, of men who were marked for death and whom anybody might slay. There are differing accounts of the number doomed by this proscription; according to one annalist the death-roll was swelled to 4,700 before the reign of terror ceased. Sulla ruled as a conqueror until it pleased him to take an official title, when he commanded the people to elect him Dictator, for such term as he might judge to be fit. They obeyed. As Dictator, he proceeded to remodel the Roman constitution by a series of laws which were adopted at his command. One of these laws enfranchised 10,000 slaves and made them citizens. Another took away from the tribunes a great part of their powers; allowed none but members of the senate to be candidates for the office, and no person once a tribune to hold a curule office. Others reconstructed the senate, adding 300 new members to its depleted ranks, and restored to it the judicial function which C. Gracchus had transferred to the knights; they also restored to it the initiative in legislation. Having remodeled the Roman government to his liking, Sulla astounded his friends and enemies by suddenly laying down his dictatorial powers and retiring to private life at his villa, near Puteoli, on the Bay of Naples. There he wrote his memoirs, which have been lost, and gave himself up to the life of pleasure which was even dearer to him than the life of power. But he enjoyed it scarcely a year, when he died, B. C. 78. His body, taken to Rome, was burned with pomp.—G. Long, *Decline of the Roman Republic, v. 2, ch. 17–29.*

ALSO IN: W. Ihne, *Hist. of Rome, bk. 7, ch. 15–23.*—Plutarch, *Marius and Sulla.*—T. Mommsen, *Hist. of Rome, bk. 4, ch. 9–10.*—C. Merivale, *The Fall of the Roman Republic, ch. 4–5.*

B. C. 80.—The throne of Egypt bequeathed to the Republic by Ptolemy Alexander. See EGYPT: B. C. 80–48.

B. C. 78-68.—Danger from the legionaries.—Rising power of Pompeius.—Attempt of Lepidus.—Pompeius against Sertorius in Spain.—Insurrection of Spartacus and the Gladiators.—The second Mithridatic War, and war in Armenia.—"The Roman legionary, . . . drawn from the dregs of the populace, and quartered through the best years of his life in Greece and Asia, in Spain and Gaul, lived solely upon his pay, enhanced by extortion or plunder. His thirst of rapine grew upon him. He required his chiefs to indulge him with the spoil of cities and provinces; and when a foreign enemy was not at hand, he was tempted to turn against the subjects of the state, or, if need be, against the state itself. . . . Marius and Sulla, Cinna and Carbo had led the forces of Rome against Rome herself. . . . The problem which thus presented itself to the minds of patriots—how, namely, to avert the impending dissolution of their polity under the blows of their own defenders—was indeed an anxious and might well appear a hopeless one. It was to the legions only that they could trust, and the legions were notoriously devoted to their chiefs. . . . The triumph of Sulla had been secured by the accession to his side of Pompeius Strabo, the commander of a large force quartered in Italy. These troops had transferred their obedience to a younger Pompeius, the son of their late leader. Under his auspices they had gained many victories; they had put down the Marian faction, headed by Carbo, in Sicily, and had finally secured the ascendency of the senate on the shores of Africa. Sulla had evinced some jealousy of their captain, who was young in years, and as yet had not risen above the rank of Eques; but when Pompeius led his victorious legions back to Italy, the people rose in the greatest enthusiasm to welcome him, and the dictator, yielding to their impetuosity, had granted him a triumph and hailed him with the title of 'Magnus.' Young as he was, he became at once, on the abdication of Sulla, the greatest power in the commonwealth. This he soon caused to be known and felt. The lead of the senatorial party had now fallen to Q. Lutatius Catulus and M. Æmilius Lepidus, the heads of two of the oldest and noblest families of Rome. The election of these chiefs to the consulship for the year 676 of the city (B. C. 78) seemed to secure for the time the ascendency of the nobles, and the maintenance of Sulla's oligarchical constitution bequeathed to their care. . . . But there were divisions within the party itself which seemed to seize the opportunity for breaking forth. Lepidus was inflamed with ambition to create a faction of his own, and imitate the career of the usurpers before him. . . . But he had miscalculated his strength. Pompeius disavowed him, and lent the weight of his popularity and power to the support of Catulus; and the senate hoped to avert an outbreak by engaging both the consuls by an oath to abstain from assailing each other. During the remainder of his term of office Lepidus refrained from action; but as soon as he reached his province, the Narbonensis in Gaul, he developed his plans, summoned to his standard the Marians, who had taken refuge in great numbers in that region, and invoked the aid of

the Italians, with the promise of restoring to them the lands of which they had been dispossessed by Sulla's veterans. With the aid of M. Junius Brutus, who commanded in the Cisalpine, he made an inroad into Etruria, and called upon the remnant of its people, who had been decimated by Sulla, to rise against the faction of their oppressors. The senate, now thoroughly alarmed, charged Catulus with its defence; the veterans, restless and dissatisfied with their fields and farms, crowded to the standard of Pompeius. Two Roman armies met near the Milvian bridge, a few miles to the north of the city, and Lepidus received a check, which was again and again repeated, till he was driven to flee into Sardinia, and there perished shortly afterwards of fever. Pompeius pursued Brutus into the Cisalpine. . . . The remnant of [Lepidus'] troops was carried over to Spain by Perperna, and there swelled the forces of an abler leader of the same party, Q. Sertorius." Sertorius had established himself strongly in Spain, and aspired to the founding of an independent state; but after a prolonged struggle he was overcome by Pompeius and assassinated by traitors in his own ranks (see SPAIN: B. C. 83–72).—"Pompeius had thus recovered a great province for the republic at the moment when it seemed on the point of being lost through the inefficiency of one of the senatorial chiefs. Another leader of the dominant party was about to yield him another victory.. A war was raging in the heart of Italy. A body of gladiators had broken away from their confinement at Capua under the lead of Spartacus, a Thracian captive, had seized a large quantity of arms, and had made themselves a retreat or place of defence in the crater of Mount Vesuvius [see SPARTACUS, THE RISING OF]. . . . The consuls were directed to lead the legions against them, but were ignominiously defeated [B. C. 72]. In the absence of Pompeius in Spain and of Lucullus in the East, M. Crassus was the most prominent among the chiefs of the party in power. This illustrious noble was a man of great influence, acquired more by his wealth, for which he obtained the surname of Dives, than for any marked ability in the field or in the forum; but he had a large following of clients and dependents, who . . . now swelled the cry for placing a powerful force under his orders, and entrusting to his hands the deliverance of Italy. The brigands themselves were becoming demoralized by lack of discipline. Crassus drove them before him to the extremity of the peninsula. . . . Spartacus could only save a remnant of them by furiously breaking through the lines of his assailants. This brave gladiator was still formidable, and it was feared that Rome itself might be exposed to his desperate attack. The senate sent importunate messages to recall both Pompeius and Lucullus to its defence. . . . Spartacus had now become an easy prey, and the laurels were quickly won with which Pompeius was honoured by his partial countrymen. Crassus was deeply mortified, and the senate itself might feel some alarm at the redoubled triumphs of a champion of whose loyalty it was not secure. But the senatorial party had yet another leader, and a man of more ability than Crassus, at the head of another army. The authority of Pompeius in the western provinces was balanced in the East by that of L. Licinius Lucullus, who commanded the forces of the republic in the struggle which she was still maintaining against Mithridates. . . . The military successes of Lucullus fully justified the choice of the government." He expelled Mithridates from all the dominions which he claimed, and drove him to take refuge with the king of Armenia. "The kingdom of Armenia under Tigranes III. was at the height of its power when Clodius, the brother-in-law of Lucullus, then serving under him, was despatched to the royal residence at Tigranocerta to demand the surrender of Mithridates. . . . The capital of Armenia was well defended by its position among the mountains and the length and severity of its winter season. It was necessary to strike once for all [B. C. 69]. Lucullus had a small but well-trained and well-appointed army of veterans. Tigranes surrounded and encumbered himself with a vast cloud of undisciplined barbarians, the flower of whom, consisting of 17,000 mailed cavalry, however formidable in appearance, made but a feeble resistance to the dint of the Roman spear and broadsword. When their ranks were broken they fell back upon the inert masses behind them, and threw them into hopeless confusion. Tigranes made his escape with dastardly precipitation. A bloody massacre ensued. . . . In the following year Lucullus advanced his posts still further eastward. . . . But a spirit of discontent or lassitude had crept over his own soldiers. . . . He was constrained to withdraw from the siege of Artaxata, the furthest stronghold of Tigranes, on the banks of the Araxes, and after crowning his victories with a successful assault upon Nisibis, he gave the signal for retreat, leaving the destruction of Mithridates still unaccomplished. Meanwhile the brave proconsul's enemies were making head against him at Rome."—C. Merivale, *The Roman Triumvirates, ch.* 1.—Lucullus "wished to consummate the ruin of Tigranes, and afterwards to carry his arms to Parthia. He had not this perilous glory. Hitherto, his principal means of success had been to conciliate the people, by restraining the avidity both of his soldiers and of the Italian publicans. The first refused to pursue a war which only enriched the general; the second wrote to Rome, where the party of knights was every day regaining its ancient ascendancy. They accused of rapacity him who had repressed theirs. All were inclined to believe, in short, that Lucullus had drawn enormous sums from the towns which he preserved from the soldiers and publicans. They obtained the appointment of a successor, and by this change the fruit of this conquest was in a great measure lost. Even before Lucullus had quitted Asia, Mithridates re-entered Pontus, invaded Cappadocia, and leagued himself more closely with the pirates."—J. Michelet, *Hist. of the Roman Republic, p.* 308.—"It was imagined at Rome that Mithridates was as good as conquered, and that a new province of Bithynia and Pontus was awaiting organisation. . . . Ten commissioners as usual had been despatched to assist. . . . Lucullus had hoped before their arrival to strike some blow to recover his losses; but Marcius Rex had refused his appeal for help from Cilicia, and his own troops had . . . declined to march . . . when they learnt that the command was about to pass from Lucullus to Glabrio."—E. S. Shuckburgh, *Hist. of Rome to the Battle of Actium, p.* 677.

ALSO IN: Plutarch, *Pompeius Magnus.*—G. Long, *Decline of the Roman Republic, v.* 2, *ch.* 30–33, *and v.* 3, *ch.* 1–5.—G. Rawlinson, *Sixth Great Oriental Monarchy, ch.* 10.

B. C. 69-63.—The drift towards revolution. —Pompeius in the East.—His extraordinary commission.—His enlargement of the Roman dominions.—His power.—Ambitions and projects of Cæsar.—Consulship of Cicero.—"To a superficial observer, at the close of the year 70 B. C., it might possibly have seemed that the Republic had been given a new lease of life. . . . And, indeed, for two or three years this promising condition of things continued. The years 69 and 68 B. C. must have been tolerably quiet ones, for our authorities have very little to tell us of them. . . . Had a single real statesman appeared on the scene at this moment, or even if the average senator or citizen had been possessed of some honesty and insight, it was not impossible that the government might have been carried on fairly well even under republican forms. But there was no leading statesman of a character suited to raise the whole tone of politics; and there was no general disposition on the part of either Senate or people to make the best of the lull in the storm, to repair damages, or to set the ship on her only true course. So the next few years show her fast drifting in the direction of revolution; and the current that bore her was not a local one, or visible to the eye of the ordinary Roman, but one of world-wide force, whose origin and direction could only be perceived by the highest political intelligence. It was during these years that Cæsar was quietly learning the business of government, both at home and in the provinces. . . . Cæsar was elected quæstor in 69 B. C., and served the office in the following year. It fell to him to begin his acquaintance with government in the province of Further Spain, and thus began his lifelong connection with the peoples of the West. . . . On his return to Rome, which must have taken place about the beginning of 67 B. C., Cæsar was drawn at once into closer connection with the man who, during the next twenty years, was to be his friend, his rival, and his enemy. Pompeius was by this time tired of a quiet life. . . . Both to him and his friends, it seemed impossible to be idle any longer. There was real and abundant reason for the employment of the ablest soldier of the day. The audacity of the pirates was greater than ever [see CILICIA, PIRATES OF]. Lucullus, too, in Asia, had begun to meet with disasters, and was unable, with his troops in a mutinous temper, to cope with the combined forces of the kings of Armenia and Pontus. . . . In this year, 67 B. C., a bill was proposed by a tribune, Gabinius, in the assembly of the plebs, in spite of opposition in the Senate, giving Pompeius exactly that extensive power against the pirates which he himself desired, and which was really necessary if the work was to be done swiftly and completely. He was to have exclusive command for three years over the whole Mediterranean, and over the resources of the provinces and dependent states. For fifty miles inland in every province bordering on these seas—i. e., in the whole Empire—he was to exercise an authority equal to that of the existing provincial governor. He was to have almost unlimited means of raising both fleets and armies, and was to nominate his own staff of twenty-five 'legati' (lieutenant-generals), who were all to have the rank of prætor. Nor was this all; for it was quite understood that this was only part of a plan which was to place him at the head of the armies in Asia Minor, superseding the able but now discredited Lucullus. In fact, by another law of Gabinius, Lucullus was recalled, and his command given to one of the consuls of the year, neither of whom, as was well known, was likely to wield it with the requisite ability. Whichever consul it might be, he would only be recognised as keeping the place warm for Pompeius. . . . Pompeius left Rome in the spring of 67 B. C., rapidly cleared the seas of piracy, and in the following year superseded Lucullus in the command of the war against Mithridates [with the powers given him by the Gabinian Law prolonged and extended by another, known as the Manilian Law]. He did not return till the beginning of 61 B. C. At first sight it might seem as though his absence should have cleared the air, and left the political leaders at Rome a freer hand. But the power and the resources voted him, and the unprecedented success with which he used them, made him in reality as formidable to the parties at home as he was to the peoples of the East. He put an end at last to the power of Mithridates, received the submission of Tigranes of Armenia, and added to the Roman dominion the greater part of the possessions of both these kings. The sphere of Roman influence now for the first time reached the river Euphrates, and the Empire was brought into contact with the great Parthian kingdom beyond it. Asia Minor became wholly Roman, with the exception of some part of the interior, which obedient kinglets were allowed to retain. Syria was made a Roman province. Pompeius took Jerusalem, and added Judæa to Syria [see JEWS: B. C. 166–40]. . . . The man to whom all this was due became at once the leading figure in the world. It became clear that when his career of conquest was over yet another task would devolve on him, if he chose to accept it—the re-organisation of the central government at Rome. . . . His gathered power overhung the state like an avalanche ready to fall; and in the possible path of an avalanche it is waste of time and labour to build any solid work. So these years, for Cæsar as for the rest, are years of plotting and intrigue on one side, and of half-hearted government on the other. . . . He was elected to the curule-ædileship—the next above the quæstorship in the series of magistracies—and entered on his office on January 1, 65 B. C. . . . Cæsar's political connection with Crassus at this time is by no means clear. The two were sailing the same course, and watching Pompeius with the same anxiety; but there could not have been much in common between them, and they were in fact rapidly getting in each other's way. The great money-lender, however, must have been in the main responsible for the enormous expenditure which Cæsar risked in this ædileship and the next three years. . . . At the close of the year 64 B. C., on the accession to office of a new board of tribunes, . . . an agrarian bill on a vast scale was promulgated by the tribune Servilius Rullus. The two most startling features of this were: first, the creation of a board of ten to carry out its provisions, each member of which was to be invested with military and

judicial powers like those of the consuls and prætors; and secondly, the clauses which entrusted this board with enormous financial resources, to be raised by the public sale of all the territories and property acquired since the year 88 B. C., together with the booty and revenues now in the hands of Pompeius. The bill included, as its immediate object, a huge scheme of colonisation for Italy, on the lines of the Gracchan agrarian bills. . . . But it was really an attack on the weak fortress of senatorial government, in order to turn out its garrison, and occupy and fortify it in the name of the democratic or Marian party, against the return of the new Sulla, which was now thought to be imminent. The bill may also have had another and secondary object—namely, to force the hand of the able and ambitious consul [Cicero] who would come into office on January 1, 63; at any rate it succeeded in doing this, though it succeeded in nothing else. Cicero's great talents, and the courage and skill with which he had so far for the most part used them, had made him already a considerable power in Rome; but no one knew for certain to which party he would finally attach himself. . . . On the very first day of his office he attacked the bill in the Senate and exposed its real intention, and showed plainly that his policy was to convert Pompeius into a pillar of the constitution, and to counteract all democratic plots directed against him. . . . Whether it was his eloquence, or the people's indifference, that caused the bill to be dropped, can only be matter of conjecture; but it was withdrawn at once by its proposer, and the whole scheme fell through. This was Cicero's first and only real victory over Cæsar. . . . It was about this time, in the spring of 63 B. C., that the office of Pontifex Maximus became vacant by the death of old Metellus Pius, and Cæsar at once took steps to secure it for himself. The chances in his favour were small, but the prize was a tempting one. Success would place him at the head of the whole Roman religious system. . . . He was eligible, for he had already been for several years one of the college of pontifices, but as the law of election stood, a man so young and so democratic would have no chance against candidates like the venerable conservative leader Catulus, and Cæsar's own old commander in the East, Servilius Isauricus, both of whom were standing. Sulla's law, which placed the election in the hands of the college itself—a law framed expressly to exclude persons of Cæsar's stamp—must be repealed, and the choice vested once more in the people. The useful tribune Labienus was again set to work, the law was passed, and on March 6th Cæsar was elected by a large majority. . . . The latter part of this memorable year was occupied with a last and desperate attempt of the democratic party to possess themselves of the state power while there was yet time to forestall Pompeius. This is the famous conspiracy of Catilina; it was an attack of the left wing on the senatorial position, and the real leaders of the democracy took no open or active part in it."—W. W. Fowler, *Julius Cæsar, ch.* 4–5.

Also in J. A. Froude, *Cæsar, ch.* 10.—Suetonius, *Lives of the Twelve Cæsars: Julius, sect.* 7–13.—C. Middleton, *Life of Cicero, sect.* 2.

B. C. 63.—The conspiracy of Catiline.—The conspiracy organized against the senatorial government of Rome by L. Sergius Catilina, B. C. 63, owes much of its prominence in Roman history to the preservation of the great speeches in which Cicero exposed it, and by which he rallied the Roman people to support him in putting it down. Cicero was consul that year, and the official responsibility of the government was on his shoulders. The central conspirators were a desperate, disreputable clique of men, who had everything to gain and nothing to lose by revolution. Behind them were all the discontents and malignant tempers of demoralized and disorganized Rome; and still behind these were suspected to be, darkly hidden, the secret intrigues of men like Cæsar and Crassus, who watched and waited for the expiring breath of the dying republic. Cicero, having made a timely discovery of the plot, managed the disclosure of it with great adroitness and won the support of the people to his proceedings against the conspirators. Catiline made his escape from Rome and placed himself at the head of a small army which his supporters had raised in Etruria; but he and it were both destroyed in the single battle fought. Five of his fellow-conspirators were hastily put to death without trial, by being strangled in the Tullianum.—W. Forsyth, *Life of Cicero, ch.* 8.

Also in A. Trollope, *Life of Cicero, ch.* 9.—A. J. Church, *Roman Life in the Days of Cicero, ch.* 7.—Cicero, *Orations (tr. by C. D. Yonge), v.* 2.

B. C. 63-58.—Increasing disorders in the capital.—The wasted opportunities of Pompeius.—His alliance with Cæsar and Crassus.—The First Triumvirate.—Cæsar's consulship.—His appointment to the command in Cisalpine Gaul.—Exile of Cicero.—"Recent events had fully demonstrated the impotence of both the Senate and the democratic party; neither was strong enough to defeat the other or to govern the State. There was no third party—no class remaining out of which a government might be erected; the only alternative was monarchy—the rule of a single person. Who the monarch would be was still uncertain; though, at the present moment, Pompeius was clearly the only man in whose power it lay to take up the crown that offered itself. . . . For the moment the question which agitated all minds was whether Pompeius would accept the gift offered him by fortune, or would retire and leave the throne vacant. . . . In the autumn of 63 B. C. Quintus Metellus Nepos arrived in the capital from the camp of Pompeius, and got himself elected tribune with the avowed purpose of procuring for Pompeius the command against Catilina by special decree, and afterwards the consulship for 61 B. C. . . . The aristocracy at once showed their hostility to the proposals of Metellus, and Cato had himself elected tribune expressly for the purpose of thwarting him. But the democrats were more pliant, and it was soon evident that they had come to a cordial understanding with the general's emissary. Metellus and his master both adopted the democratic view of the illegal executions [of the Catilinarians]; and the first act of Cæsar's prætorship was to call Catulus to account for the moneys alleged to have been embezzled by him in rebuilding the Capitoline temple and to transfer the superintendence of the works to Pompeius. . . . On the day of voting, Cato and another of the tribunes put their veto upon the proposals of Metellus,

who disregarded it. There were conflicts of the armed bands of both sides, which terminated in favour of the government. The Senate followed up the victory by suspending Metellus and Cæsar from their offices. Metellus immediately departed for the camp of Pompeius; and when Cæsar disregarded the decree of suspension against himself, the Senate had ultimately to revoke it. Nothing could have been more favourable to the interests of Pompeius than these late events. After the illegal executions of the Catilinarians, and the acts of violence against Metellus, he 'could appear at once as the defender of the two palladia of Roman liberty'—the right of appeal, and the inviolability of the tribunate,—and as the champion of the party of order against the Catilinarian band. But his courage was unequal to the emergency; he lingered in Asia during the winter of 63-62 B. C., and thus gave the Senate time to crush the insurrection in Italy, and deprived himself of a valid pretext for keeping his legions together. In the autumn of 62 B. C. he landed at Brundisium, and, disbanding his army, proceeded to Rome with a small escort. On his arrival in the city in 61 B. C. he found himself in a position of complete isolation; he was feared by the democrats, hated by the aristocracy, and distrusted by the wealthy class. He at once demanded for himself a second consulship, the confirmation of all his acts in the East, and the fulfilment of the promise he had made to his soldiers to furnish them with lands. But each of these demands was met with the most determined opposition. . . . His promise of lands to his soldiers was indeed ratified, but not executed, and no steps were taken to provide the necessary funds and lands. . . . From this disagreeable position, Pompeius was rescued by the sagacity and address of Cæsar, who saw in the necessities of Pompeius the opportunity of the democratic party. Ever since the return of Pompeius, Cæsar had grown rapidly in influence and weight. He had been prætor in 62 B. C., and, in 61, governor in Farther Spain, where he utilized his position to free himself from his debts, and to lay the foundation of the military position he desired for himself. Returning in 60 B. C., he readily relinquished his claim to a triumph, in order to enter the city in time to stand for the consulship. . . . It was quite possible that the aristocracy might be strong enough to defeat the candidature of Cæsar, as it had defeated that of Catilina; and again, the consulship was not enough; an extraordinary command, secured to him for several years, was necessary for the fulfilment of his purpose. Without allies such a command could not be hoped for; and allies were found where they had been found ten years before, in Pompeius and Crassus, and in the rich equestrian class. Such a treaty was suicide on the part of Pompeius; . . . but he had drifted into a situation so awkward that he was glad to be released from it on any terms. . . . The bargain was struck in the summer of 60 B. C. [forming what became known in Roman history as the First Triumvirate]. Cæsar was promised the consulship and a governorship afterwards; Pompeius, the ratification of his arrangements in the East, and land for his soldiers; Crassus received no definite equivalent, but the capitalists were promised a remission of part of the money they had undertaken to pay for the lease of the Asiatic taxes. . . . Cæsar was easily elected consul for 59 B. C. All that the exertions of the Senate could do was to give him an aristocratic colleague in Marcus Bibulus. Cæsar at once proceeded to fulfil his obligations to Pompeius by proposing an agrarian law. All remaining Italian domain land, which meant practically the territory of Capua, was to be given up to allotments, and other estates in Italy were to be purchased out of the revenues of the new Eastern provinces. The soldiers were simply recommended to the commission, and thus the principle of giving rewards of land for military service was not asserted. The execution of the bill was to be entrusted to a commission of twenty. . . . At length all these proposals were passed by the assembly [after rejection by the Senate], and the commission of twenty, with Pompeius and Crassus at their head, began the execution of the agrarian law. Now that the first victory was won, the coalition was able to carry out the rest of its programme without much difficulty. . . . It was determined by the confederates that Cæsar should be invested by decree of the people with a special command resembling that lately held by Pompeius. Accordingly the tribune Vatinius submitted to the tribes a proposal which was at once adopted. By it Cæsar obtained the governorship of Cisalpine Gaul, and the supreme command of the three legions stationed there, for five years, with the rank of proprætor for his adjutants. His jurisdiction extended southwards as far as the Rubicon, and included Luca and Ravenna. Subsequently the province of Narbo was added by the Senate, on the motion of Pompeius. . . . Cæsar had hardly laid down his consulship when it was proposed, in the Senate, to annul the Julian laws [See JULIAN LAWS]. . . . The regents determined to make examples of some of the most determined of their opponents." Cicero was accordingly sent into exile, by a resolution of the tribes, and Cato was appointed to an odious public mission, which carried him out of the way, to Cyprus.—T. Mommsen, *Hist. of the Roman Republic* (*abridged by Bryans and Hendy*), *ch.* 33.

ALSO IN G. Long, *Decline of the Roman Republic*, *v.* 3, *ch.* 17-20.—C. Middleton, *Life of Cicero*, *sect.* 4.—Napoleon III., *Hist. of Julius Cæsar*, *ch.* 3-4.

B. C. 58-51.—Cæsar's conquest of Gaul.—See GAUL: B. C. 58-51.

B. C. 57-52.—Effect of Cæsar's Gallic victories.—Return of Cicero from exile.—New arrangements of the Triumvirs.—Cæsar's Proconsulship extended.—The Trebonian Law.—Disaster and death of Crassus at Carrhæ.—Increasing anarchy in the city.—"In Rome the enemies of Cæsar . . . were awed into silence [by his victorious career in Gaul], and the Senate granted the unprecedented honour of fifteen days' 'supplicatio' to the gods for the brilliant successes in Gaul. Among the supporters of this motion was, as Cæsar learnt in the winter from the magistrates and senators who came to pay court to him at Ravenna, M. Tullius Cicero. From the day of his exile the efforts to secure his return had begun, but it was not until the 4th of August that the Senate, led by the consul, P. Lentulus Spinther, carried the motion for his return, in spite of the violence of the armed gang of Clodius, and sum-

moned all the country tribes to crowd the comitia on Campus Martius, and ratify the senatus consultum. The return of the great orator to the country which he had saved in the terrible days of 63 B. C. was more like a triumph than the entrance of a pardoned criminal. . . . But he had come back on sufferance; the great Three must be conciliated. . . . Cicero, like many other optimates in Rome, was looking for the beginnings of a breach between Pompeius, Crassus and Cæsar, and was anxious to nourish any germs of opposition to the triple-headed monarchy. He pleaded against Cæsar's friend Vatinius, and he gave notice of a motion for checking the action of the agrarian law in Campania. But these signs of an independent opposition were suddenly terminated by a humiliating recantation; for before entering upon his third campaign Cæsar crossed the Apennines, and appeared at the Roman colony of Lucca. . . . Two hundred senators crowded to the rendezvous, but arrangements were made by the Three very independently of Senate in Rome or Senate in Lucca. It was agreed that Pompeius and Crassus should hold a joint consulship again next year, and before the expiration of Cæsar's five years they were to secure his reappointment for another five. . . . Unfortunate Cicero was awed, and in his other speeches of this year tried to win the favor of the great men by supporting their proposed provincial arrangements, and pleading in defence of Cæsar's friend and protégé, L. Balbus." In the year 55 B. C. the Trebonian Law was passed, "which gave to Crassus and Pompeius, as proconsular provinces, Syria and Spain, for the extraordinary term of five years. In this repeated creation of extraordinary powers in favor of the coalition of dynasts, Cato rightly saw an end of republican institutions. . . . Crassus . . . started in 54 B. C., at the head of seven legions, in face of the combined opposition of tribunes and augurs, to secure the eastern frontier of Roman dominion by vanquishing the Parthian power, which, reared on the ruins of the kingdom of the Seleucids, was now supreme in Ctesiphon and Seleucia. Led into the desert by the Arab Sheikh Abgarus, acting as a traitor, the Roman army was surrounded by the fleet Parthian horsemen, who could attack and retreat, shooting their showers of missiles all the time. In the blinding sand and sun of the desert near Carrhæ [on the river Belik, one of the branches of the Euphrates, the supposed site of the Haran of Biblical history], Crassus experienced a defeat which took its rank with Cannæ and the Arausio. A few days afterwards (June 9th, 53 B. C.) he was murdered in a conference to which the commander of the Parthian forces invited him. . . . The shock of this event went through the Roman world, and though Cassius, the lieutenant of Crassus, retrieved the honour of the Roman arms against the Parthians in the following year, that agile people remained to the last unconquered, and the Roman boundary was never to advance further to the east. Crassus, then, was dead, and Pompeius, though he lent Cæsar a legion at the beginning of the year, was more ready to assume the natural antagonism to Cæsar, since the death of his wife Julia in September, 54 B. C., had broken a strong tie with his father-in-law. Further, the condition of the capital seemed reaching a point of anarchy at which Pompeius, as the only strong man on the spot, would have to be appointed absolute dictator. In 53 B. C. no consuls could, in the violence and turmoil of the comitia, be elected until July, and the year closed without any elections having taken place for 52 B. C. T. Annius Milo, who was a candidate for the consulship, and P. Clodius, who was seeking the prætorship, turned every street of Rome into a gladiatorial arena." In January Clodius was killed. "Pompeius was waiting in his new gardens near the Porta Carmentalis, until a despairing government should invest him with dictatorial power; he was altogether too timid and too constitutional to seize it. But with Cato in Rome no one dared mention the word dictator. Pompeius, disappointed, was named sole consul on the 4th of February [B. C. 52], and by July he had got as his colleague his new father-in-law, Metellus."—R. F. Horton, *Hist. of the Romans, ch.* 29.

Also in W. Forsyth, *Life of Cicero, ch.* 13–16 (*v.* 1–2).—C. Merivale, *The Roman Triumvirates, ch.* 5.—G. Rawlinson, *The Sixth Great Oriental Monarchy, ch.* 11.

B. C. 55-54.—Cæsar's invasions of Britain. —See Britain: B. C. 55–54.

B.C. 52-50.—Rivalry of Pompeius and Cæsar. —Approach of the crisis.—Cæsar's legions in motion towards the capital.—"Cæsar had long ago resolved upon the overthrow of Pompey, as had Pompey, for that matter, upon his. For Crassus, the fear of whom had hitherto kept them in peace, having now been killed in Parthia, if the one of them wished to make himself the greatest man in Rome, he had only to overthrow the other; and if he again wished to prevent his own fall, he had nothing for it but to be beforehand with him whom he feared. Pompey had not been long under any such apprehensions, having till lately despised Cæsar, as thinking it no difficult matter to put down him whom he himself had advanced. But Cæsar had entertained this design from the beginning against his rivals, and had retired, like an expert wrestler, to prepare himself apart for the combat. Making the Gallic wars his exercise-ground, he had at once improved the strength of his soldiery, and had heightened his own glory by his great actions, so that he was looked on as one who might challenge comparison with Pompey. Nor did he let go any of those advantages which were now given him, both by Pompey himself and the times, and the ill government of Rome, where all who were candidates for office publicly gave money, and without any shame bribed the people, who, having received their pay, did not contend for their benefactors with their bare suffrages, but with bows, swords and slings. So that after having many times stained the place of election with the blood of men killed upon the spot, they left the city at last without a government at all, to be carried about like a ship without a pilot to steer her; while all who had any wisdom could only be thankful if a course of such wild and stormy disorder and madness might end no worse than in a monarchy. Some were so bold as to declare openly that the government was incurable but by a monarchy, and that they ought to take that remedy from the hands of the gentlest physician, meaning Pompey, who, though in words he pretended to

decline it, yet in reality made his utmost efforts to be declared dictator. Cato, perceiving his design, prevailed with the Senate to make him sole consul [B. C. 52], that with the offer of a more legal sort of monarchy he might be withheld from demanding the dictatorship. They over and above voted him the continuance of his provinces, for he had two, Spain and all Africa, which he governed by his lieutenants, and maintained armies under him, at the yearly charge of a thousand talents out of the public treasury. Upon this Cæsar also sent and petitioned for the consulship, and the continuance of his provinces. Pompey at first did not stir in it, but Marcellus and Lentulus opposed it, who had always hated Cæsar, and now did everything, whether fit or unfit, which might disgrace and affront him. For they took away the privilege of Roman citizens from the people of New Comum, who were a colony that Cæsar had lately planted in Gaul; and Marcellus, who was then consul, ordered one of the senators of that town, then at Rome, to be whipped [B. C. 51], and told him he laid that mark upon him to signify he was no citizen of Rome, bidding him, when he went back again, to show it to Cæsar. After Marcellus's consulship, Cæsar began to lavish gifts upon all the public men out of the riches he had taken from the Gauls; discharged Curio, the tribune, from his great debts; gave Paulus, then consul, 1,500 talents, with which he built the noble court of justice adjoining the forum, to supply the place of that called the Fulvian. Pompey, alarmed at these preparations, now openly took steps, both by himself and his friends, to have a successor appointed in Cæsar's room, and sent to demand back the soldiers whom he had lent him to carry on the wars in Gaul. Cæsar returned them, and made each soldier a present of 250 drachmas. The officer who brought them home to Pompey, spread amongst the people no very fair or favorable report of Cæsar, and flattered Pompey himself with false suggestions that he was wished for by Cæsar's army; and though his affairs here were in some embarrassment through the envy of some, and the ill state of the government, yet there the army was at his command, and if they once crossed into Italy, would presently declare for him; so weary were they of Cæsar's endless expeditions, and so suspicious of his designs for a monarchy. Upon this Pompey grew presumptuous, and neglected all warlike preparations, as fearing no danger. . . . Yet the demands which Cæsar made had the fairest colors of equity imaginable. For he proposed to lay down his arms, and that Pompey should do the same, and both together should become private men, and each expect a reward of his services from the public. For that those who proposed to disarm him, and at the same time to confirm Pompey in all the power he held, were simply establishing the one in the tyranny which they accused the other of aiming at. When Curio made these proposals to the people in Cæsar's name, he was loudly applauded, and some threw garlands towards him, and dismissed him as they do successful wrestlers, crowned with flowers. Antony, being tribune, produced a letter sent from Cæsar on this occasion, and read it, though the consuls did what they could to oppose it. But Scipio, Pompey's father-in-law, proposed in the Senate, that if Cæsar did not lay down his arms within such a time, he should be voted an enemy; and the consuls putting it to the question, whether Pompey should dismiss his soldiers, and again, whether Cæsar should disband his, very few assented to the first, but almost all to the latter. But Antony proposing again, that both should lay down their commissions, all but a very few agreed to it. Scipio was upon this very violent, and Lentulus the consul cried aloud, that they had need of arms, and not of suffrages, against a robber; so that the senators for the present adjourned, and appeared in mourning as a mark of their grief for the dissension. Afterwards there came other letters from Cæsar, which seemed yet more moderate, for he proposed to quit everything else, and only to retain Gaul within the Alps, Illyricum, and two legions, till he should stand a second time for consul. Cicero, the orator, who was lately returned from Cilicia, endeavored to reconcile differences, and softened Pompey, who was willing to comply in other things, but not to allow him the soldiers. At last Cicero used his persuasions with Cæsar's friends to accept of the provinces and 6,000 soldiers only, and so to make up the quarrel. And Pompey was inclined to give way to this, but Lentulus, the consul, would not hearken to it, but drove Antony and Curio out of the senate-house with insults, by which he afforded Cæsar [then at Ravenna] the most plausible pretence that could be, and one which he could readily use to inflame the soldiers, by showing them two persons of such repute and authority, who were forced to escape in a hired carriage in the dress of slaves. For so they were glad to disguise themselves, when they fled out of Rome. There were not about him at that time [November, B. C. 50] above 300 horse, and 5,000 foot; for the rest of his army, which was left behind the Alps, was to be brought after him by officers who had received orders for that purpose. But he thought the first motion towards the design which he had on foot did not require large forces at present, and that what was wanted was to make this first step suddenly, and so as to astound his enemies with the boldness of it. . . . Therefore, he commanded his captains and other officers to go only with their swords in their hands, without any other arms, and make themselves masters of Ariminum, a large city of Gaul, with as little disturbance and bloodshed as possible. He committed the care of these forces to Hortensius, and himself spent the day in public as a stander-by and spectator of the gladiators, who exercised before him. A little before night he attended to his person, and then went into the hall, and conversed for some time with those he had invited to supper, till it began to grow dusk, when he rose from table, and made his excuses to the company, begging them to stay till he came back, having already given private directions to a few immediate friends, that they should follow him, not all the same way, but some one way, some another. He himself got into one of the hired carriages, and drove at first another way, but presently turned towards Ariminum."
—Plutarch, *Cæsar* (*Clough's Dryden's trans.*)

Also in Cæsar, *Commentaries on the Civil War, bk.* 1, *ch.* 1–8.—T. Arnold, *Hist. of the Later Roman Commonwealth, ch.* 8 (*v.* 1).

B. C. 50–49.—Cæsar's passage of the Rubicon.—Flight of Pompeius and the Consuls from Italy.—Cæsar at the capital.—"About ten miles from Ariminum, and twice that distance

from Ravenna, the frontier of Italy and Gaul was traced by the stream of the Rubicon. This little river, red with the drainage of the peat mosses from which it descends [and evidently deriving its name from its color], is formed by the union of three mountain torrents, and is nearly dry in the summer, like most of the water courses on the eastern side of the Appenines. In the month of November the winter flood might present a barrier more worthy of the important position which it once occupied; but the northern frontier of Italy had long been secure from invasion, and the channel was spanned by a bridge of no great dimensions. . . . The ancients amused themselves with picturing the guilty hesitation with which the founder of a line of despots stood, as they imagined, on the brink of the fatal river [in the night of the 27th of November, B. C. 50, corrected calendar, or January 15, B. C. 49, without the correction], and paused for an instant before he committed the irrevocable act, pregnant with the destinies of a long futurity. Cæsar, indeed, in his Commentaries, makes no allusion to the passage of the Rubicon, and, at the moment of stepping on the bridge, his mind was probably absorbed in the arrangements he had made for the march of his legions or for their reception by his friends in Ariminum."—C. Merivale, *Hist. of the Romans, ch.* 14.—After the crossing of the Rubicon there were still more messages between Cæsar and Pompey, and the consuls supporting the latter. "Each demands that the other shall first abandon his position. Of course, all these messages mean nothing. Cæsar, complaining bitterly of injustice, sends a portion of his small army still farther into the Roman territory. Marc Antony goes to Arezzo with five cohorts, and Cæsar occupies three other cities with a cohort each. The marvel is that he was not attacked and driven back by Pompey. We may probably conclude that the soldiers, though under the command of Pompey, were not trustworthy as against Cæsar. As Cæsar regrets his two legions, so no doubt do the two legions regret their commander. At any rate, the consular forces, with Pompey and the consuls and a host of senators, retreat southwards to Brundusium—Brindisi—intending to leave Italy. . . . During this retreat, the first blood in the civil war is spilt at Corfinium, a town which, if it now stood at all, would stand in the Abruzzi. Cæsar there is victor in a small engagement, and obtained possession of the town. The Pompeian officers whom he finds there he sends away, and allows them even to carry with them money which he believes to have been taken from the public treasury. Throughout his route southward the soldiers of Pompey—who had heretofore been his soldiers—return to him. Pompey and the consuls still retreat, and still Cæsar follows them, though Pompey had boasted, when first warned to beware of Cæsar, that he had only to stamp upon Italian soil and legions would arise from the earth ready to obey him. He knows, however, that away from Rome, in her provinces, in Macedonia and Achaia, in Asia and Cilicia, in Sicily, Sardinia, and Africa, in Mauritania and the two Spains, there are Roman legions which as yet know no Cæsar. It may be better for Pompey that he should stamp his foot somewhere out of Italy. At any rate he sends the obedient consuls and his attendant senators over to Dyrrhachium in Illyria with a part of his army, and follows with the remainder as soon as Cæsar is at his heels. Cæsar makes an effort to intercept him and his fleet, but in that he fails. Thus Pompey deserts Rome and Italy,—and never again sees the imperial city or the fair land. Cæsar explains to us why he does not follow his enemy and endeavour at once to put an end to the struggle. Pompey is provided with shipping and he is not; and he is aware that the force of Rome lies in her provinces. Moreover, Rome may be starved by Pompey, unless he, Cæsar, can take care that the corn-growing countries, which are the granaries of Rome, are left free for the use of the city."—A. Trollope, *The Commentaries of Cæsar, ch.* 9.—Turning back from Brundisium, Cæsar proceeded to Rome to take possession of the seat of government which his enemies had abandoned to him. He was scrupulous of legal forms, and, being a proconsul, holding military command, did not enter the city in person. But he called together, outside of the walls, such of the senators as were in Rome and such as could be persuaded to return to the city, and obtained their formal sanction to various acts. Among the measures so authorized was the appropriation of the sacred treasure stored up in the vaults of the temple of Saturn. It was a consecrated reserve, to be used for no purpose except the repelling of a Gallic invasion —which had been, for many generations, the greatest dread of Rome. Cæsar claimed it, because he had put an end to that fear, by conquering the Gauls. His stay at Rome on this occasion (April, B. C. 49) was brief, for he needed to make haste to encounter the Pompeian legions in Spain, and to secure the submission of all the west before he followed Pompeius into the Eastern world.—G. Long, *Decline of the Roman Republic, v.* 5, *ch.* 1–4.

Also in J. A. Froude, *Cæsar, ch.* 21.

B. C. 49.—Cæsar's first campaign against the Pompeians in Spain.—His conquest of Massilia.—In Spain, all the strong forces of the country were commanded by partisans of Pompeius and the Optimate party. Cæsar had already sent forward C. Fabius from Southern Gaul with three legions, to take possession of the passes of the Pyrenees and the principal Spanish roads. Following quickly in person, he found that his orders had been vigorously obeyed. Fabius was confronting the Pompeian generals, Afranius and Petreius at Ilerda (modern Lerida in Catalonia), on the river Sicoris (modern Segre), where they made their stand. They had five legions of well-trained veterans, besides native auxiliaries to a considerable number. Cæsar's army, with the reinforcements that he had added to it, was about the same. The Pompeians had every advantage of position, commanding the passage of the river by a permanent bridge of stone and drawing supplies from both banks. Cæsar, on the other hand, had great difficulty in maintaining his communications, and was placed in mortal peril by a sudden flood which destroyed his bridges. Yet, without any general battle, by pure strategic skill and by resistless energy, he forced the hostile army out of its advantageous position, intercepted its retreat and compelled an unconditional surrender. This Spanish campaign, which occupied but forty days, and which was decisive of the contest for all Spain, was one of the finest of Cæsar's military

achievements. The Greek city of Massilia (modern Marseilles), still nominally independent and the ally of Rome, although surrounded by the Roman conquests in Gaul, had seen fit to range itself on the side of Pompeius and the Optimates, and to close its gates in the face of Cæsar, when he set out for his campaign in Spain. He had not hesitated to leave three legions of his moderate army before the city, while he ordered a fleet to be built at Arelates (Arles), for coöperation in the siege. Decimus Brutus commanded the fleet and Trebonius was the general of the land force. The siege was made notable by remarkable engineering operations on both sides, but the courage of the Massiliots was of no long endurance. When Cæsar returned from his Spanish campaign he found them ready to surrender. Notwithstanding they had been guilty of a great act of treachery during the siege, by breaking an armistice, he spared their city, on account, he said, of its name and antiquity. His soldiers, who had expected rich booty, were offended, and a dangerous mutiny, which occurred soon afterwards at Placentia, had this for its main provocation.—Cæsar, *The Civil War, bk.* 1, *ch.* 36–81, *and bk.* 2, *ch.* 1–22.

Also in G. Long, *Decline of the Roman Republic, v.* 5, *ch.* 5 *and* 8.—C. Merivale, *Hist. of the Romans, ch.* 15–16.

B. C. 48.—The war in Epirus and Thessaly.—Cæsar's decisive victory at Pharsalia.—Having established his authority in Italy, Gaul and Spain, and having legalized it by procuring from the assembly of the Roman citizens his formal election to the consulship, for the year A. U. 706 (B. C. 48), Cæsar prepared to follow Pompeius and the Senatorial party across the Adriatic. As the calendar then stood, it was in January that he arrived at Brundisium to take ship; but the season corresponded with November in the calendar as Cæsar, himself, corrected it soon afterwards. The vessels at his command were so few that he could transport only 15,500 of his troops on the first expedition, and it was with that number that he landed at Palæste on the coast of Epirus. The sea was swarming with the fleets of his enemies, and, although he escaped them in going, his small squadron was caught on the return voyage and many of its ships destroyed. Moreover, the Pompeian cruisers became so vigilant that the second detachment of his army, left behind at Brundisium, under Marcus Antonius, found no opportunity to follow him until the winter had nearly passed. Meantime, with his small force, Cæsar proceeded boldly into Macedonia to confront Pompeius, reducing fortresses and occupying towns as he marched. Although his great antagonist had been gathering troops in Macedonia for months, and now numbered an army of some 90,000 or 100,000 men, it was Cæsar, not Pompeius, who pressed for a battle, even before Mark Antony had joined him. As soon as the junction had occurred he pushed the enemy with all possible vigor. But Pompeius had no confidence in his untrained host. He drew his whole army into a strongly fortified, immense camp, on the sea coast near Dyrrhachium, at a point called Petra, and there he defied Cæsar to dislodge him. The latter undertook to wall him in on the land-side of his camp, by a line of ramparts and towers seventeen miles in length. It was an undertaking too great for his force. Pompeius made a sudden flank movement which disconcerted all his plans, and so defeated and demoralized his men that he was placed in extreme peril for a time. Had the Senatorial chief shown half of Cæsar's energy at that critical moment, the cause of Cæsar would probably have been lost. But Pompeius and his party took time to rejoice over their victory, while Cæsar framed plans to repair his defeat. He promptly abandoned his lines before the enemy's camp and fell back into the interior of the country, to form a junction with certain troops which he had previously sent eastward to meet reënforcements then coming to Pompeius. He calculated that Pompeius would follow him, and Pompeius did so. The result was to give Cæsar, at last, the opportunity he had been seeking for months, to confront with his tried legions the motley levies of his antagonist on an open field. The decisive and ever memorable battle was fought in Thessaly, on the plain of Pharsalia, through which flows the river Enipeus, and overlooking which, from a contiguous height, stood anciently the city of Pharsalus. It was fought on the 9th of August, in the year 48 before Christ. It was a battle quickly ended. The foot-soldiers of Pompeius out-numbered those of Cæsar at least as two to one; but they could not stand the charge which the latter made upon them. His cavalry was largely composed of the young nobility of Rome, and Cæsar had few horsemen with which to meet them; but he set against them a strong reserve of his sturdy veterans on foot, and they broke the horsemen's ranks. The defeat was speedily a rout; there was no rallying. Pompeius fled with a few attendants and made his way to Alexandria, where his tragical fate overtook him. Some of the other leaders escaped in different directions. Some, like Brutus, submitted to Cæsar, who was practically the master, from that hour, of the Roman realm, although Thapsus had still to be fought.—Cæsar, *The Civil War, bk.* 3.

Also in W. W. Fowler, *Julius Cæsar, ch.* 16.—G. Long, *Decline of the Roman Republic, v.* 5, *ch.* 10–17.—T. A. Dodge, *Cæsar, ch.* 31–35.

B. C. 48-47.—Pursuit of Pompeius to Egypt.—His assassination.—Cæsar at Alexandria, with Cleopatra.—The rising against him.—His peril.—His deliverance.

See Alexandria: B. C. 48–47.

B. C. 47-46.—Cæsar's overthrow of Pharnaces at Zela.—His return to Rome.—The last stand of his opponents in Africa.—Their defeat at Thapsus.—At the time when Cæsar was in a difficult position at Alexandria, and the subjects of Rome were generally uncertain as to whether their yoke would be broken or not by the pending civil war, Pharnaces, son of the vanquished Pontic king, Mithridates, made an effort to recover the lost kingdom of his father. He himself had been a traitor to his father, and had been rewarded for his treason by Pompeius, who gave him the small kingdom of Bosporus, in the Crimea. He now thought the moment favorable for regaining Pontus, Cappadocia and Lesser Armenia. Cæsar's lieutenant in Asia Minor, Domitius Calvinus, marched against him with a small force, and was badly defeated at Nicopolis (B. C. 48), in Armenia Minor. As a consequence, Cæsar, on being extricated from Alexandria, could not return to Rome, although

his affairs there sorely needed him, until he had restored the Roman authority in Asia Minor. As soon as he could reach Pharnaces, although his army was small in numbers, he struck and shattered the flimsy throne at a single blow. The battle was fought (B. C. 47) at Zela, in Pontus, where Mithridates had once gained a victory over the Romans. It was of this battle that Cæsar is said to have written his famous '*Veni, vidi, vici.*' "Plutarch says that this expression was used in a letter to one Amintius; the name is probably a mistake. Suetonius asserts that the three words were inscribed on a banner and carried in Cæsar's triumph. Appian and Dion refer to them as notorious."—C. Merivale, *Hist. of the Romans, ch.* 18.—After defeating Pharnaces at Zela, destroying his army, "Cæsar passed on through Galatia and Bithynia to the province of Asia proper, settling affairs in every centre; and leaving the faithful Mithridates [of Pergamum—See ALEXANDRIA: B. C. 48–47] with the title of King of the Bosphorus, as a guarantee for the security of these provinces, he sailed for Italy, and arrived at Tarentum before any one was aware of his approach. If he had really wasted time or lost energy in Egypt, he was making up for it now. On the way from Tarentum to Brundisium he met Cicero, who had been waiting for him here for nearly a year. He alighted, embraced his old friend, and walked with him some distance. The result of their talk was shown by Cicero's conduct for the rest of Cæsar's lifetime; he retired to his villas, and sought relief in literary work, encouraged doubtless by Cæsar's ardent praise. The magical effect of Cæsar's presence was felt throughout Italy; all sedition ceased, and Rome, which had been the scene of riot and bloodshed under the uncertain rule of Antonius, was quiet in an instant. The master spent three months in the city, working hard. He had been a second time appointed dictator while he was in Egypt, and probably without any limit of time, space or power; and he acted now without scruple as an absolute monarch. Everything that had to be done he saw to himself. Money was raised, bills were passed, the Senate recruited, magistrates and provincial governors appointed. But there was no time for any attempt at permanent organisation; he must wrest Africa from his enemies. . . . He quelled a most serious mutiny, in which even his faithful tenth legion was concerned, with all his wonderful skill and knowledge of human nature; sent on all available forces to Sicily, and arrived himself at Lilybæum in the middle of December."—W. W. Fowler, *Julius Cæsar, ch.* 17.—The last stand of Cæsar's opponents as a party—the senatorial party, or the republicans, as they are sometimes called—was made in Africa, on the old Carthaginian territory, with the city of Utica for their headquarters, and with Juba, the Numidian king, for their active ally. Varus, who had held his ground there, defeating and slaying Cæsar's friend Curio, was joined first by Scipio, afterwards by Cato, Labienus and other leaders, Cato having led a wonderful march through the desert from the Lesser Syrtis. In the course of the year of respite from pursuit which Cæsar's occupations elsewhere allowed them, they gathered and organized a formidable army. It was near the end of the year 47 B. C. that Cæsar assembled his forces at Lilybæum, in Sicily, and sailed with the first detachment for Africa. As happened so often to him in his bold military adventures, the troops which should follow were delayed by storms, and he was exposed to imminent peril before they arrived. But he succeeded in fortifying and maintaining a position on the coast, near Ruspina, until they came. As soon as they reached him he offered battle to his adversaries, and found presently an opportunity to force the fighting upon them at Thapsus, a coast town in their possession, which he attacked. The battle was decided by the first charge of Cæsar's legionaries, which swept everything—foot-soldiers, cavalry and elephants—before it. The victors in their ferocity gave no quarter and slaughtered 10,000 of the enemy, while losing from their own ranks but fifty men. The decisive battle of Thapsus was fought on the 6th of April, B. C. 46, uncorrected calendar, or Feb. 6th, as corrected later. Scipio, the commander, fled to Spain, was intercepted on the voyage, and ended his own life. The high-minded, stoical Cato committed suicide at Utica, rather than surrender his freedom to Cæsar. Juba, the Numidian king, likewise destroyed himself in despair; his kingdom was extinguished and Numidia became a Roman province. A few scattered leaders of revolt still disputed Cæsar's supremacy, but his power was firmly fixed.—A. Hirtius, *The African War.*

ALSO IN G. Long, *Decline of the Roman Republic, v.* 5, *ch.* 24–27.

B. C. 45—Cæsar's last campaign against the Pompeians in Spain.—His victory at Munda.—After Thapsus, Cæsar had one more deadly and desperate battle to fight for his sovereignty over the dominions of Rome. Cnæus Pompeius, son of Pompeius Magnus, with Labienus and Varus, of the survivors of the African field, had found disaffection in Spain, out of which they drew an army, with Pompeius in command. Cæsar marched in person against this new revolt, crossing the Alps and the Pyrenees with his customary celerity. After a number of minor engagements had been fought, the decisive battle occurred at Munda, in the valley of the Guadalquiver (modern Monda, between Ronda and Malaga), on the 17th of March, B. C. 45. "Never, it is said, was the great conqueror brought so near to defeat and destruction;" but he won the day in the end, and only Sextus Pompeius survived among the leaders of his enemies. The dead on the field were 30,000.—*Commentary on the Spanish War.*

ALSO IN C. Merivale, *Hist. of the Romans, ch.* 19.—G. Long, *Decline of the Roman Republic, v.* 5, *ch.* 30.

B. C. 45-44.—The Sovereignty of Cæsar and his titles.—His permanent Imperatorship.—His unfulfilled projects.—"At Rome, official enthusiasm burst forth anew at the tidings of these successes [in Spain]. The Senate decreed fifty days of supplications, and recognized Cæsar's right to extend the pomœrium, since he had extended the limits of the Empire. . . . After Thapsus he was more than a demi-god; after Munda he was a god altogether. A statue was raised to him in the temple of Quirinus with the inscription: 'To the invincible God,' and a college of priests, the Julian, was consecrated to him. . . . On the 13th September the dictator appeared at the gates of Rome, but he did

not triumph till the beginning of October. This time there was no barbarian king or chieftain to veil the victories won over citizens. But Cæsar thought he had no longer need to keep up such consideration; since he was now the State, his enemies, whatever name they bore, must be enemies of the State. . . . It was expected that Cæsar, having suffered so many outrages, would now punish severely, and Cicero, who had always doubted his clemency, believed that tyranny would break out as soon as the tyrant was above fear. But jealousies, recollections of party strifes, did not reach to the height of Cæsar. . . . He restored the statues of Sylla; he replaced that of Pompey on the rostra. . . . He pardoned Cassius, who had tried to assassinate him, the consularis Marcellus who had stirred up war against him, and Quintus Ligarius who had betrayed him in Africa. As a temporary precaution, however, he forbade to the Pompeians, by a 'lex Hirtia,' admission to the magistracy. For his authority, Cæsar sought no new forms. . . . Senate, comitia, magistracies existed as before; but he centred public action in himself alone by combining in his own hands all the republican offices. The instrument which Cæsar used in order to give to his power legal sanction was the Senate. In former times, the general, after the triumph, laid aside his title of imperator and imperium, which included absolute authority over the army, the judicial department and the administrative power; Cæsar, by a decree of the Senate, retained both during life, with the right of drawing freely from the treasury. His dictatorship and his office of præfectus morum were declared perpetual; the consulship was offered him for ten years, but he would not accept it; the Senate wished to join executive to electoral authority by offering him the right of appointment in all curule and plebeian offices; he reserved for himself merely the privilege of nominating half the magistracy. The Senate had enjoined the members chosen to swear, before entering on office, that they would undertake nothing contrary to the dictator's acts, these having the force of law. Further, they gave to his person the legal inviolability of the tribunes, and in order to ensure it, knights and senators offered to serve as guards, while the whole Senate took an oath to watch over his safety. To the reality of power were added the outward signs. In the Senate, at the theatre, in the circus, on his tribunal, he sat, dressed in the royal robe, on a throne of gold, and his effigy was stamped on the coins, where the Roman magistrates had not yet ventured to engrave more than their names. They even went as far as talking of succession, as in a regular monarchy. His title of imperator and the sovereign pontificate were transmissible to his legitimate or adopted children. . . . Cæsar was not deceived by the secret perfidy which prompted such servilities, and he valued them as they deserved. But his enemies found in them fresh reasons for hating the great man who had saved them. . . . The Senate had . . . sunk from its character of supreme council of the Republic into that of a committee of consultation, which the master often forgot to consult. The Civil war had decimated it; Cæsar appointed to it brave soldiers, even sons of freedmen who had served him well, and a considerable number of provincials, Spaniards, Gauls of Gallia Narbonensis, who had long been Romans. He had so many services to reward that his Senate reached the number of 900 members. . . . One day the Senate went in a body to the temple of Venus Genetrix to present to Cæsar certain decrees drawn up in his honor. The demi-god was ill and dared not leave his couch. This was imprudent, for the report spread that he had not deigned to rise. . . . The higher nobles remained apart, not from honours, but from power; but they forgot neither Pharsalia nor Thapsus. They would have consented to obey on condition of having the appearance of commanding. This disguised obedience is for an able government more convenient than outward servility. A few concessions made to vanity obtain tranquil possession of power. This was the policy of Augustus, but it is not that of great ambitions or of a true statesman. These pretences leave everything doubtful; nothing is settled; and Cæsar wished to lay the foundations of a government which should bring a new order of things out of a chaos of ruins. Unless we are paying too much attention to mere anecdotes, he desired the royal diadem. . . . It is difficult not to believe that Cæsar considered the constituting of a monarchical power as the rational achievement of the revolution which he was carrying out. In this way we could explain the persistence of his friends in offering him a title odious to the Romans, who were quite ready to accept a monarch, but not monarchy. . . . In order to attain to this royal title . . . he must mount still higher, and this new greatness he would seek in the East. . . . It was meet that he should wipe out the second military humiliation of Rome after effacing the first; that he should avenge Crassus."—V. Duruy, *Hist. of Rome, ch.* 58, *Sect.* 2–3 (*v.* 3).—"Cæsar was born to do great things, and had a passion after honor. . . . It was in fact a sort of emulous struggle with himself, as it had been with another, how he might outdo his past actions by his future. In pursuit of these thoughts he resolved to make war upon the Parthians, and when he had subdued them, to pass through Hyrcania; thence to march along by the Caspian Sea to Mount Caucasus, and so on about Pontus, till he came into Scythia; then to overrun all the countries bordering upon Germany, and Germany itself; and so to return through Gaul into Italy, after completing the whole circle of his intended empire, and bounding it on every side by the ocean. While preparations were making for this expedition, he proposed to dig through the isthmus on which Corinth stands; and appointed Anienus to superintend the work. He had also a design of diverting the Tiber, and carrying it by a deep channel directly from Rome to Circeii, and so into the sea near Tarracina, that there might be a safe and easy passage for all merchants who traded to Rome. Besides this, he intended to drain all the marshes by Pomentium and Setia, and gain ground enough from the water to employ many thousands of men in tillage. He proposed further to make great mounds on the shore nearest Rome, to hinder the sea from breaking in upon the land, to clear the coast at Ostia of all the hidden rocks and shoals that made it unsafe for shipping, and to form ports and harbors fit to receive the large number of vessels that would frequent them. These things were designed without being carried into effect; but his refor-

mation of the calendar [See CALENDAR, JULIAN], in order to rectify the irregularity of time, was not only projected with great scientific ingenuity, but was brought to its completion, and proved of very great use."—Plutarch, *Cæsar* (*Clough's Dryden's trans.*).

ALSO IN T. Mommsen, *Hist. of Rome, bk. 5, ch. 11, with note.*

B. C. 44.—The Assassination of Cæsar.—"The question of the kingship was over; but a vague alarm had been created, which answered the purpose of the Optimates. Cæsar was at their mercy any day. They had sworn to maintain all his acts. They had sworn, after Cicero's speech, individually and collectively to defend his life. Cæsar, whether he believed them sincere or not, had taken them at their word, and came daily to the Senate unarmed and without a guard. . . . There were no troops in the city. Lepidus, Cæsar's master of the horse, who had been appointed governor of Gaul, was outside the gates with a few cohorts; but Lepidus was a person of feeble character, and they trusted to be able to deal with him. Sixty senators, in all, were parties to the immediate conspiracy. Of these, nine tenths were members of the old faction whom Cæsar had pardoned, and who, of all his acts, resented most that he had been able to pardon them. They were the men who had stayed at home, like Cicero, from the fields of Thapsus and Munda, and had pretended penitence and submission that they might take an easier road to rid themselves of their enemy. Their motives were the ambition of their order and personal hatred of Cæsar; but they persuaded themselves that they were animated by patriotism, and as, in their hands, the Republic had been a mockery of liberty, so they aimed at restoring it by a mock tyrannicide. . . . One man only they were able to attract into coöperation who had a reputation for honesty, and could be conceived, without absurdity, to be animated by a disinterested purpose. Marcus Brutus was the son of Cato's sister Servilia, the friend, and a scandal said the mistress, of Cæsar. That he was Cæsar's son was not too absurd for the credulity of Roman drawing-rooms. Brutus himself could not have believed in the existence of such a relation, for he was deeply attached to his mother; and although, under the influence of his uncle Cato, he had taken the Senate's side in the war, he had accepted afterwards not pardon only from Cæsar, but favors of many kinds, for which he had professed, and probably felt, some real gratitude. . . . Brutus was perhaps the only member of the senatorial party in whom Cæsar felt genuine confidence. His known integrity, and Cæsar's acknowledged regard for him, made his accession to the conspiracy an object of particular importance. . . . Brutus, once wrought upon, became with Cassius the most ardent in the cause which assumed the aspect to him of a sacred duty. Behind them were the crowd of senators of the familiar faction, and others worse than they, who had not even the excuse of having been partisans of the beaten cause; men who had fought at Cæsar's side till the war was over, and believed, like Labienus, that to them Cæsar owed his fortune, and that he alone ought not to reap the harvest. . . . The Ides of March drew near. Cæsar was to set out in a few days for Parthia. Decimus Brutus was going, as governor, to the north of Italy, Lepidus to Gaul, Marcus Brutus to Macedonia, and Trebonius to Asia Minor. Antony, Cæsar's colleague in the consulship, was to remain in Italy. Dolabella, Cicero's son-in-law, was to be consul with him as soon as Cæsar should have left for the East. The foreign appointments were all made for five years, and in another week the party would be scattered. The time for action had come, if action there was to be. . . . An important meeting of the Senate had been called for the Ides (the 15th) of the month. The Pontifices, it was whispered, intended to bring on again the question of the Kingship before Cæsar's departure. The occasion would be appropriate. The Senate-house itself was a convenient scene of operations. The conspirators met at supper the evening before at Cassius's house. Cicero, to his regret, was not invited. The plan was simple, and was rapidly arranged. Cæsar would attend unarmed. The senators not in the secret would be unarmed also. The party who intended to act were to provide themselves with poniards, which could be easily concealed in their paper boxes. So far all was simple; but a question rose whether Cæsar only was to be killed, or whether Antony and Lepidus were to be dispatched along with him. They decided that Cæsar's death would be sufficient. . . . Antony and Lepidus were not to be touched. For the rest the assassins had merely to be in their places in the Senate in good time. When Cæsar entered, Trebonius was to detain Antony in conversation at the door. The others were to gather about Cæsar's chair on pretence of presenting a petition, and so could make an end. A gang of gladiators were to be secreted in the adjoining theatre to be ready should any unforeseen difficulty present itself. . . . Strange stories were told in after years of the uneasy labors of the elements that night. . . . Calpurnia dreamt her husband was murdered, and that she saw him ascending into heaven, and received by the hand of God. In the morning (March 15th) the sacrifices were again unfavorable. Cæsar was restless. Some natural disorder affected his spirits, and his spirits were reacting on his body. Contrary to his usual habit, he gave way to depression. He decided, at his wife's entreaty, that he would not attend the Senate that day. The house was full. The conspirators were in their places with their daggers ready. Attendants came in to remove Cæsar's chair. It was announced that he was not coming. Delay might be fatal. They conjectured that he already suspected something. A day's respite, and all might be discovered. His familiar friend whom he trusted—the coincidence is striking—was employed to betray him. Decimus Brutus, whom it was impossible for him to distrust, went to entreat his attendance. . . . Cæsar shook off his uneasiness, and rose to go. As he crossed the hall his statue fell and shivered on the stones. Some servant, perhaps, had heard whispers, and wished to warn him. As he still passed on, a stranger thrust a scroll into his hand, and begged him to read it on the spot. It contained a list of the conspirators, with a clear account of the plot. He supposed it to be a petition and placed it carelessly among his other papers. The fate of the Empire hung upon a thread, but the thread was not broken. . . . Cæsar entered

and took his seat. His presence awed men, in spite of themselves, and the conspirators had determined to act at once, lest they should lose courage to act at all. He was familiar and easy of access. They gathered round him. . . . One had a story to tell him; another some favor to ask. Tullius Cimber, whom he had just made governor of Bithynia, then came close to him, with some request which he was unwilling to grant. Cimber caught his gown, as if in entreaty, and dragged it from his shoulders. Cassius, who was standing behind, stabbed him in the throat. He started up with a cry and caught Cassius's arm. Another poniard entered his breast, giving a mortal wound. He looked round, and seeing not one friendly face, but only a ring of daggers pointing at him, he drew his gown over his head, gathered the folds about him that he might fall decently, and sank down without uttering another word. . . . The Senate rose with shrieks and confusion, and rushed into the Forum. The crowd outside caught the words that Cæsar was dead, and scattered to their houses. Antony, guessing that those who had killed Cæsar would not spare himself, hurried off into concealment. The murderers, bleeding some of them from wounds which they had given one another in their eagerness, followed, crying that the tyrant was dead, and that Rome was free; and the body of the great Cæsar was left alone in the house where a few weeks before Cicero told him that he was so necessary to his country that every senator would die before harm should reach him."—J. A. Froude, *Cæsar, ch.* 26.

B. C. 44.—The genius and character of Cæsar.—His rank among great men.—"Was Cæsar, upon the whole, the greatest of men? Dr. Beattie once observed, that if that question were left to be collected from the suffrages already expressed in books, and scattered throughout the literature of all nations, the scale would be found to have turned prodigiously in Cæsar's favor, as against any single competitor; and there is no doubt whatsoever, that even amongst his own countrymen, and his own contemporaries, the same verdict would have been returned, had it been collected upon the famous principle of Themistocles, that he should be reputed the first, whom the greatest number of rival voices had pronounced the second."—T. De Quincey, *The Cæsars, ch.* 1.—"The founder of the Roman Empire was a very great man. With such genius and such fortune it is not surprising that he should be made an idol. In intellectual stature he was at least an inch higher than his fellows, which is in itself enough to confound all our notions of right and wrong. He had the advantage of being a statesman before he was a soldier, whereas Napoleon was a soldier before he was a statesman. His ambition coincided with the necessity of the world, which required to be held together by force; and, therefore, his Empire endured for four hundred, or, if we include its Eastern offset, for fourteen hundred years, while that of Napoleon crumbled to pieces in four. But unscrupulous ambition was the root of his character. It was necessary, in fact, to enable him to trample down the respect for legality which still hampered other men. To connect him with any principle seems to me impossible. He came forward, it is true, as the leader of what is styled the democratic party, and in that sense the empire which he founded may be called democratic. But to the gamblers who brought their fortunes to that vast hazard table, the democratic and aristocratic parties were merely rouge and noir. The social and political equity, the reign of which we desire to see, was, in truth, unknown to the men of Cæsar's time. It is impossible to believe that there was an essential difference of principle between one member of the triumvirate and another. The great adventurer had begun by getting deeply into debt, and had thus in fact bound himself to overthrow the republic. He fomented anarchy to prepare the way for his dictatorship. He shrank from no accomplice however tainted, not even from Catiline; from no act however profligate or even cruel. . . . The noblest feature in Cæsar's character was his clemency. But we are reminded that it was ancient, not modern clemency, when we find numbered among the signal instances of it his having cut the throats of the pirates before he hanged them, and his having put to death without torture (simplici morte punivit) a slave suspected of conspiring against his life. Some have gone so far as to speak of him as the incarnation of humanity. But in the whole history of Roman conquest will you find a more ruthless conqueror? A million of Gauls we are told perished by the sword. Multitudes were sold into slavery. The extermination of the Eburones went to the verge even of ancient licence. The gallant Vercingetorix, who had fallen into Cæsar's hands under circumstances which would have touched any but a depraved heart, was kept by him a captive for six years, and butchered in cold blood on the day of the triumph. The sentiment of humanity was then undeveloped. Be it so, but then we must not call Cæsar the incarnation of humanity. Vast plans are ascribed to Cæsar at the time of his death, and it seems to be thought that a world of hopes for humanity perished when he fell. But if he had lived and acted for another century, what could he have done with those moral and political materials but found, what he did found, a military and sensualist empire. A multitude of projects are attributed to him by writers, who, we must remember, are late, and who make him ride a fairy charger with feet like the hands of a man. Some of these projects are really great, such as the codification of the law, and measures for the encouragement of intellect and science; others are questionable, such as the restoration of commercial cities from which commerce had departed; others, great works to be accomplished by an unlimited command of men and money, are the common dreams of every Nebuchadnezzar. . . . Still Cæsar was a very great man, and he played a dazzling part, as all men do who come just at the fall of an old system, when society is as clay in the hands of the potter, and found a new system in its place; while the less dazzling task of making the new system work, by probity and industry, and of restoring the shattered allegiance of a people to its institutions, descends upon unlaurelled heads. But that the men of his time were bound to recognise in him a Messiah, to use the phrase of the Emperor of the French, and that those who opposed him were Jews crucifying their Messiah is an impression which I venture to think will in time subside."—Goldwin Smith, *The Last Republicans of Rome* (*Macmillan's Mag., April*, 1868).

ALSO IN: T. Arnold, *Hist. of the Later Roman Commonwealth, ch.* 9 (*v.* 2).—A. Trollope, *Life of Cicero, v.* 2, *ch.* 8.

B. C. 44.—After Cæsar's death.—Flight of "the Liberators."—Mark Antony in power.—Arrival and wise conduct of Cæsar's heir, the young Octavius.—The assassins of Cæsar were not long in discovering that Rome gave no applause to their bloody deed. Its first effect was a simply stupefying consternation. The Senators fled,—the forum and the streets were nearly emptied. When Brutus attempted an harangue his hearers were few and silent. In gloomy alarm, he made haste, with his associates, to take refuge on the heights of the capitol. During the night which followed, a few senators, who approved the assassination—Cicero among the number—climbed the hill and held council with them in their place of retreat. The result was a second attempt made, on the following day, to rouse public feeling in their favor by speeches in the forum. The demonstration was again a failure, and the "liberators," as they wished to be deemed, returned with disappointment to the capitol. Meantime, the surviving consul, who had been Cæsar's colleague for the year, M. Antonius—known more commonly as Mark Antony—had acted with vigor to secure power in his own hands. He had taken possession of the great treasure which Cæsar left, and had acquired his papers. He had come to a secure understanding, moreover, with Lepidus, Cæsar's Master of Horse, who controlled a legion quartered near by, and who really commanded the situation, if his energy and his abilities had been equal to it. Lepidus marched his legion into the city, and its presence preserved order. Yet, with all the advantage in their favor, neither Antony nor Lepidus took any bold attitude against Cæsar's murderers. On the contrary, Antony listened to propositions from them and consented, as consul, to call a meeting of the Senate for deliberation on their act. At that meeting he even advocated what might be called a decree of oblivion, so far as concerned the striking down of Cæsar, and a confirmation of all the acts executed and unexecuted, of the late Imperator. These had included the recent appointment of Brutus, Cassius and other leaders among the assassins to high proconsular commands in the provinces. Of course the proposed measure was acceptable to them and their friends, while Antony, having Cæsar's papers in his possession, expected to gain everything from it. Under cover of the blank confirmation of Cæsar's acts, he found in Cæsar's papers a ground of authority for whatever he willed to do, and was accused of forging without limit where the genuine documents failed him. At the same time, taking advantage of the opportunity that was given to him by a public funeral decreed to Cæsar, he delivered an artful oration, which infuriated the people and drove the blood-stained "liberators" in terror from the city. But in many ways Antonius weakened the strong position which his skilful combinations had won for him. In his undisguised selfishness he secured no friends of his own; he alienated the friends of Cæsar by his calm indifference to the crime of the assassins of Cæsar, while he harvested for himself the fruits of it; above all, he offended and insulted the people by his impudent appropriation of Cæsar's vast hoard of wealth. The will of the slain Imperator had been read, and it was known that he had bequeathed three hundred sesterces—nearly £3 sterling, or $15—to every citizen of Rome. The heir named to the greater part of the estate was Cæsar's favorite grand-nephew (grandson of his younger sister, Julia) Caius Octavius, who became, by the terms of the will, his adopted son, and who was henceforth to bear the name Caius Julius Cæsar Octavianus. The young heir, then but eighteen years of age, was at Apollonia, in Illyria, at the quarters of a considerable force which Cæsar had assembled there. With wonderful coolness and prudence for his age, he declined proposals to lead the army to Rome, for the assertion of his rights, but went quietly thither with a few friends, feeling the public pulse as he journeyed. At Rome he demanded from Antony the moneys which Cæsar had left, but the profligate and reckless consul had spent them and would give no account. By great exertions Octavius raised sufficient means on his own account to pay Cæsar's legacy to the Roman citizens, and thereby he consolidated a popular feeling in his own favor, against Antony, which placed him, at once, in important rivalry with the latter. It enabled him presently to share the possession of power with Antony and Lepidus, in the Second Triumvirate, and, finally, to seize the whole sovereignty which Cæsar intended to bequeath to him.—C. Merivale, *Hist. of the Romans, ch.* 23–24.

ALSO IN: G. Long, *Decline of the Roman Republic, v.* 5, *ch.* 34.

B. C. 44-42.—Destruction of the Liberators.—Combination of Antony, Octavius and Lepidus.—The Second Triumvirate.—Mark Antony's arrangement of peace with the murderers of Cæsar, on the basis of a confirmation in the Senate of all Cæsar's acts, gave to Marcus Brutus the government of Macedonia, to Decimus Brutus that of Cisalpine Gaul, and to Cassius that of Syria, since Cæsar had already named them to those several commands before they slew him. But Antony succeeded ere long in procuring decrees from the Senate, transferring Macedonia to his brother, and Syria to Dolabella. A little later he obtained a vote of the people giving Cisalpine Gaul to himself, and cancelling the commission of Decimus Brutus. His consular term was now near its expiration and he had no intention to surrender the power he had enjoyed. An army in northern Italy would afford the support which his plans required. But, before those plans were ripe, his position had grown exceedingly precarious. The Senate and the people were alike unfriendly to him, and alike disposed to advance Octavius in opposition. The latter, without office or commission, had already, in the lawless manner of the time, by virtue of the encouragement given to him, collected an army of several legions under his personal banner. Decimus Brutus refused to surrender the government of Gaul, and was supported by the best wishes of the Senate in defying Antony to wrest it from him. The latter now faced the situation boldly, and, although two legions brought from Epirus went over to Octavius, he collected a strong force at Ariminum, marched into Cisalpine Gaul and blockaded Decimus Brutus in Mutina (modern Modena). Meantime, new consuls, Hirtius and Pansa, had taken office at Rome, and the Senate, led by

Cicero, had declared its hostility to Antony. Octavius was called upon to join the new consuls with his army, in proceeding against the late consul — now treated as a public enemy, though not so pronounced. He did so, and two battles were fought, on the 15th of April, B. C. 43, at Forum Gallorum, and on the 27th of the same month under the walls of Mutina, which forced Antony to retreat, but which cost Rome the lives of both her consuls. Antony retired across the Alps and joined his old friend Lepidus in Transalpine Gaul. Octavius declined to follow. Instead of doing so, he sent a military deputation to Rome to demand the consulship, and quickly followed it with his army when the demand had been refused. The demonstration proved persuasive, and he was elected consul, with his half-brother for colleague. His next business was to come to terms with Antony and Lepidus, as against the Liberators and their friends. A conference was arranged, and the three new masters of Rome met in October, B. C. 43, on an island near Bononia (modern Bologna), constituting themselves a commission of three — a triumvirate — to settle the affairs of the commonwealth. They framed a formal contract of five years' duration; divided the powers of government between themselves; named officials for the subordinate places; and — most serious proceeding of all — prepared a proscription list, as Sulla had done, of enemies to be put out of the way. It was an appalling list of 300 senators (the immortal Cicero at their head) and 2,000 knights. When the work of massacre in Rome and Italy had been done, and when the terrified Senate had legalized the self-assumed title and authority of the triumvirs, these turned their attention to the East, where M. Brutus and Cassius had established and maintained themselves in power. Decimus Brutus was already slain, after desertion by his army and capture in attempted flight. In the summer of the year 42 B. C., Antony led a division of the joint army of the triumvirate across the sea and through Macedonia, followed soon after by Octavius with additional forces. They were met at Philippi, and there, in two great battles, fought with an interval of twenty days between, the republic of Rome was finally done to death. "The battle of Philippi, in the estimation of the Roman writers, was the most memorable conflict in their military annals. The numbers engaged on either side far exceed all former experience. Eighty thousand legionaries alone were counted on the one side, and perhaps 120,000 on the other — at least three times as many as fought at Pharsalia." Both Cassius and Brutus died by their own hands. There was no more opposition to the triumvirs, except from Sextus Pompeius, last survivor of the family of the great Pompeius, who had created for himself at sea a little half-piratical realm, and who forced the three to recognize him for a time as a fourth power in the Roman world. But he, too, perished, B. C. 35. For seven years, from B. C. 42 to B. C. 36, Antony ruled the East, Octavius the West, and Lepidus reigned in Africa. —C. Merivale, *Hist. of the Romans, ch.* 24–28.

Also in: The same, *The Fall of the Roman Republic, ch.* 15.

B. C. 31. — The victory of Octavius at Actium. — The rise of the Empire. — The battles of Philippi, which delivered the whole Roman world to Antony, Octavius and Lepidus (the Triumvirs), were fought in the summer of 42 B. C. The battle of Actium, which made Octavius — soon to be named Augustus — the single master of a now fully founded Empire, was fought on the 2d of Sept., B. C. 31. In the interval of eleven years, Octavius, governing Rome, Italy, and the provinces of the West, had steadily consolidated and increased his power, gaining the confidence, the favor and the fear of his subject people. Antony, oppressing the East, had consumed his energies and his time in dalliance with Cleopatra, and had made himself the object of hatred and contempt. Lepidus, who had Africa for his dominion to begin with, had measured swords with Octavius and had been summarily deposed, in the year 36 B. C. It was simply a question of time as to when Antony, in his turn, should make room for the coming monarch. Already, in the year after Philippi, the two sovereign-partners had been at the verge of war. Antony's brother and his wife, Fulvia, had raised a revolt in Italy against Octavius, and it had been crushed at Perusia, before Antony could rouse himself to make a movement in support of it. He did make a formidable demonstration at last; but the soldiers of the two rivals compelled them on that occasion to patch up a new peace, which was accomplished by a treaty negotiated at Brundisium and sealed by the marriage of Antony to Octavia, sister of Octavius. This peace was maintained for ten years, while the jealousies and animosities of the two potentates grew steadily more bitter. It came to an end when Octavius felt strong enough to defy the superior resources, in money, men and ships, which Antony held at his command. The preparations then made on both sides for the great struggle were stupendous and consumed a year. It was by the determination of Antony that the war assumed chiefly a naval character; but Octavius, not Antony, forced the sea-fight when it came. His smaller squadrons sought and attacked the swarming fleets of Egypt and Asia, in the Ambracian gulf, where they had been assembled. The great battle was fought at the inlet of the gulf, off the point, or "acte," of a tongue of land, projecting from the shores of Acarnania, on which stood a temple to Apollo, called the Actium. Hence the name of the battle. The cowardly flight of Cleopatra, followed by Antony, ended the conflict quickly, and the Antonian fleet was entirely destroyed. The deserted army, on shore, which had idly watched the sea-fight, threw down its arms, when the flight of Antonius was known. Before Octavius pursued his enemy into Egypt and to a despairing death, he had other work to do, which occupied him for nearly a year. But he was already sure of the sole sovereignty that he claimed. The date of the battle of Actium "has been formally recorded by historians as signalizing the termination of the republic and the commencement of the Roman monarchy." — C. Merivale, *Hist. of the Romans, ch.* 28.

B. C. 31–A. D. 14.—The settlement of the Empire by the second Cæsar, Octavius, called Augustus.—His organization of government. — "Power and repute had passed away from the old forms of the Republic. The whole world lay at the feet of the master of many legions; it remained only to define the constitutional forms in which the new forces were to

work. But to do this was no easy task. The perplexities of his position, the fears and hopes that crossed his mind, are thrown into dramatic form by the historian Dion Cassius, who brings a scene before our fancy in which Octavianus listens to the conflicting counsels of his two great advisers, Agrippa and Mæcenas. . . . There is little doubt that schemes of resignation were at some time discussed by the Emperor and by his circle of advisers. It is even possible, as the same writer tells us, that he laid before the Senators at this time some proposal to leave the helm of state and let them guide it as of old. . . . The scene, if ever really acted, was but an idle comedy. . . . It is more probable that he was content with some faint show of resistance when the Senate heaped their honours on his head, as afterwards when, more than once, after a ten years' interval, they solemnly renewed the tenure of his power. But we cannot doubt his sincerity in one respect — in his wish to avoid the kingly title and all the odious associations of the same. . . . He shrank also from another title, truly Roman in its character, but odious since the days of Sulla; and though the populace of Rome, when panic-struck by pestilence and famine, clamoured to have him made dictator, . . . yet nothing would induce him to bear the hateful name. But the name of Cæsar he had taken long ago, after his illustrious uncle's death, and this became the title first of the dynasty and then of the imperial office [see CÆSAR, THE TITLE]. Besides this he allowed himself to be styled Augustus, a name which roused no jealousy and outraged no Roman sentiment, yet vaguely implied some dignity and reverence from its long association with the objects of religion [see AUGUSTUS, THE TITLE]. . . . With this exception he assumed no new symbol of monarchic power, but was satisfied with the old official titles, which, though charged with memories of the Republic, yet singly corresponded to some side or fragment of absolute authority. The first of these was Imperator, which served to connect him with the army. . . . The title of the tribunician power connected the monarch with the interests of the lower orders. . . . The Emperor did not, indeed, assume the tribunate, but was vested with the tribunician power which overshadowed the annual holders of the office. It made his person sacred. . . . The 'princeps senatus' in old days had been the foremost senator of his time. . . . No one but the Emperor could fill this position safely, and he assumed the name henceforth to connect him with the Senate, as other titles seemed to bind him to the army and the people. For the post of Supreme Pontiff, Augustus was content to wait awhile, until it passed by death from the feeble hands of Lepidus. He then claimed the exclusive tenure of the office, and after this time Pontifex Maximus was always added to the long list of imperial titles. . . . Besides these titles to which he assumed an exclusive right he also filled occasionally and for short periods most of the republican offices of higher rank, both in the capital and in the country towns. He took from time to time the consular power, with its august traditions and imposing ceremonial. The authority of censor lay ready to his hands when a moral reform was to be set on foot, . . . or when the Senate was to be purged of unworthy members and the order of equites or knights to be reviewed and its dignity consulted. Beyond the capital the pro-consular power was vested in him without local limitations. . . . The offices of state at Rome, meantime, lasted on from the Republic to the Empire, unchanged in name, and with little seeming change of functions. Consuls, Prætors, Quæstors, Tribunes, and Ædiles rose from the same classes as before, and moved for the most part in the same round of work, though they had lost for ever their power of initiative and real control. . . . They were now mainly the nominees of Cæsar, though the forms of popular election were still for a time observed. . . . The consulship was entirely reserved for his nominees, but passed rapidly from hand to hand, since in order to gratify a larger number it was granted at varying intervals for a few months only. . . . It was part of the policy of Augustus to disturb as little as possible the old names and forms of the Republic. . . . But besides these he set up a number of new offices, often of more real power, though of lower rank. . . . The name præfectus, the 'préfêt' of modern France, stood in earlier days for the deputy of any officer of state charged specially to execute some definite work. The præfects of Cæsar were his servants, named by him and responsible to him, set to discharge duties which the old constitution had commonly ignored. The præfect of the city had appeared in shadowy form under the Republic to represent the consul in his absence. Augustus felt the need, when called away from Rome, to have some one there whom he could trust to watch the jealous nobles and control the fickle mob. His trustiest confidants, Mæcenas and Agrippa, filled the post, and it became a standing office, with a growing sphere of competence, overtopping the magistracies of earlier date. The præfects of the prætorian cohorts first appeared when the Senate formally assigned a body-guard to Augustus later in his reign [see PRÆTORIAN PRÆFECTS]. . . . Next to these in power and importance came the præfects of the watch — the new police force organised by Augustus as a protection against the dangers of the night; and of the corn supplies of Rome, which were always an object of especial care on the part of the imperial government. . . . The title 'procurator,' which has come down to us in the form of 'proctor,' was at first mainly a term of civil law, and was used for a financial agent or attorney. The officers so called were regarded at the first as stewards of the Emperor's property or managers of his private business. . . . The agents of the Emperor's privy purse throughout the provinces were called by the same title, but were commonly of higher rank and more repute. Such in its bare outline was the executive of the imperial government. We have next to see what was the position of the Senate. . . . It was one of the first cares of Augustus to restore its credit. At the risk of odium and personal danger he more than once revised the list, and purged it of unworthy members, summoning eminent provincials in their place. . . . The functions also of the Senate were in theory enlarged. . . . But the substance of power and independence had passed away from it for ever. Matters of great moment were debated first, not in the Senate House, but in a sort of Privy Council formed by the trusted advisers of the

Emperor. . . . If we now turn our thoughts from the centre to the provinces we shall find that the imperial system brought with it more sweeping changes and more real improvement. . . . Augustus left to the Senate the nominal control of the more peaceful provinces, which needed little military force. . . . The remaining countries, called imperial provinces, were ruled by generals, called 'legati,' or in some few cases by proctors only. They held office during the good pleasure of their master. . . . There are signs that the imperial provinces were better ruled, and that the transference of a country to this class from the other was looked upon as a real boon, and not as an empty honour. Such in its chief features was the system of Augustus. . . . This was his constructive policy, and on the value of this creative work his claims to greatness must be based."—W. W. Capes, *Roman Hist.: The Early Empire, ch.* 1.—"The arrangement undoubtedly satisfied the requirements of the moment. It saved, at least in appearance, the integrity of the republic, while at the same time it recognised and legalised the authority of the man, who was already by common consent 'master of all things'; and this it effected without any formal alteration of the constitution, without the creation of any new office, and by means of the old constitutional machinery of senate and assembly. But it was an arrangement avowedly of an exceptional and temporary character. The powers voted to Augustus were, like those voted to Pompey in 67 B. C., voted only to him, and, with the exception of the tribunician power, voted only for a limited time. No provision was made for the continuance of the arrangement, after his death, in favour of any other person. And though in fact the powers first granted to Augustus were granted in turn to each of the long line of Roman Cæsars, the temporary and provisional character impressed upon the 'principate' at its birth clung to it throughout. When the princeps for the time being died or was deposed, it was always in theory an open question whether any other citizen should be invested with the powers he had held. Who the man should be, or how he should be chosen, were questions which it was left to circumstances to answer, and even the powers to be assigned to him were, strictly speaking, determined solely by the discretion of the senate and people in each case. It is true that necessity required that some one must always be selected to fill the position first given to Augustus; that accidents, such as kinship by blood or adoption to the last emperor, military ability, popularity with the soldiers or the senate, determined the selection; and that usage decided that the powers conferred upon the selected person should be in the main those conferred upon Augustus. But to the last the Roman emperor was legally merely a citizen whom the senate and people had freely invested with an exceptional authority for special reasons. Unlike the ordinary sovereign, he did not inherit a great office by an established law of succession; and in direct contrast to the modern maxim that 'the king never dies,' it has been well said that the Roman 'principate,' died with the princeps. Of the many attempts made to get rid of this irregular, intermittent character, none were completely successful, and the inconveniences and dangers resulting from it are apparent throughout the history of the empire."—H. F. Pelham, *Outlines of Roman Hist., bk.* 5, *ch.* 3.

Also in: W. T. Arnold, *The Roman System of Provincial Administration, ch.* 3.—C. Merivale, *Hist. of the Romans under the Empire, ch.* 30–34 (*v.* 3–4).

B. C. 16-15. — Conquest of Rhætia. See Rhætia.

B. C. 12-9.—Campaigns of Drusus in Germany. See Germany: B. C. 12–9.

B. C. 8–A. D. 11.—Campaigns of Tiberius in Germany. See Germany: B. C. 8–A. D. 11.

†**A. D. 14-16.—Campaigns of Germanicus in Germany.** See Germany: A. D. 14–16.

A. D. 14-37.—Reign of Tiberius.—Increasing vices and cruelties of his rule.—Campaigns of Germanicus in Germany.— His death.—The Delatores and their victims. — Malignant ascendancy of Sejanus. — The Prætorians quartered at Rome.—Augustus had one child only, a daughter, Julia, who was brought to him by his second wife Scribonia; but on his last marriage, with Livia, divorced wife of Tiberius Claudius Nero (divorced by his command), he had adopted her two sons, Tiberius and Drusus. He gave his daughter Julia in marriage, first, to his nephew, Marcellus, the son of his sister Octavia, by her first husband, C. Marcellus. But Marcellus soon died, without offspring, and Julia became the spouse of the emperor's friend and counsellor, Agrippa, to whom she bore three sons, Caius, Lucius, and Agrippa Posthumus (all of whom died before the end of the life of Augustus), and two daughters. Thus the emperor was left with no male heir in his own family, and the imperial succession fell to his adopted son Tiberius — the eldest son of his wife Livia and of her first husband, Tiberius Claudius Nero. There were suspicions that Livia had some agency in bringing about the several deaths which cleared her son's way to the throne. When Augustus died, Tiberius was "in his 56th year, or at least at the close of the 55th. . . . He had by this time acquired a perfect mastery in dissembling his lusts, and his mistrust. . . . He was anxious to appear as a moral man, while in secret he abandoned himself to lusts and debaucheries of every kind. . . . In accordance with this character, Tiberius now played the farce which is so admirably but painfully described by Tacitus; he declined accepting the imperium, and made the senate beg and intreat him to accept it for the sake of the public good. In the end Tiberius yielded, inasmuch as he compelled the senate to oblige him to undertake the government. This painful scene forms the beginning of Tacitus' Annals. The early part of his reign is marked by insurrections among the troops in Pannonia and on the Rhine. . . . Drusus [the son of Tiberius] quelled the insurrection in Illyricum, and Germanicus [the emperor's nephew, son of his brother Drusus, who had died in Germany, B. C. 9], that on the Rhine; but, notwithstanding this, it was in reality the government that was obliged to yield. . . . The reign of Tiberius, which lasted for 23 years, that is till A. D. 37, is by no means rich in events; the early period of it only is celebrated for the wars of Germanicus in [Germany. . . . The war of Germanicus was carried into Germany as far as the river Weser [see Germany: A. D. 14–16], and it is surprising to see that the Romans thought it necessary to employ such numerous armies against tribes

which had no fortified towns. . . . The history of his reign after the German wars becomes more and more confined to the interior and to his family. He had an only son, Drusus, by his first wife Agrippina; and Germanicus, the son of his brother Drusus, was adopted by him. Drusus must have been a young man deserving of praise; but Germanicus was the adored darling of the Roman people, and with justice: he was the worthy son of a worthy father, the hero of the German wars. . . . Germanicus had declined the sovereignty, which his legions had offered to him after the death of Augustus, and he remained faithful to his adopted father, although he certainly could not love him. Tiberius, however, had no faith in virtue, because he himself was destitute of it; he therefore mistrusted Germanicus, and removed him from his victorious legions." He sent him "to superintend the eastern frontiers and provinces. On his arrival there he was received with the same enthusiasm as at Rome; but he died very soon afterwards, whether by a natural death or by poison is a question upon which the ancients themselves are not agreed. . . . In the reign of Augustus, any offence against the person of the imperator had, by some law with which we are not further acquainted, been made a 'crimen majestatis,' as though it had been committed against the republic itself. This 'crimen' in its undefined character was a fearful thing; for hundreds of offences might be made to come within the reach of the law concerning it. All these deplorable cases were tried by the senate, which formed a sort of condemning machine set in motion by the tyrant, just like the national convention under Robespierre. . . . In the early part of Tiberius' reign, these prosecutions occurred very rarely; but there gradually arose a numerous class of denouncers ('delatores'), who made it their business to bring to trial any one whom the emperor disliked" (see DELATION.—DELATORS). This was after the death of the emperor's mother, Livia, whom he feared, and who restrained his worst propensities. After her influence was removed, "his dark and tyrannical nature got the upper hand: the hateful side of his character became daily more developed, and his only enjoyment was the indulgence of his detestable lust. . . . His only friend was Aelius Sejanus, a man of equestrian rank. . . . His character bore the greatest resemblance to that of his sovereign, who raised him to the office of praefectus praetorio. . . . Sejanus increased the number of the praetorian cohorts, and persuaded Tiberius to concentrate them in the neighbourhood of Rome, in the 'castrum praetorianum,' which formed as it were the citadel outside the wall of Servius Tullius, but in the midst of the present city. The consequences of this measure render it one of the most important events in Roman history; for the praetorians now became the real sovereigns, and occupied a position similar to that which the Janissaries obtained in Algeria: they determined the fate of the empire until the reign of Diocletian [see PRÆTORIAN GUARDS]. . . . The influence of Sejanus over Tiberius increased every day, and he contrived to inspire his imperial friend with sufficient confidence to go to the island of Capreae. While Tiberius was there indulging in his lusts, Sejanus remained at Rome and governed as his vicegerent. . . . Prosecutions were now instituted against all persons of any consequence at Rome; the time when Tiberius left the capital is the beginning of the fearful annals of his reign." The tyrannical proceedings of Sejanus "continued for a number of years, until at length he himself incurred the suspicion of Tiberius," and was put out of the way. "But a man worse even than he succeeded; this was Macro, who had none of the great qualities of Sejanus, but only analagous vices. . . . The butchery at Rome even increased. . . . Caius Caesar, the son of Germanicus, commonly known by the name of Caligula, formed with Macro a connexion of the basest kind, and promised him the high post of 'praefectus praetorio' if he would assist him in getting rid of the aged monarch. Tiberius was at the time severely ill at a villa near cape Misenum. He fell into a state of lethargy, and everybody believed him to be dead. He came to life again however; on which he was suffocated, or at least his death was accelerated in some way, for our accounts differ on this point. Thus Tiberius died in the 23d year of his reign, A. D. 37, at the age of 78."—B. G. Niebuhr, *Lect's on the Hist. of Rome, lect.* 111–112 (*v.* 3).

ALSO IN: Tacitus, *Annals, bk.* 1–6.—C. Merivale, *Hist. of the Romans under the Empire, ch.* 42–46 (*v.* 5).

A. D. 37-41.—Reign of Caligula, the first of the imperial madmen.— Caius Cæsar, son of Germanicus, owed his nickname, Caligula, to the soldiers of his father's command, among whom he was a great favorite in his childhood. The name was derived from "Caliga," a kind of foot covering worn by the common soldiers, and is sometimes translated "Little Boots." "Having . . . secured the imperial power, he fulfilled by his elevation the wish of the Roman people, I may venture to say, of all mankind; for he had long been the object of expectation and desire to the greater part of the provincials and soldiers, who had known him when a child; and to the whole people of Rome, from their affection for the memory of Germanicus, his father, and compassion for the family almost entirely destroyed. . . . Immediately on his entering the city, by the joint acclamations of the senate, and people, who broke into the senate-house, Tiberius's will was set aside, it having left his other grandson, then a minor, coheir with him; the whole government and administration of affairs was placed in his hands; so much to the joy and satisfaction of the public that, in less than three months after, above 160,000 victims are said to have been offered in sacrifice. . . . To this extraordinary love entertained for him by his countrymen was added an uncommon regard by foreign nations. . . . Caligula himself inflamed this devotion by practising all the arts of popularity. . . . He published accounts of the proceedings of the government—a practice which had been introduced by Augustus, but discontinued by Tiberius. He granted the magistrates a full and free jurisdiction, without any appeal to himself. He made a very strict and exact review of the Roman knights, but conducted it with moderation; publicly depriving of his horse every knight who lay under the stigma of any thing base and dishonourable. . . . He attempted likewise to restore to the people their ancient right of voting in the choice of magistrates. . . . He twice distributed to the people a bounty of 300 sesterces a man, and as

often gave a splendid feast to the senate and the equestrian order, with their wives and children. . . . He frequently entertained the people with stage-plays of various kinds, and in several parts of the city, and sometimes by night, when he caused the whole city to be lighted. . . . He likewise exhibited a great number of circensian games from morning until night; intermixed with the hunting of wild beasts from Africa. . . . Thus far we have spoken of him as a prince. What remains to be said of him bespeaks him rather a monster than a man. . . . He was strongly inclined to assume the diadem, and change the form of government from imperial to regal; but being told that he far exceeded the grandeur of kings and princes, he began to arrogate to himself a divine majesty. He ordered all the images of the gods which were famous either for their beauty or the veneration paid them, among which was that of Jupiter Olympius, to be brought from Greece, that he might take the heads off, and put on his own. Having continued part of the Palatium as far as the Forum, and the temple of Castor and Pollux being converted into a kind of vestibule to his house, he often stationed himself between the twin brothers, and so presented himself to be worshipped by all votaries; some of whom saluted him by the name of Jupiter Latialis. He also instituted a temple and priests, with choicest victims, in honour of his own divinity. . . . The most opulent persons in the city offered themselves as candidates for the honour of being his priests, and purchased it successively at an immense price. . . . In the day-time he talked in private to Jupiter Capitolinus; one while whispering to him, and another turning his ear to him. . . . He was unwilling to be thought or called the grandson of Agrippa, because of the obscurity of his birth. . . . He said that his mother was the fruit of an incestuous commerce maintained by Augustus with his daughter Julia. . . . He lived in the habit of incest with all his sisters. . . . Whether in the marriage of his wives, in repudiating them, or retaining them, he acted with greater infamy, it is difficult to say." Some senators, "who had borne the highest offices in the government, he suffered to run by his litter in their togas for several miles together, and to attend him at supper, sometimes at the head of his couch, sometimes at his feet, with napkins. Others of them, after he had privately put them to death, he nevertheless continued to send for, as if they were still alive, and after a few days pretended that they had laid violent hands upon themselves. . . . When flesh was only to be had at a high price for feeding his wild beasts reserved for the spectacles, he ordered that criminals should be given them to be devoured; and upon inspecting them in a row, while he stood in the middle of the portico, without troubling himself to examine their cases he ordered them to be dragged away, from 'bald-pate to bald-pate' [a proverbial expression, meaning, without distinction.— *Translator's foot-note*]. . . . After disfiguring many persons of honourable rank, by branding them in the face with hot irons, he condemned them to the mines, to work in repairing the high-ways, or to fight with wild beasts; or tying them by the neck and heels, in the manner of beasts carried to slaughter, would shut them up in cages, or saw them asunder. . . . He compelled parents to be present at the execution of their sons. . . . He generally prolonged the sufferings of his victims by causing them to be inflicted by slight and frequently repeated strokes; this being his well-known and constant order: 'Strike so that he may feel himself die.' . . . Being incensed at the people's applauding a party at the Circensian games in opposition to him, he exclaimed, 'I wish the Roman people had but one neck.' . . . He used also to complain aloud of the state of the times, because it was not rendered remarkable by any public calamities. . . . He wished for some terrible slaughter of his troops, a famine, a pestilence, conflagrations, or an earthquake. Even in the midst of his diversions, while gaming or feasting, this savage ferocity, both in his language and actions, never forsook him. Persons were often put to the torture in his presence, whilst he was dining or carousing. A soldier, who was an adept in the art of beheading, used at such times to take off the heads of prisoners, who were brought in for that purpose. . . . He never had the least regard either to the chastity of his own person, or that of others. . . . Besides his incest with his sisters . . . there was hardly any lady of distinction with whom he did not make free. . . . Only once in his life did he take an active part in military affairs. . . . He resolved upon an expedition into Germany. . . . There being no hostilities, he ordered a few Germans of his guard to be carried over and placed in concealment on the other side of the Rhine, and word to be brought him after dinner that an enemy was advancing with great impetuosity. This being accordingly done, he immediately threw himself, with his friends, and a party of the pretorian knights, into the adjoining wood, where, lopping branches from the trees, and forming trophies of them, he returned by torch-light, upbraiding those who did not follow him with timorousness and cowardice. . . . At last, as if resolved to make war in earnest, he drew up his army upon the shore of the ocean, with his balistæ and other engines of war, and while no one could imagine what he intended to do, on a sudden commanded them to gather up the sea shells, and fill their helmets and the folds of their dress with them, calling them 'the spoils of the ocean due to the Capitol and the Palatium.' As a monument of his success he raised a lofty tower. . . . He was crazy both in body and mind, being subject, when a boy, to the falling sickness. . . . What most of all disordered him was want of sleep, for he seldom had more than three or four hours' rest in a night; and even then his sleep was not sound."—Suetonius, *Lives of the Twelve Cæsars: Caligula* (*tr. by A. Thomson*).

Also in: C. Merivale, *Hist. of the Romans under the Empire, ch.* 47-48 (*v.* 5).—S. Baring-Gould, *The Tragedy of the Caesars, v.* 2.

A. D. 41.—The murder of Caligula.—Elevation of Claudius to the throne by the Prætorians.—Beginning of the domination of the soldiery.—"If we may believe our accounts, the tyrant's overthrow was due not to abhorrence of his crimes or indignation at his assaults on the Roman liberties, so much as to resentment at a private affront. Among the indiscretions which seem to indicate the partial madness of the wretched Caius, was the caprice with which he turned from his known foes against his personal friends and familiars. . . . No one felt himself secure, neither the freedmen who attended on

his person, nor the guards who watched over his safety. Among these last was Cassius Chærea, tribune of a prætorian cohort, whose shrill woman's voice provoked the merriment of his master, and subjected him to injurious insinuations. Even when he demanded the watchword for the night the emperor would insult him with words and gestures. Chærea resolved to wipe out the affront in blood. He sought Callistus and others . . . and organized with them and some of the most daring of the nobles a plot against the emperor's life. . . . The festival of the Palatine games was fixed on for carrying the project into effect. Four days did Caius preside in the theatre, surrounded by the friends and guards who were sworn to slay him, but still lacked the courage. On the fifth and last, the 24th of January 794 [A. D. 41], feeling indisposed from the evening's debauch, he hesitated at first to rise. His attendants, however, prevailed on him to return once more to the shows; and as he was passing through the vaulted passage which led from the palace to the Circus, he inspected a choir of noble youths from Asia, who were engaged to perform upon the stage. . . . Caius was still engaged in conversation with them when Chærea and another tribune, Sabinus, made their way to him: the one struck him on the throat from behind with his sword, while the other was in the act of demanding the watchword. A second blow cleft the tyrant's jaw. He fell, and drawing his limbs together to save his body, still screamed, 'I live! I live!' while the conspirators thronging over him, and crying, 'again! again!' hacked him with thirty wounds. The bearers of his litter rushed to his assistance with their poles, while his body-guard of Germans struck wildly at the assassins, and amongst the crowd which surrounded them, killed, it was said, more than one senator who had taken no part in the affair. . . . When each of the conspirators had thrust his weapon into the mangled body, and the last shrieks of its agony had been silenced, they escaped with all speed from the corridor in which it lay; but they had made no dispositions for what was to follow, and were content to leave it to the consuls and senate, amazed and unprepared, to decide on the future destiny of the republic. . . . Some cohorts of the city guards accepted the orders of the consuls, and occupied the public places under their direction. At the same time the consuls, Sentius Saturninus and Pomponius Secundus, the latter of whom had been substituted for Caius himself only a few days before, convened the senate. . . . The first act of the sitting was to issue an edict in which the tyranny of Caius was denounced, and a remission of the most obnoxious of his taxes proclaimed, together with the promise of a donative to the soldiers. The fathers next proceeded to deliberate on the form under which the government should be henceforth administered. On this point no settled principles prevailed. Some were ready to vote that the memory of the Cæsars should be abolished, their temples overthrown, and the free state of the Scipios and Catos restored; others contended for the continuance of monarchy in another family, and among the chiefs of nobility more than one candidate sprang up presently to claim it. The debate lasted late into the night; and in default of any other specific arrangement, the consuls continued to act as the leaders of the commonwealth. . . . But while the senate deliberated, the prætorian guards had resolved. . . . In the confusion which ensued on the first news of the event, several of their body had flung themselves furiously into the palace, and begun to plunder its glittering chambers. None dared to offer them any opposition; the slaves and freedmen fled or concealed themselves. One of the inmates, half hidden behind a curtain in an obscure corner, was dragged forth with brutal violence; and great was the intruders' surprise when they recognised him as Claudius, the long despised and neglected uncle of the murdered emperor. He sank at their feet almost senseless with terror: but the soldiers in their wildest mood still respected the blood of the Cæsars, and instead of slaying or maltreating the suppliant, the brother of Germanicus, they hailed him, more in jest perhaps than earnest, with the title of Imperator, and carried him off to their camp. . . . In the morning, when it was found that the senate had come to no conclusion, and that the people crowding about its place of meeting were urging it with loud cries to appoint a single chief, and were actually naming him as the object of their choice, Claudius found courage to suffer the prætorians to swear allegiance to him, and at the same time promised them a donative of 15,000 sesterces apiece. . . . The senators assembled once again in the temple of Jupiter; but now their numbers were reduced to not more than a hundred, and even these met rather to support the pretensions of certain of their members, who aspired to the empire . . . than to maintain the cause of the ancient republic. But the formidable array of the prætorians, who had issued from their camp into the city, and the demonstrations of the popular will, daunted all parties in the assembly. . . . Presently the Urban cohorts passed over, with their officers and colours, to the opposite side. All was lost: the prætorians, thus reinforced, led their hero to the palace, and there he commanded the senate to attend upon him. Nothing remained but to obey and pass the decree, which had now become a formal act of investiture, by which the name and honours of Imperator were bestowed upon the new chief of the commonwealth. Such was the first creation of an emperor by the military power of the prætorians. . . . Surrounded by drawn swords Claudius had found courage to face his nephew's murderers, and to vindicate his authority to the citizens, by a strong measure of retribution, in sending Chærea and Lupus, with a few others of the blood-embrued, to immediate execution. . . . Claudius was satisfied with this act of vigour, and proceeded, with a moderation but little expected, to publish an amnesty for all the words and acts of the late interregnum. Nevertheless for thirty days he did not venture to come himself into the Curia. . . . The personal fears, indeed, of the new emperor contributed, with a kindly and placable disposition, to make him anxious to gain his subjects' good-will by the gentleness and urbanity of his deportment. . . . His proclamation of amnesty was followed by the pardon of numerous exiles and criminals, especially such as were suffering under sentence for the crime of majestas. . . . The popularity of the new prince, though manifested, thanks to his own discretion, by no such grotesque and impious flatteries as attended on the opening

promise of Caius, was certainly not less deeply felt. . . . The confidence indeed of the upper classes, after the bitter disappointment they had so lately suffered, was not to be so lightly won. The senate and knights might view their new ruler with indulgence, and hope for the best; but they had been too long accustomed to regard him as proscribed from power by constitutional unfitness, as imbecile in mind, and which was perhaps in their estimation even a worse defect, as misshapen and half-developed in physical form, to anticipate from him a wise or vigorous administration. . . . In another rank he would have been exposed perhaps in infancy; as the son of Drusus and Antonia he was permitted to live: but he became from the first an object of disgust to his parents, who put him generally out of their sight, and left him to grow up in the hands of hirelings without judgment or feeling. . . . That the judgment of one from whom the practical knowledge of men and things had been withheld was not equal to his learning, and that the infirmities of his body affected his powers of decision, his presence of mind, and steadfastness of purpose, may easily be imagined: nevertheless, it may be allowed that in a private station, and anywhere but at Rome, Claudius would have passed muster as a respectable, and not, perhaps, an useless member of society. The opinion which is here given of this prince's character may possibly be influenced in some degree by the study of his countenance in the numerous busts still existing, which represent it as one of the most interesting of the whole imperial series. If his figure, as we are told, was tall, and when sitting appeared not ungraceful, his face, at least in repose, was eminently handsome. But it is impossible not to remark in it an expression of pain and anxiety which forcibly arrests our sympathy. It is the face of an honest and well-meaning man, who feels himself unequal to the task imposed upon him. . . . There is the expression of fatigue both of mind and body, which speaks of midnight watches over books, varied with midnight carouses at the imperial table, and the fierce caresses of rival mistresses. There is the glance of fear, not of open enemies, but of pretended friends; the reminiscence of wanton blows, and the anticipation of the deadly potion. Above all, there is the anxious glance of dependence, which seems to cast about for a model to imitate, for ministers to shape a policy, and for satellites to execute it. The model Claudius found was the policy of the venerated Augustus; but his ministers were the most profligate of women, and the most selfish of emancipated slaves. . . . The commencement of the new reign was marked by the renewed activity of the armies on the frontiers."—C. Merivale, *Hist. of the Romans under the Empire, ch.* 48–49 (*v.* 5).

Also in: W. W. Capes, *The Early Empire, ch.* 3–4.

A. D. 42-67.—St. Peter and the Roman Church: The question. See Papacy: St. Peter and the Church at Rome.

A. D. 43-53.—Conquests of Claudius in Britain. See Britain: A. D. 43–53.

A. D. 47-54.—The wives of Claudius, Messalina and Agrippina.—Their infamous and terrible ascendancy.—Murder of the emperor.—Advent of Nero.—The wife of Claudius was "Valeria Messalina, the daughter of his cousin Barbatus Messala, a woman whose name has become proverbial for infamy. His most distinguished freedmen were the eunuch Posidus; Felix, whom he made governor of Judæa, and who had the fortune to be the husband of three queens; and Callistus, who retained the power which he had acquired under Caius. But far superior in point of influence to these were the three secretaries (as we may term them), Polybius, Narcissus, and Pallas. . . . The two last were in strict league with Messalina; she only sought to gratify her lusts; they longed for honours, power, and wealth. . . . Their plan, when they would have any one put to death, was to terrify Claudius . . . by tales of plots against his life. . . . Slaves and freedmen were admitted as witnesses against their masters; and, though Claudius had sworn, at his accession, that no freeman should be put to the torture, knights and senators, citizens and strangers, were tortured alike. . . . Messalina now set no bounds to her vicious courses. Not content with being infamous herself, she would have others so; and she actually used to compel ladies to prostitute themselves even in the palace, and before the eyes of their husbands, whom she rewarded with honours and commands, while she contrived to destroy those who would not acquiesce in their wives' dishonour." At length (A. D. 48) she carried her audacity so far as to go publicly through a ceremony of marriage with one of her lovers. This nerved even the weak Claudius to resolution, and she was put to death. The emperor then married his niece, Julia Agrippina, the daughter of Germanicus. "The woman who had now obtained the government of Claudius and the Roman empire was of a very different character from the abandoned Messalina. The latter had nothing noble about her; she was the mere bondslave of lust, and cruel and avaricious only for its gratification; but Agrippina was a woman of superior mind, though utterly devoid of principle. In her, lust was subservient to ambition; it was the desire of power, or the fear of death, and not wantonness, that made her submit to the incestuous embraces of her brutal brother Caius, and to be prostituted to the companions of his vices. It was ambition and parental love that made her now form an incestuous union with her uncle. . . . The great object of Agrippina was to exclude Britannicus [the son of Claudius by Messalina], and obtain the succession for her own son, Nero Domitius, now a boy of twelve years of age. She therefore caused Octavia [daughter of Claudius] to be betrothed to him, and she had the philosopher Seneca recalled from Corsica, whither he had been exiled by the arts of Messalina, and committed to him the education of her son, that he might be fitted for empire. In the following year (51) Claudius, yielding to her influence, adopted him." But, although Britannicus was thrust into the background and treated with neglect, his feeble father began after a time to show signs of affection for him, and Agrippina, weary of waiting and fearful of discomfiture, caused poison to be administered to the old emperor in his food (A. D. 54). "The death of Claudius was concealed till all the preparations for the succession of Nero should be made, and the fortunate hour marked by the astrologers be arrived. He then (Oct. 13) issued from the palace, . . . and, being cheered by the cohort which was on guard, he

mounted a litter and proceeded to the camp. He addressed the soldiers, promising them a donative, and was saluted emperor. The senate and provinces acquiesced without a murmur in the will of the guards. Claudius was in his 64th year when he was poisoned."—T. Keightley, *Hist. of the Roman Empire, pt.* 1, *ch.* 5.

Also in: C. Merivale, *Hist. of the Romans under the Empire, ch.* 50 (*v.* 5).—Tacitus, *Annals, bk.* 11–12.

A. D. 54-64.—The atrocities of Nero.—The murder of his mother.—The burning of the city.—"Nero . . . was but a variety of the same species [as Caligula]. He also was an amateur, and an enthusiastic amateur, of murder. But as this taste, in the most ingenious hands, is limited and monotonous in its modes of manifestation, it would be tedious to run through the long Suetonian roll-call of his peccadilloes in this way. One only we shall cite, to illustrate the amorous delight with which he pursued any murder which happened to be seasoned highly to his taste by enormous atrocity, and by almost unconquerable difficulty. . . . For certain reasons of state, as Nero attempted to persuade himself, but in reality because no other crime had the same attractions of unnatural horror about it, he resolved to murder his mother Agrippina. This being settled, the next thing was to arrange the mode and the tools. Naturally enough, according to the custom then prevalent in Rome, he first attempted the thing by poison. The poison failed: for Agrippina, anticipating tricks of this kind, had armed her constitution against them, like Mithridates; and daily took potent antidotes and prophylactics. Or else (which is more probable) the emperor's agent in such purposes, fearing his sudden repentance and remorse, . . . had composed a poison of inferior strength. This had certainly occurred in the case of Britannicus, who had thrown off with ease the first dose administered to him by Nero," but who was killed by a second more powerful potion. "On Agrippina, however, no changes in the poison, whether of kind or strength, had any effect; so that, after various trials, this mode of murder was abandoned, and the emperor addressed himself to other plans. The first of these was some curious mechanical device, by which a false ceiling was to have been suspended by bolts above her bed; and in the middle of the night, the bolt being suddenly drawn, a vast weight would have descended with a ruinous destruction to all below. This scheme, however, taking air from the indiscretion of some amongst the accomplices, reached the ears of Agrippina. . . . Next, he conceived the idea of an artificial ship, which, at the touch of a few springs, might fall to pieces in deep water. Such a ship was prepared, and stationed at a suitable point. But the main difficulty remained, which was to persuade the old lady to go on board." By complicated stratagems this was brought about. "The emperor accompanied her to the place of embarkation, took a most tender leave of her, and saw her set sail. It was necessary that the vessel should get into deep water before the experiment could be made; and with the utmost agitation this pious son awaited news of the result. Suddenly a messenger rushed breathless into his presence, and horrified him by the joyful information that his august mother had met with an alarming accident; but, by the blessing of Heaven, had escaped safe and sound, and was now on her road to mingle congratulations with her affectionate son. The ship, it seems, had done its office; the mechanism had played admirably; but who can provide for everything? The old lady, it turned out, could swim like a duck; and the whole result had been to refresh her with a little sea-bathing. Here was worshipful intelligence. Could any man's temper be expected to stand such continued sieges? . . . Of a man like Nero it could not be expected that he should any longer dissemble his disgust, or put up with such repeated affronts. He rushed upon his simple congratulating friend, swore that he had come to murder him, and as nobody could have suborned him but Agrippina, he ordered her off to instant execution. And, unquestionably, if people will not be murdered quietly and in a civil way, they must expect that such forbearance is not to continue for ever; and obviously have themselves only to blame for any harshness or violence which they may have rendered necessary. It is singular, and shocking at the same time, to mention, that, for this atrocity, Nero did absolutely receive solemn congratulations from all orders of men. With such evidences of base servility in the public mind, and of the utter corruption which they had sustained in their elementary feelings, it is the less astonishing that he should have made other experiments upon the public patience, which seem expressly designed to try how much it would support. Whether he were really the author of the desolating fire which consumed Rome for six days and seven nights [A. D. 64], and drove the mass of the people into the tombs and sepulchres for shelter, is yet a matter of some doubt. But one great presumption against it, founded on its desperate imprudence, as attacking the people in their primary comforts, is considerably weakened by the enormous servility of the Romans in the case just stated: they who could volunteer congratulations to a son for butchering his mother (no matter on what pretended suspicions), might reasonably be supposed incapable of any resistance which required courage, even in a case of self-defence or of just revenge. . . . The great loss on this memorable occasion was in the heraldic and ancestral honours of the city. Historic Rome then went to wreck for ever. Then perished the 'domus priscorum ducum hostilibus ad-huc spoliis adornatæ'; the 'rostral' palace; the mansion of the Pompeys; the Blenheims and the Strathfieldsayes of the Scipios, the Marcelli, the Paulli, and the Cæsars; then perished the aged trophies from Carthage and from Gaul; and, in short, as the historian sums up the lamentable desolation, 'quidquid visendum atque memorabile ex antiquitate duraverat.' And this of itself might lead one to suspect the emperor's hand as the original agent; for by no one act was it possible so entirely and so suddenly to wean the people from their old republican recollections. . . . In any other sense, whether for health or for the conveniences of polished life, or for architectural magnificence, there never was a doubt that the Roman people gained infinitely by this conflagration. For, like London, it arose from its ashes with a splendour proportioned to its vast expansion of wealth and population; and marble took the place of wood. For the moment, however, this event must have been felt by the people as an overwhelming calamity. And it serves to illustrate the passive

endurance and timidity of the popular temper, and to what extent it might be provoked with impunity, that in this state of general irritation and effervescence Nero absolutely forbade them to meddle with the ruins of their own dwellings — taking that charge upon himself, with a view to the vast wealth which he anticipated from sifting the rubbish."—T. De Quincey, *The Cæsars, ch.* 3.

ALSO IN: Suetonius, *Lives of the Twelve Cæsars: Nero.*—Tacitus, *Annals, bk.* 13–16.—S. Baring-Gould, *The Tragedy of the Caesars, v.* 2.

A. D. 61.—Campaigns of Suetonius Paulinus in Britain. See BRITAIN: A. D. 61.

A. D. 64-68. — The first persecution of Christians.—The fitting end of Nero.—"Nero was so secure in his absolutism, he had hitherto found it so impossible to shock the feelings of the people or to exhaust the terrified adulation of the Senate, that he was usually indifferent to the pasquinades which were constantly holding up his name to execration and contempt. But now [after the burning of Rome] he felt that he had gone too far, and that his power would be seriously imperilled if he did not succeed in diverting the suspicions of the populace. He was perfectly aware that when the people in the streets cursed those who set fire to the city, they meant to curse him. If he did not take some immediate step he felt that he might perish, as Gaius [Caligula], had perished before him, by the dagger of the assassin. It is at this point of his career that Nero becomes a prominent figure in the history of the Church. It was this phase of cruelty which seemed to throw a blood-red light over his whole character, and led men to look on him as the very incarnation of the world-power in its most demoniac aspect — as worse than the Antiochus Epiphanes of Daniel's Apocalypse — as the Man of Sin whom (in language figurative, indeed, yet awfully true) the Lord should slay with the breath of His mouth and destroy with the brightness of His coming. For Nero endeavoured to fix the odious crime of having destroyed the capital of the world upon the most innocent and faithful of his subjects — upon the only subjects who offered heartfelt prayers on his behalf — the Roman Christians. . . . Why he should have thought of singling out the Christians, has always been a curious problem, for at this point St. Luke ends the Acts of the Apostles, perhaps purposely dropping the curtain, because it would have been perilous and useless to narrate the horrors in which the hitherto neutral or friendly Roman Government began to play so disgraceful a part. Neither Tacitus, nor Suetonius, nor the Apocalypse, help us to solve this particular problem. The Christians had filled no large space in the eye of the world. Until the days of Domitian we do not hear of a single noble or distinguished person who had joined their ranks. . . . The slaves and artisans, Jewish and Gentile, who formed the Christian community at Rome, had never in any way come into collision with the Roman Government. . . . That the Christians were entirely innocent of the crime charged against them was well known both at the time and afterwards. But how was it that Nero sought popularity and partly averted the deep rage which was rankling in many hearts against himself, by torturing men and women, on whose agonies he thought that the populace would gaze not only with a stolid indifference, but even with fierce satisfaction? Gibbon has conjectured that the Christians were confounded with the Jews, and that the detestation universally felt for the latter fell with double force upon the former. Christians suffered even more than the Jews because of the calumnies so assiduously circulated against them, and from what appeared to the ancients to be the revolting absurdity of their peculiar tenets. 'Nero,' says Tacitus, 'exposed to accusation, and tortured with the most exquisite penalties, a set of men detested for their enormities, whom the common people called Christians. Christus, the founder of this sect, was executed during the reign of Tiberius by the Procurator Pontius Pilate, and the deadly superstition, suppressed for a time, began to burst out once more, not only throughout Judaea, where the evil had its root, but even in the City, whither from every quarter all things horrible or shameful are drifted, and find their votaries.' The lordly disdain which prevented Tacitus from making any inquiry into the real views and character of the Christians, is shown by the fact that he catches up the most baseless allegations against them. . . . The masses, he says, called them 'Christians;' and while he almost apologises for staining his page with so vulgar an appellation, he merely mentions in passing, that, though innocent of the charge of being turbulent incendiaries, on which they were tortured to death, they were yet a set of guilty and infamous sectaries, to be classed with the lowest dregs of Roman criminals. But the haughty historian throws no light on one difficulty, namely, the circumstances which led to the Christians being thus singled out. The Jews were in no way involved in Nero's persecution. . . . The Jews were by far the deadliest enemies of the Christians; and two persons of Jewish proclivities were at this time in close proximity to the person of the Emperor. One was the pantomimist Aliturus, the other was Poppaea, the harlot Empress. . . . If, as seems certain, the Jews had it in their power during the reign of Nero more or less to shape the whisper of the throne, does not historical induction drive us to conclude with some confidence that the suggestion of the Christians as scapegoats and victims came from them? . . . Tacitus tells us that 'those who confessed were first seized, and then on their evidence a huge multitude were convicted, not so much on the charge of incendiarism as for their hatred to mankind.' Compressed and obscure as the sentence is, Tacitus clearly means to imply by the 'confession' to which he alludes the confession of Christianity; and though he is not sufficiently generous to acquit the Christians absolutely of all complicity in the great crime, he distinctly says that they were made the scapegoats of a general indignation. The phrase — 'a huge multitude' — is one of the few existing indications of the number of martyrs in the first persecution, and of the number of Christians in the Roman Church. When the historian says that they were convicted on the charge of 'hatred against mankind' he shows how completely he confounds them with the Jews, against whom he elsewhere brings the accusation of 'hostile feelings towards all except themselves.' Then the historian adds one casual but frightful sentence — a sentence which flings a dreadful light on the cruelty of Nero and the Roman mob. He adds,

'And various forms of mockery were added to enhance their dying agonies. Covered with the skins of wild beasts, they were doomed to die by the mangling of dogs, or by being nailed to crosses; or to be set on fire and burnt after twilight by way of nightly illumination. Nero offered his own gardens for this show, and gave a chariot race, mingling with the mob in the dress of a charioteer, or actually driving about among them. Hence, guilty as the victims were, and deserving of the worst punishments, a feeling of compassion towards them began to rise, as men felt that they were being immolated not for any advantage to the commonwealth, but to glut the savagery of a single man.' Imagine that awful scene, once witnessed by the silent obelisk in the square before St. Peter's at Rome! . . . Retribution did not linger, and the vengeance fell at once on the guilty Emperor and the guilty city. The air was full of prodigies. There were terrible storms; the plague wrought fearful ravages. Rumours spread from lip to lip. Men spoke of monstrous births; of deaths by lightning under strange circumstances; of a brazen statue of Nero melted by the flash; of places struck by the brand of heaven in fourteen regions of the city; of sudden darkenings of the sun. A hurricane devastated Campania; comets blazed in the heavens; earthquakes shook the ground. On all sides were the traces of deep uneasiness and superstitious terror. To all these portents, which were accepted as true by Christians as well as by Pagans, the Christians would give a specially terrible significance. . . . In spite of the shocking servility with which alike the Senate and the people had welcomed him back to the city with shouts of triumph, Nero felt that the air of Rome was heavy with curses against his name. He withdrew to Naples, and was at supper there on March 19, A. D. 68, the anniversary of his mother's murder, when he heard that the first note of revolt had been sounded by the brave C. Julius Vindex, Præfect of Farther Gaul. He was so far from being disturbed by the news, that he showed a secret joy at the thought that he could now order Gaul to be plundered. For eight days he took no notice of the matter. . . . At last, when he heard that Virginius Rufus had also rebelled in Germany, and Galba in Spain, he became aware of the desperate nature of his position. On receiving this intelligence he fainted away, and remained for some time unconscious. He continued, indeed, his grossness and frivolity, but the wildest and fiercest schemes chased each other through his melodramatic brain. . . . Meanwhile he found that the palace had been deserted by his guards, and that his attendants had robbed his chamber even of the golden box in which he had stored his poison. Rushing out, as though to drown himself in the Tiber, he changed his mind, and begged for some quiet hiding-place in which to collect his thoughts. The freedman Phaon offered him a lowly villa about four miles from the city. Barefooted, and with a faded coat thrown over his tunic, he hid his head and face in a kerchief, and rode away with only four attendants. . . . There is no need to dwell on the miserable spectacle of his end, perhaps the meanest and most pusillanimous which has ever been recorded. The poor wretch who, without a pang, had caused so many brave Romans and so many innocent Christians to be murdered, could not summon up resolution to die. . . . Meanwhile a courier arrived for Phaon. Nero snatched his despatches out of his hand, and read that the Senate had decided that he should be punished in the ancestral fashion as a public enemy. Asking what the ancestral fashion was, he was informed that he would be stripped naked and scourged to death with rods, with his head thrust into a fork. Horrified at this, he seized two daggers, and after theatrically trying their edges, sheathed them again, with the excuse that the fatal moment had not yet arrived! Then he bade Sporus begin to sing his funeral song, and begged some one to show him how to die. . . . The sound of horses' hoofs then broke on his ears, and, venting one more Greek quotation, he held the dagger to his throat. It was driven home by Epaphroditus, one of his literary slaves. . . . So died the last of the Cæsars! And as Robespierre was lamented by his landlady, so even Nero was tenderly buried by two nurses who had known him in the exquisite beauty of his engaging childhood, and by Acte, who had inspired his youth with a genuine love."—F. W. Farrar, *The Early Days of Christianity, bk.* 1, *ch.* 4.

Also in: T. W. Allies, *The Formation of Christendom, ch.* 10 (*v.* 2).

A. D. 68-96.—End of the Julian line.—The "Twelve Cæsars" and their successors.—A logical classification.—"In the sixth Caesar [Nero] terminated the Julian line. The three next princes in the succession were personally uninteresting; and, with a slight reserve in favor of Otho, . . . were even brutal in the tenor of their lives and monstrous; besides that the extreme brevity of their several reigns (all three, taken conjunctly, having held the supreme power for no more than twelve months and twenty days) dismisses them from all effectual station or right to a separate notice in the line of Caesars. Coming to the tenth in the succession, Vespasian, and his two sons, Titus and Domitian, who make up the list of the twelve Caesars, as they are usually called, we find matter for deeper political meditation and subjects of curious research. But these emperors would be more properly classed with the five who succeed them—Nerva, Trajan, Hadrian, and the two Antonines; after whom comes the young ruffian, Commodus, another Caligula or Nero, from whose short and infamous reign Gibbon takes up his tale of the decline of the empire. And this classification would probably have prevailed, had not the very curious work of Suetonius, whose own life and period of observation determined the series and cycle of his subjects, led to a different distribution. But as it is evident that, in the succession of the first twelve Caesars, the six latter have no connection whatever by descent, collaterally, or otherwise, with the six first, it would be a more logical distribution to combine them according to the fortunes of the state itself, and the succession of its prosperity through the several stages of splendour, declension, revival, and final decay. Under this arrangement, the first seventeen would belong to the first stage; Commodus would open the second; Aurelian down to Constantine or Julian would fill the third; and Jovian to Augustulus would bring up the melancholy rear."—T. De Quincey, *The Cæsars, ch.* 3.

A. D. 69.—Revolt of the Batavians under Civilis. See Batavians: A. D. 69.

A. D. 69.—Galba, Otho, Vitellius.—Vespasian.—The Vitellian conflict.— On the overthrow and death of Nero, June, A. D. 68, the veteran soldier Galba, proclaimed imperator by his legions in Spain, and accepted by the Roman senate, mounted the imperial throne. His brief reign was terminated in January of the following year by a sudden revolt of the prætorian guard, instigated by Salvius Otho, one of the profligate favorites of Nero, who had betrayed his former patron and was disappointed in the results. Galba was slain and Otho made emperor, to reign, in his turn, for a brief term of three months. Revolt against Otho was quick to show itself in the provinces, east and west. The legions on the Rhine set up a rival emperor, in the person of their commander, Aulus Vitellius, whose single talent was in gluttony, and who had earned by his vices the favor of four beastly rulers, from Tiberius to Nero, in succession. Gaul having declared in his favor, Vitellius sent forward two armies by different routes into Italy. Otho met them, with such forces as he could gather, at Bedriacum, between Verona and Cremona, and suffered there a defeat which he accepted as decisive. He slew himself, and Vitellius made his way to Rome without further opposition, permitting his soldiers to plunder the country as they advanced. But the armies of the east were not disposed to accept an emperor by the election of the armies of the west, and they, too, put forward a candidate for the purple. Their choice was better guided, for it fell on the sturdy soldier, Titus Flavius Vespasianus, then commanding in Judea. The advance corps of the forces supporting Vespasian (called "Flavians," or "Flavianites") entered Cisalpine Gaul from Illyricum in the autumn of 69, and encountered the Vitellians at Bedriacum, on the same field where the latter had defeated the Othonians a few weeks before. The Vitellians were defeated. Cremona, a flourishing Roman colony, which capitulated to the conquerors, was perfidiously given up to a merciless soldiery and totally destroyed,— one temple, alone, escaping. Vitellius, in despair, showed an eagerness to resign the throne, and negotiated his resignation with a brother of Vespasian, residing in Rome. But the mob of fugitive Vitellian soldiers which had collected in the capital interposed violently to prevent this abdication. Flavius Sabinus — the brother of Vespasian — took refuge, with his supporters, in the Capitolium, or temple of Jupiter, on the Capitoline Hill. But the sacred precincts were stormed by the Vitellian mob, the Capitol — the august sanctuary of Rome — was burned and Sabinus was slain. The army which had won the victory for Vespasian at Bedriacum, commanded by Antonius Primus, soon appeared at the gates of the city, to avenge this outrage. The unorganized force which attempted opposition was driven before it in worse disorder. Victors and vanquished poured into Rome together, slaughtering and being slaughtered in the streets. The rabble of the city joined in the bloody hunt, and in the plundering that went with it. "Rome had seen the conflicts of armed men in the streets under Sulla and Cinna, but never before such a hideous mixture of levity and ferocity." Vitellius was among the slain, his brief reign ending on the 21st of December, A. D. 69. Vespasian was still in the east, and did not enter Rome until the summer of the following year. —Tacitus, *History, bk.* 1-3.

Also in: C. Merivale, *Hist. of the Romans, ch.* 56-57.

A. D. 70.—Siege and destruction of Jerusalem by Titus. See Jews: A. D. 66-70.

A. D. 70-96.—The Flavian family.—Vespasian, Titus, and Domitian. — "Unfortunately Tacitus fails us . . . at this point, and this time completely. Nothing has been saved of his 'Histories' from the middle of the year 70, and we find ourselves reduced to the mere biographies of Suetonius, to the fragments of Dion, to the abridgments of Aurelius Victor and Eutropius. The majestic stream from which we have drawn and which flowed with brimming banks is now only a meagre thread of water. Of all the emperors Vespasian is the one who loses the most by this, for he was, says S. Augustine, a very good prince and very worthy of being beloved. He came into power at an age when one is no longer given to change, at 60 years. He had never been fond of gaming or debauchery, and he maintained his health by a frugal diet, even passing one day every month without eating. His life was simple and laborious. . . . He had no higher aim than to establish order in the state and in the finances; but he accomplished this, and if his principate, like all the others, made no preparations for the future, it did much for the present. It was a restorative reign, the effects of which were felt for several generations; this service is as valuable as the most brilliant victories. Following the example of the second Julius, the first of the Flavians resolved to seek in the senate the support of his government. This assembly, debased by so many years of tyranny, needed as much as it did a century before to be submitted to a severe revision. . . . Vespasian acted with resolution. Invested with the title of censor in 73, with his son Titus for colleague, he struck from the rolls of the two orders the members deemed unworthy, replaced them by the most distinguished persons of the Empire, and, by virtue of his powers as sovereign pontiff, raised several of them to the patriciate. A thousand Italian or provincial families came to be added to the 200 aristocratic families which had survived, and constituted with these the higher Roman society, from which the candidates for all civil, military, and religious functions were taken. . . . This aristocracy, borrowed by Vespasian from the provincial cities, where it had been trained to public affairs, where it had acquired a taste for economy, simplicity, and order, brought into Rome pure morals. . . . It will furnish the great emperors of the second century, the skilled lieutenants who will second them, and senators who will hereafter conspire only at long intervals. . . . To the senate, thus renewed and become the true representation of the Empire, Vespasian submitted all important matters. . . . Suetonius renders him this testimony, that it would be difficult to cite a single individual unjustly punished in his reign, at least unless it were in his absence or without his knowledge. He loved to dispense justice himself in the Forum. . . . The legions, who had made and unmade five emperors in two years, were no longer attentive to the ancient discipline. He brought them back to it. . . . The morals of the times were bad; he did more than the laws to reform them — he set

good examples. . . . Augustus had raised two altars to Peace; Vespasian built a temple to her, in which he deposited the most precious spoils of Jerusalem; and . . . the old general closed, for the sixth time, the doors of the temple of Janus. He built a forum surrounded by colonnades, in addition to those already existing, and commenced, in the midst of the city, the vast amphitheatre, a mountain of stone, of which three-fourths remain standing to-day. . . . A colossal statue raised near by for Nero, but which Vespasian consecrated to the Sun, gave it its name, the Coliseum. . . . We have no knowledge of the wars of Vespasian, except that three times in the year 71 he assumed the title of 'imperator,' and three times again the following year. But when we see him making Cappadocia an imperial proconsular province with numerous garrisons to check the incursions which desolated it; and, towards the Danube, extending his influence over the barbarians even beyond the Borysthenes; when we read in Tacitus that Velleda, the prophetess of the Bructeri, was at that time brought a captive to Rome; that Cerialis vanquished the Brigantes and Frontinus the Silures, we must believe that Vespasian made a vigorous effort along the whole line of his outposts to impress upon foreign nations respect for the Roman name. . . . Here is the secret of that severe economy which appeared to the prodigal and light-minded a shameful stinginess. . . . Vespasian . . . was 69 years old, and was at his little house in the territory of Reate when he felt the approach of death. 'I feel that I am becoming a god,' he said to those around him, laughing in advance at his apotheosis. . . . 'An emperor,' he said, 'ought to die standing.' He attempted to rise and expired in this effort, on the 23rd of June, 79. The first plebeian emperor has had no historian, but a few words of his biographer suffice for his renown: 'rem publicam stabilivit et ornavit,' 'by him the State was strengthened and glorified.'. . . Vespasian being dead, Titus assumed the title of Augustus. . . . His father had prepared him for this by taking him as associate in the Empire; he had given to him the title of Cæsar, the censorship, the tribunitian power, the prefecture of the prætorium, and seven consulates. Coming into power at the age of maturity, rich in experience and satiated with pleasures by his very excesses, he had henceforth but one passion, that of the public welfare. At the outset he dismissed his boon companions; in his father's lifetime he had already sacrificed to Roman prejudices his tender sentiments for the Jewish queen Berenice, whom he had sent back to the East. In taking possession of the supreme pontificate he declared that he would keep his hands pure from blood, and he kept his word: no one under his reign perished by his orders." It was during the short reign of Titus that Herculaneum and Pompeii were overwhelmed by an eruption of Vesuvius (August 23, A. D. 79), while other calamities afflicted Italy. "Pestilence carried off thousands of people even in Rome [see PLAGUE: A. D. 78–266]; and at last a conflagration, which raged three days, consumed once more the Capitol, the library of Augustus, and Pompey's theatre. To Campania Titus sent men of consular rank with large sums of money, and he devoted to the relief of the survivors the property that had fallen to the treasury through the death of those who had perished in the disaster without leaving heirs. At Rome he took upon himself the work of repairing everything, and to provide the requisite funds he sold the furniture of the imperial palace. . . . This reign lasted only 26 months, from the 23rd of June, A. D. 79, to the 13th of September, A. D. 81. As Titus was about to visit his paternal estate in the Sabine territory he was seized by a violent fever, which soon left no hope of his recovery. There is a report that he partly opened the curtains of his litter and gazed at the sky with eyes full of tears and reproaches. 'Why,' he exclaimed, 'must I die so soon? In all my life I have, however, but one thing to repent.' What was this? No one knows." Titus was succeeded by his brother Domitian, then thirty years old. "The youth of Domitian had been worthy of the times of Nero, and he had wearied his father and brother by his intrigues. Nevertheless he was sober, to the extent of taking but one meal a day, and he had a taste for military exercises, for study and poetry, especially since the elevation of his family. Vespasian had granted him honours, but no power, and, at the death of Titus, he had only the titles of Cæsar and Prince of the Youth. In his hurry to seize at last that Empire so long coveted, he abandoned his dying brother to rush to Rome, to the camp of the prætorians. . . . On the day of their coronation there are few bad princes. Almost all begin well, but, in despotic monarchies, the majority end badly, particularly when the reigns are of long duration. . . . Domitian reigned 15 years, one year longer than Nero, and his reign reproduced the same story: at first a wise government, then every excess. Happily the excesses did not come till late. . . . Fully as vain as the son of Agrippina, Domitian heaped every title upon his own head and decreed deification to himself. His edicts stated: 'Our lord and our god ordains. . . .' The new god did not scorn vulgar honours. . . . He was consul 17 times, and 22 times did he have himself proclaimed 'imperator' for victories that had not always been gained. He recalled Nero too by his fondness for shows and for building. . . . There were several wars under Domitian, all defensive excepting the expedition against the Catti [see CHATTI], which was only a great civil measure to drive away the hostile marauders from the frontier. If Pliny the Younger and Tacitus are to be believed, these wars were like those which Caligula waged: Domitian's victories were defeats; his captives, purchased slaves; his triumphs, audacious falsehoods. Suetonius is not so severe. . . . Domitian's cruelty appeared especially, and perhaps we should say only, after the revolt of a person of high rank, Antonius Saturninus, who pretended to be a descendant of the triumvir. . . . He was in command of two legions in Germany whom he incited to revolt, and he called the Germans to his aid. An unexpected thaw stopped this tribe on the right bank of the Rhine, while Appius Norbanus Maximus, governor of Aquitania, crushed Antonius on the opposite shore. . . . This revolt must belong to the year 93, which, as Pliny says, is that in which Domitian's great cruelties began. . . . Domitian lived in a state of constant alarm; every sound terrified him, every man seemed to him an assassin, every occurrence was an omen of evil." He endured this life of gloomy terror for three years, when his dread forebodings were realized, and he was

murdered by his own attendants, September 18, A. D. 96.—V. Duruy, *Hist. of Rome, ch.* 77–78 (*v.* 4).

Also in: Suetonius, *Lives of the Twelve Cæsars: Vespasian, Titus, Domitian.*—C. Merivale, *Hist. of the Romans under the Empire, ch.* 57–60 (*v.* 6–7).

A. D. 78-84.—Campaigns of Agricola in Britain. See Britain: A. D. 78–84.

A. D. 96-138.—Brief reign of Nerva.—Adoption and succession of Trajan.—His persecution of Christians.—His conquests beyond the Danube and in the east.—Hadrian's relinquishment of them.—"On the same day on which Domitian was assassinated, M. Cocceius Nerva was proclaimed Emperor by the Prætorians, and confirmed by the people. He owed his elevation principally to Petronius, Prefect of the Prætorians, and Parthenius, chamberlain to the late Emperor. He was of Cretan origin, and a native of Narni in Umbria, and consequently the first Emperor who was not of Italian descent. . . . He was prudent, upright, generous, and of a gentle temper; but a feeble frame and weak constitution, added to the burden of 64 years, rendered him too reserved, timid, and irresolute for the arduous duties of a sovereign prince. . . . The tolerant and reforming administration of the new Emperor soon became popular. Rome breathed again after the bloody tyranny under which she had been trampled to the dust. The perjured 'delator' was threatened with the severest penalties. The treacherous slave who had denounced his master was put to death. Exiles returned to their native cities, and again enjoyed their confiscated possessions. . . . Determined to administer the government for the benefit of the Roman people, he (Nerva) turned his attention to the question of finance, and to the burdensome taxation which was the fruit of the extravagance of his predecessors. . . . He diminished the enormous sums which were lavished upon shows and spectacles, and reduced, as far as was possible, his personal and household expenses. . . . It was not probable that an Emperor of so weak and yielding a character, notwithstanding his good qualities as a prince and a statesman, would be acceptable to a licentious and dominant soldiery. But a few months had elapsed when a conspiracy was organized against him by Calpurnius Crassus. It was, however, discovered; and the ringleader, having confessed his crime, experienced the Emperor's usual generosity, being only punished by banishment to Tarentum. . . . Meanwhile the Prætorians, led on by Ælianus Carperius, who had been their Prefect under Domitian, besieged Nerva in his palace, with cries of vengeance upon the assassins of his predecessor, murdered Petronius and Parthenius, and compelled the timid Emperor publicly to express his approbation of the deed, and to testify his obligation to them for wreaking vengeance on the guilty. . . . Nerva was in declining years, and, taught by circumstances that he was unequal to curb or cope with the insolence of the soldiery, adopted Trajan as his son and successor [A. D. 97]. Soon after, he conferred upon him in the Senate the rank of Cæsar, and the name of Germanicus, and added the tribuneship and the title of Emperor. This act calmed the tumult, and was welcomed with the unanimous consent of the Senate and the people. . . . Soon after the adoption of Trajan he died of a fit of ague which brought on fever, at the gardens of Sallust, after a reign of sixteen months, in the sixty-sixth year of his age [A. D. 98]. . . . The choice which Nerva had made proved a fortunate one. M. Ulpius Nerva Trajanus was a Spaniard, a native of Italica, near Seville. . . . He was of an ancient and distinguished family, and his father had filled the office of consul. Although a foreigner, he was a Roman in habits, sympathies, and language; for the south of Spain had become so completely Roman that the inhabitants generally spoke Latin. When a young man he had distinguished himself in a war against the Parthians. . . . At the time of his adoption by Nerva he was in command of a powerful army in Lower Germany, his head-quarters being at Cologne. He was in the prime of life, possessed of a robust constitution, a commanding figure, and a majestic countenance. He was a perfect soldier, by taste and education, and was endowed with all the qualities of a general. . . . He was a strict disciplinarian, but he knew all his veterans, spoke to them by their names, and never let a gallant action pass unrewarded. . . . The news of Nerva's death was conveyed to him at Cologne by his cousin Hadrian, where he immediately received the imperial power. During the first year of his reign he remained with the army in Germany, engaged in establishing the discipline of the troops and in inspiring them with a love of their duty. . . . The ensuing year he made his entry into Rome on foot, together with his empress, Pompeia Plotina, whose amiability and estimable character contributed much to the popularity of her husband. Her conduct, together with that of his sister, Marciana, exercised a most beneficial influence upon Roman society. They were the first ladies of the imperial court who by their example checked the shameless licentiousness which had long prevailed amongst women of the higher classes. . . . The tastes and habits of his former life led to a change in the peaceful policy which had so long prevailed. The first war in which he was engaged was with the Dacians, who inhabited the country beyond the Danube [see Dacia: A. D. 102–106]. . . . A few years of peace ensued, which Trajan endured with patient reluctance; and many great public works undertaken during the interval show his genius for civil as well as for military administration. . . . But his presence was soon required in the East, and he joyfully hailed the opportunity thus offered him for gaining fresh laurels. The real object of this expedition was ambition—the pretext, that Exedarius, or Exodares, king of Armenia, had received the crown from the king of Parthia, instead of from the Emperor of Rome, as Tiridates had from the hands of Nero. For this insult he demanded satisfaction. Chosroes, the king of Parthia, at first treated his message with contempt; but afterwards, seeing that war was imminent, he sent ambassadors with presents to meet Trajan at Athens, and to announce to him the deposition of Exedarius, and to entreat him to confer the crown of Armenia upon Parthamasiris, or Parthamaspes. Trajan received the ambassadors coldly, told them that he was on his march to Syria, and would there act as he thought fit. Accordingly he crossed into Asia, and marched by way of Cilicia, Syria, and Seleucia to Antioch. The condemnation of the

martyr bishop St. Ignatius marked his stay in that city [A. D. 115]. It seems strange that the persecution of the Christians should have met with countenance and support from an emperor like Trajan; but the fact is, the Roman mind could not separate the Christian from the Jew. The religious distinction was beneath their notice; they contemplated the former merely as a sect of the latter. The Roman party in Asia were persuaded that the Jews were meditating and preparing for insurrection; and the rebellions of this and the ensuing reign proved that their apprehensions were not unreasonable. Hence, at Antioch, the imperial influence was on the side of persecution; and hence when Pliny, the gentle governor of Pontus and Bithynia, wrote to Trajan for instructions respecting the Christians in his province, his 'rescript' spoke of Christianity as a dangerous superstition, and enjoined the punishment of its professors if discovered, although he would not have them sought for. Having received the voluntary submission of Abgarus, prince of Osrhoene in Mesopotamia, he marched against Armenia. Parthamasiris, who had assumed the royal state, laid his diadem at his feet, in the hopes that he would return it to him as Nero had to Tiridates. Trajan claimed his kingdom as a province of the Roman people, and the unfortunate monarch lost his life in a useless struggle for his crown. This was the commencement of his triumphs: he received the voluntary submission of the kings of Iberia, Sarmatia, the Bosphorus, Colchis, Albania; and he assigned kings to most of the barbarous tribes that inhabited the coast of the Euxine. Still he proceeded on his career of conquest. He chastised the king of Adiabene, who had behaved to him with treachery, and took possession of his dominions, subjugated the rest of Mesopotamia, constructed a bridge of boats over the Tigris, and commenced a canal to unite the two great rivers of Assyria. His course of conquest was resistless; he captured Seleucia, earned the title of Parthicus by taking Ctesiphon, the capital of Parthia [A. D. 116], imposed a tribute on Mesopotamia, and reduced Assyria to the condition of a Roman province. He returned to winter at Antioch, which was in the same winter almost destroyed by an earthquake. Trajan escaped through a window, not without personal injury. . . . The river Tigris bore the victorious Emperor from the scene of his conquest down to the Persian Gulf; he subjugated Arabia Felix, and, like a second Alexander, was meditating and even making preparations for an invasion of India by sea; but his ambitious designs were frustrated by troubles nearer at hand. Some of the conquered nations revolted, and his garrisons were either expelled or put to the sword. He sent his generals to crush the rebels; one of them, Maximus, was conquered and slain; the other, Lusius Quietus, gained considerable advantages and was made governor of Palestine, which had begun to be in a state of insurrection [see JEWS: A. D. 116]. He himself marched to punish the revolted Hagareni (Saracens), whose city was called Atra, in Mesopotamia. . . . Trajan laid siege to it, but was obliged to raise the siege with great loss. Soon after this he was seized with illness. . . . Leaving his army therefore to the care of Hadrian, whom he had made governor of Syria, he embarked for Rome at the earnest solicitation of the Senate. On arriving at Selinus in Cilicia (afterwards named Trajanopolis), he was seized with diarrhœa, and expired in the twentieth year of his reign [August, A. D. 117]. . . . He died childless, and it is said had not intended to nominate a successor, following in this the example of Alexander. Hadrian owed his adoption to Plotina. . . . Dio positively asserts that she concealed her husband's death for some days, and that the letter informing the Senate of his last intentions was signed by her, and not by Trajan. Hadrian received the despatches declaring his adoption on the 9th of August, and those announcing Trajan's death two days afterwards. . . . As soon as he was proclaimed Emperor at Antioch, he sent an apologetic despatch to the Senate requesting their assent to his election; the army, he said, had chosen him without waiting for their sanction, lest the Republic should remain without a prince. The confirmation which he asked for was immediately granted. . . . The state of Roman affairs was at this moment a very critical one, and did not permit the new Emperor to leave the East. Emboldened by the news of Trajan's illness, the conquered Parthians had revolted and achieved some great successes; Sarmatia on the north, Mauritania, Egypt, and Syria on the south, were already in a state of insurrection. The far-sighted prudence of Hadrian led him to fear that the empire was not unlikely to fall to pieces by its own weight, and that the Euphrates was its best boundary. It was doubtless a great sacrifice to surrender all the rich and populous provinces beyond that river which had been gained by the arms of his predecessor. It was no coward fear or mean envy of Trajan which prompted Hadrian, but he wisely felt that it was worth any price to purchase peace and security. Accordingly he withdrew the Roman armies from Armenia, Assyria and Mesopotamia, constituted the former of these an independent kingdom, surrendered their two latter to the Parthians, and restored their deposed king Chosroes to his throne. . . . After taking these measures for establishing peace in the East, he left Catilius Severus governor of Syria, and returned by way of Illyria to Rome, where he arrived the following year. . . . A restless curiosity, which was one of the principal features in his character, would not permit him to remain inactive at Rome; he determined to make a personal survey of every province throughout his vast dominions, and for this reason he is so frequently represented on medals as the Roman Hercules. He commenced his travels with Gaul, thence he proceeded to Germany, where he established order and discipline amongst the Roman forces, and then crossed over to Britain. . . . It would be uninteresting to give a mere catalogue of the countries which he visited during the ensuing ten years of his reign. In the fifteenth winter of it he arrived in Egypt, and rebuilt the tomb of Pompey the Great at Pelusium. Thence he proceeded to Alexandria which was at that period the university of the world. . . . He had scarcely passed through Syria when the Jews revolted, and continued in arms for three years [see JEWS: A. D. 130–134]. . . . Hadrian spent the winter at Athens, where he gratified his architectural taste by completing the temple of Jupiter Olympius. . . . Conscious . . . of the infirmities of disease and of advancing years, he adopted L. Aurelius Verus, a man

OCEANUS ATLANTICUS
MARE GERMANICUM
MARE IBERICUM
MARE ADRIATICUM
MARE TYRRHENUM
MARE BALEARES
MARE SARDINIA
MARE CORSICA
MARE SICILIA
MARE AFRICA
MARE GAETULIA
HIBERNIA
CALEDONIA
VALENTIA
MAXIMA CAESARIENSIS
BRITANNIA SECUNDA
FLAVIA CAESARIENSIS
BRITANNIA PRIMA
BELGICA
GERMANIA INFERIOR
GERMANIA SUPERIOR
LUGDUNENSIS
AQUITANIA
GALLIA NARBONENSIS
TARRACONENSIS
LUSITANIA
BAETICA
RAETIA
NORICUM
PANNONIA
DALMATIA
ITALIA
ROMA
SICILIA
SARDINIA
CORSICA
NUMIDIA
MAURETANIA TINGITANA
MAURETANIA CAESARIENSIS
BYZACIUM
TRIPOLITANA
FRANKS
SAXONS
BURGUNDIANS
SUEVI
ALEMANNI
GERMANIA
Britannia
Rhenus
Colonia Agrippina
Rotomagus
Lutetia Parisiorum
Durocortorum
Agedincum
Lugdunum
Aventicum
Augusta Vindelicorum
Regina
Laurincum
Virunum
Aquileja
Tergeste
Salonae
Mediolanum
Genua
Massilia
Nicaea
Pisae
Ravenna
Arretium
Ancona
Perusia
Aesculum
Corfinium
Capua
Neapolis
Pompeji
Tarentum
Arpi
Messana
Lilybaeum
Agrigentum
Syracusae
Hippo Regius
Hippo Zarytus
Utica
Carthago
Hadrumetum
Leptis Magna
Caesarea
Icosium
Saldae
Sitifis
Tingis
Lixus
Gades
Malaca
Nova Carthago
Carthago
Corduba
Hispalis
Segovia
Toletum
Caesaraugusta
Tarraco
Dertosa
Valentia
Emerita Augusta
Olisipo
Conimbriga
Bracara
Asturica
Brigantium
Pallantia
Numantia
Pompaelo
Iuliobona
Durius
Tagus
Iberus
Baetis
Anas
Salo
Ebro
Rubricatum
Lemanis
Londinium
Camulodunum
Eburacum
Deva
Isca Silurum
Aquae Sulis
Glevum
Venta Belgarum
Calleva Atrebatum
Verulamium
Lindum
Ratae
Corieltauvorum
Viroconium
Uxacona
Augustobona Tricassium
Lugdunum
Vienna
Forum Julii
Arelate
Narbo
Tolosa
Burdigala
Limonum
Avaricum
Mediolanum Santonum
Augustoritum
Ageduincum
Vesontio
Argentoratum
Moguntiacum
Treviri
Augusta Rauricorum
Vindonissa
Brigantium
Curia
Tarvisium
Aquileja
Emona
Poetovio
Siscia
Sirmium
Scupi
Dyrrhachium
Apollonia
Nicopolis
Thessalonica
Philippi
Byzantium
Cyzicus
Nicomedia
Nicaea
Ancyra
Tarsus
Antioch
Seleucia
Laodicea
Tyre
Caesarea
Jerusalem
Damascus
Petra
Alexandria
Memphis
Pelusium
Babylon
Ctesiphon
Seleucia
Hatra
Nisibis
Carrhae
Zeugma
Edessa
Hierapolis
Samosata
Melitene
Satala
Trapezus
Artaxata
Tigranocerta
Nineveh
Arbela
Gaugamela
Susa
Persepolis
Pasargadae
Ecbatana
Rhagae
Hecatompylos
Alexandria Eschate
Bactra
Maracanda
Alexandria Margiana
Alexandria Arachosiae
Alexandria Carmaniae
Alexandria Ariana
Alexandria Prophthasia
Alexandria Opiana
Alexandria Caucasi
Alexandria Oxiana
Alexandria Ad Issum
Alexandria Troas
Alexandria Ad Aegyptum
Alexandria Ad Pedem Montis Caucasi
Alexandria Ad Pedem Montis Imaei
Alexandria Ad Pedem Montis Sogdiani
Alexandria Ad Pedem Montis Sogdiani
Alexandria Ad Pedem Montis Sogdiani


THE ROMAN EMPIRE AT ITS GREATEST EXTENT
UNDER TRAJAN (116)
SHOWING ACQUISITIONS OF TERRITORY FROM THE ACCESSION OF AUGUSTUS.
ROMAN TERRITORY AT THE ACCESSION OF AUGUSTUS
TERRITORY ACQUIRED TO THE ACCESSION OF TRAJAN
TERRITORY ACQUIRED BY TRAJAN
THE TEMPORARY CONQUESTS OF TRAJAN ARE SHOWN BY THE BORDER COLOR.
THE ACQUISITIONS OF THE DIFFERENT EMPERORS ARE INDICATED BY THE LETTERING.
SARMATIA
DACIA
By Trajan 106 A.D.
MOESIA INFERIOR
By Augustus 29 B.C.
THRACIA
By Claudius 47 A.D.
CHERSONESUS TAURICA
By Augustus
PONTUS EUXINUS
COLCHIS
IBERIA
ALBANIA
CASPIUM MARE
ALANI
HUNS
OSTRO-GOTHS
VISI-GOTHS
PAPHLAGONIA
BITHYNIA
GALATIA
By Augustus 25 B.C.
CAPPADOCIA
By Tiberius 17 A.D.
By Nero 63 A.D.
ARMENIA MINOR
By Vespasian
By Trajan 114 A.D.
ARMENIA
MEDIA ATROPATENE
MYSIA
LYDIA
CARIA
LYCIA
By Claudius 43 A.D.
PISIDIA
PAMPHYLIA
CILICIA
OSROENE
COMMAGENE
By Vespasian 73 A.D.
ADIABENE
PARTHIAN EMP.
MESOPOTAMIA
By Trajan 116
BABYLONIA
SYRIA
PHOENICIA
PALESTINA
ARABIA
By Trajan 107 A.D.
PETRAEA
AEGYPTUS
By Augustus 30 B.C.
MARMARICA
CRETA
CYPRUS
RHODUS
By Vespasian
MARE AEGAEUM
Nappoca
Apulum
Troesmis
Trajan's Bridge
Istor (Danube)
Tomi
Heraclea
Pityus
Dioscurias
Phasis
Trapezus
Sinope
Amisus
Amastris
Serdica
Philippopolis
Byzantium (By Vespasian)
Chalcedon
Nicomedia
Philippi
Thessalonica
Dyrrachium
Apollonia
Cyrene
Ancyra
Gangra
Sebastia
Halys
Caesarea Mazaca
Amida
Nisibis
Tigris
Ecbatana
Euphrates
Ctesiphon
Seleucia
Artaxata
Corduene
Gazaca
Nicephorium
Tyana
Iconium
Antioch in Pisidia
Sardis
Pergamum
Smyrna
Ephesus
Miletus
Tarsus
Seleucia
Antiochia
Apamea
Emesa
Palmyra
Damascus
Tyre
Caesarea
Bostra
Gaza
Jerusalem (Hierosolyma)
Alexandria
Sais
Pelusium
Thessalia
Delphi
Corinthus
Athenae
Achaia
Macedonia
Thessalonica
Aegium
Larissa
Epirus
Dardania
Moesia
Thracia
Pannonia
Germania
Sarmatia
Dacia
Pontus Euxinus
Mare Aegaeum
Mare Mediterraneum
Arabia
Mesopotamia
Babylonia
Parthian Emp.
Media Atropatene
Armenia
Colchis
Iberia
Albania
Caspium Mare
Alani
Huns
Ostro-Goths
Visi-Goths
Sarmatia
Cyprus
Creta
Rhodus
Marmarica
Aegyptus
Petraea
Arabia
Syria
Phoenicia
Palestina
Lycia
Caria
Lydia
Mysia
Bithynia
Galatia
Cappadocia
Armenia
Pontus
Paphlagonia
Chersonesus Taurica
Dacia
Moesia Inferior
Thracia
Macedonia
Achaia
Thessalia
Epirus
Dardania
Pannonia
Germania
Sarmatia
Dacia
Pontus Euxinus
Mare Aegaeum
Mare Mediterraneum
Arabia
Mesopotamia
Babylonia
Parthian Emp.
Media Atropatene
Armenia
Colchis
Iberia
Albania
Caspium Mare
Alani
Huns
Ostro-Goths
Visi-Goths
Sarmatia
Cyprus
Creta
Rhodus
Marmarica
Aegyptus
Petraea
Arabia
Syria
Phoenicia
Palestina
Lycia
Caria
Lydia
Mysia
Bithynia
Galatia
Cappadocia
Armenia
Pontus
Paphlagonia
Chersonesus Taurica
Dacia
Moesia Inferior
Thracia
Macedonia
Achaia
Thessalia
Epirus
Dardania
Pannonia
Germania
Sarmatia

of pleasure and of weak and delicate health, totally unfit for his new position. . . . Age and disease had now so altered his [Hadrian's] character that he became luxurious, self-indulgent, suspicious, and even cruel. Verus did not live two years, and the Emperor then adopted Titus Antoninus, on condition that he should in his turn adopt M. Annius Verus, afterwards called M. Aurelius, and the son of Aurelius Verus." Hadrian's malady "now became insupportably painful, his temper savage even to madness, and many lives of senators and others were sacrificed to his fury. His sufferings were so excruciating that he was always begging his attendants to put him to death. At last he went to Baiæ, where, setting at defiance the prescriptions of his physicians, he ate and drank what he pleased. Death, therefore, soon put a period to his sufferings, in the sixty-third year of his age and the twenty-first of his restless reign [A. D. 138]. Antoninus was present at his death, his corpse was burnt at Puteoli (Pozzuoli), and his ashes deposited in the mausoleum (moles Hadriani) which he had himself built, and which is now the Castle of St. Angelo."—R. W. Browne, *Hist. of Rome from A. D. 96, ch.* 1–2.

Also in: C. Merivale, *Hist. of the Romans under the Empire, ch.* 63–66 (*v.* 7).—T. Arnold and others, *Hist. of the Roman Empire* (*Encyclop. Metropolitana*), *ch.* 4–6.

A. D. 138-180.—The Antonines.—Antoninus Pius.—Marcus Aurelius.—"On the death of Hadrian in A. D. 138, Antoninus Pius succeeded to the throne, and, in accordance with the late Emperor's conditions, adopted Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Commodus. Marcus had been betrothed at the age of 15 to the sister of Lucius Commodus, but the new Emperor broke off the engagement, and betrothed him instead to his daughter Faustina. The marriage, however, was not celebrated till seven years afterwards, A. D. 146. The long reign of Antoninus Pius is one of those happy periods that have no history. An almost unbroken peace reigned at home and abroad. Taxes were lightened, calamities relieved, informers discouraged; confiscations were rare, plots and executions were almost unknown. Throughout the whole extent of his vast domain the people loved and valued their Emperor, and the Emperor's one aim was to further the happiness of his people. He, too, like Aurelius, had learnt that what was good for the bee was good for the hive. . . . He disliked war, did not value the military title of Imperator, and never deigned to accept a triumph. With this wise and eminent prince, who was as amiable in his private relations as he was admirable in the discharge of his public duties, Marcus Aurelius spent the next 23 years of his life. . . . There was not a shade of jealousy between them; each was the friend and adviser of the other, and, so far from regarding his destined heir with suspicion, the Emperor gave him the designation 'Cæsar,' and heaped upon him all the honours of the Roman commonwealth. It was in vain that the whisper of malignant tongues attempted to shake this mutual confidence. . . . In the year 161, when Marcus was now 40 years old, Antoninus Pius, who had reached the age of 75, caught a fever at Lorium. Feeling that his end was near, he summoned his friends and the chief men of Rome to his bedside, and there (without saying a word about his other adopted son, who is generally known by the name of Lucius Verus) solemnly recommended Marcus to them as his successor; and then, giving to the captain of the guard the watchword of 'Equanimity,' as though his earthly task was over he ordered to be transferred to the bedroom of Marcus the little golden statue of Fortune, which was kept in the private chamber of the Emperors as an omen of public prosperity. The very first act of the new Emperor was one of splendid generosity, namely, the admission of his adoptive brother Lucius Verus into the fullest participation of imperial honours. . . . The admission of Lucius Verus to a share of the Empire was due to the innate modesty of Marcus. As he was a devoted student, and cared less for manly exercises, in which Verus excelled, he thought that his adoptive brother would be a better and more useful general than himself, and that he could best serve the State by retaining the civil administration, and entrusting to his brother the management of war. Verus, however, as soon as he got away from the immediate influence and ennobling society of Marcus, broke loose from all decency, and showed himself to be a weak and worthless personage. . . . Two things only can be said in his favour; the one, that, though depraved, he was wholly free from cruelty; and the other, that he had the good sense to submit himself entirely to his brother. . . . Marcus had a large family by Faustina, and in the first year of his reign his wife bore twins, of whom the one who survived became the wicked and detested Emperor Commodus. As though the birth of such a child were in itself an omen of ruin, a storm of calamity began at once to burst over the long tranquil State. An inundation of the Tiber . . . caused a distress which ended in wide-spread famine. Men's minds were terrified by earthquakes, by the burning of cities, and by plagues of noxious insects. To these miseries, which the Emperors did their best to alleviate, was added the horror of wars and rumours of wars. The Parthians, under their king Vologeses, defeated and all but destroyed a Roman army, and devastated with impunity the Roman province of Syria. The wild tribes of the Catti burst over Germany with fire and sword; and the news from Britain was full of insurrection and tumult. Such were the elements of trouble and discord which overshadowed the reign of Marcus Aurelius from its very beginning down to its weary close. As the Parthian war was the most important of the three, Verus was sent to quell it, and but for the ability of his generals — the greatest of whom was Avidius Cassius — would have ruined irretrievably the fortunes of the Empire. These generals, however, vindicated the majesty of the Roman name [A. D. 165–166 — see Parthia], and Verus returned in triumph, bringing back with him from the East the seeds of a terrible pestilence which devastated the whole Empire [see Plague: A. D. 78–266] and by which, on the outbreak of fresh wars, Verus himself was carried off at Aquileia. . . . Marcus was now the undisputed lord of the Roman world. . . . But this imperial elevation kindled no glow of pride or self-satisfaction in his meek and chastened nature. He regarded himself as being in fact the servant of all. . . . He was one of those who held that nothing should be done hastily, and that few crimes were worse than the waste of time. It is to such views and

such habits that we owe the composition of his works. His 'Meditations' were written amid the painful self-denial and distracting anxieties of his wars with the Quadi and the Marcomanni [A. D. 168–180,—see SARMATIAN AND MARCOMANNIAN WARS OF MARCUS AURELIUS], and he was the author of other works which unhappily have perished. Perhaps of all the lost treasures of antiquity there are few which we should feel a greater wish to recover than the lost autobiography of this wisest of Emperors and holiest of Pagan men. . . . The Court was to Marcus a burden; he tells us himself that Philosophy was his mother, Empire only his stepmother; it was only his repose in the one that rendered even tolerable to him the burdens of the other. . . . The most celebrated event of the war [with the Quadi] took place in a great victory . . . which he won in A. D. 174, and which was attributed by the Christians to what is known as the 'Miracle of the Thundering Legion' [see THUNDERING LEGION]. . . . To the gentle heart of Marcus all war, even when accompanied with victories, was eminently distasteful; and in such painful and ungenial occupations no small part of his life was passed. . . . It was his unhappy destiny not to have trodden out the embers of this [the Sarmatian] war before he was burdened with another far more painful and formidable. This was the revolt of Avidius Cassius, a general of the old blunt Roman type, whom, in spite of some ominous warnings, Marcus both loved and trusted. The ingratitude displayed by such a man caused Marcus the deepest anguish; but he was saved from all dangerous consequences by the wide-spread affection which he had inspired by his virtuous reign. The very soldiers of the rebellious general fell away from him, and, after he had been a nominal Emperor for only three months and six days, he was assassinated by some of his own officers. . . . Marcus travelled through the provinces which had favoured the cause of Avidius Cassius, and treated them all with the most complete and indulgent forbearance. . . . During this journey of pacification, he lost his wife Faustina, who died suddenly in one of the valleys of Mount Taurus. History . . . has assigned to Faustina a character of the darkest infamy, and it has even been made a charge against Aurelius that he overlooked or condoned her offences. . . . No doubt Faustina was unworthy of her husband; but surely it is the glory and not the shame of a noble nature to be averse from jealousy and suspicion. . . . 'Marcus Aurelius cruelly persecuted the Christians.' Let us briefly consider this charge. . . . Marcus in his 'Meditations' alludes to the Christians once only, and then it is to make a passing complaint of the indifference to death, which appeared to him, as it appeared to Epictetus, to arise, not from any noble principles, but from mere obstinacy and perversity. That he shared the profound dislike with which Christians were regarded is very probable. That he was a cold-blooded and virulent persecutor is utterly unlike his whole character. . . . The true state of the case seems to have been this: The deep calamities in which during the whole reign of Marcus the Empire was involved, caused wide-spread distress, and roused into peculiar fury the feelings of the provincials against men whose atheism (for such they considered it to be) had kindled the anger of the gods. . . . Marcus, when appealed to, simply let the existing law take its course. . . . The martyrdoms took place in Gaul and Asia Minor, not in Rome. . . . The persecution of the churches in Lyons and Vienne happened in A. D. 177. Shortly after this period fresh wars recalled the Emperor to the North. . . . He was worn out with the toils, trials and travels of his long and weary life. He sunk under mental anxieties and bodily fatigues, and after a brief illness died in Pannonia, either at Vienna or at Sirmium, on March 17, A. D. 180, in the 59th year of his age and the 20th of his reign."—F. W. Farrar, *Seekers after God: Marcus Aurelius.*—"One moment, thanks to him, the world was governed by the best and greatest man of his age. Frightful decadences followed; but the little casket which contained the 'Thoughts' on the banks of the Granicus was saved. From it came forth that incomparable book in which Epictetus was surpassed, that Evangel of those who believe not in the supernatural, which has not been comprehended until our day. Veritable, eternal Evangel, the book of 'Thoughts,' which will never grow old, because it asserts no dogma."—E. Renan, *English Conferences: Marcus Aurelius.*

ALSO IN: W. W. Capes, *The Age of the Antonines.*—C. Merivale, *Hist. of the Romans under the Empire, ch.* 67-68 (*v.* 7).—P. B. Watson, *Marcus Aurelius Antoninus.*—G. Long, *Thoughts of the Emperor M. Aurelius Antoninus, introd.*

A. D. 180-192.—The reign of Commodus.—"If a man were called to fix the period in the history of the world during which the condition of the human race was most happy and prosperous, he would, without hesitation, name that which elapsed from the death of Domitian to the accession of Commodus. The vast extent of the Roman empire was governed by absolute power, under the guidance of virtue and wisdom. The armies were restrained by the firm but gentle hand of four successive emperors whose characters and authority commanded involuntary respect. . . . It has been objected to Marcus, that he sacrificed the happiness of millions to a fond partiality for a worthless boy; and that he chose a successor in his own family rather than in the republic. Nothing, however, was neglected by the anxious father, and by the men of virtue and learning whom he summoned to his assistance, to expand the narrow mind of young Commodus, to correct his growing vices, and to render him worthy of the throne for which he was designed. . . . The beloved son of Marcus succeeded to his father, amidst the acclamations of the senate and armies; and when he ascended the throne, the happy youth saw round him neither competitor to remove, nor enemies to punish. In this calm elevated station it was surely natural that he should prefer the love of mankind to their detestation, the mild glories of his five predecessors to the ignominious fate of Nero and Domitian. Yet Commodus was not, as he has been represented, a tiger born with an insatiate thirst of human blood, and capable, from his infancy, of the most inhuman actions. Nature had formed him of a weak, rather than a wicked disposition. His simplicity and timidity rendered him the slave of his attendants, who gradually corrupted his mind. His cruelty, which at first obeyed the dictates of others, degenerated into habit, and at length became the ruling passion of his soul. . . . During the three first years of his reign, the

forms, and even the spirit, of the old administration were maintained by those faithful counsellors to whom Marcus had recommended his son, and for whose wisdom and integrity Commodus still entertained a reluctant esteem. The young prince and his profligate favorites revelled in all the license of sovereign power; but his hands were yet unstained with blood; and he had even displayed a generosity of sentiment, which might perhaps have ripened into solid virtue. A fatal incident decided his fluctuating character. One evening, as the emperor was returning to the palace through a dark and narrow portico in the amphitheatre, an assassin, who waited his passage, rushed upon him with a drawn sword, loudly exclaiming, 'The senate sends you this.' The menace prevented the deed; the assassin was seized by the guards, and immediately revealed the authors of the conspiracy. It had been formed, not in the State, but within the walls of the palace. . . . But the words of the assassin sunk deep into the mind of Commodus, and left an indelible impression of fear and hatred against the whole body of the senate. Those whom he had dreaded as importunate ministers he now suspected as secret enemies. The Delators, a race of men discouraged, and almost extinguished, under the former reigns, again became formidable as soon as they discovered that the emperor was desirous of finding disaffection and treason in the senate. . . . Suspicion was equivalent to proof; trial to condemnation. The execution of a considerable senator was attended with the death of all who might lament or revenge his fate; and when Commodus had once tasted human blood, he became incapable of pity or remorse. . . . Pestilence and famine contributed to fill up the measure of the calamities of Rome. . . . His cruelty proved at last fatal to himself. He had shed with impunity the noblest blood of Rome: he perished as soon as he was dreaded by his own domestics. Marcia, his favorite concubine, Eclectus, his chamberlain, and Lætus, his Prætorian præfect, alarmed by the fate of their companions and predecessors, resolved to prevent the destruction which every hour hung over their heads, either from the mad caprice of the tyrant, or the sudden indignation of the people. Marcia seized the occasion of presenting a draught of wine to her lover, after he had fatigued himself with hunting some wild beasts. Commodus retired to sleep; but whilst he was laboring with the effects of poison and drunkenness, a robust youth, by profession a wrestler, entered his chamber, and strangled him without resistance" (December 31, A. D. 192).—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, ch.* 3–4.

Also in: J. B. L. Crevier, *Hist. of the Roman Emperors, bk.* 21 (*v.* 7).

A. D. 192-284.—From Commodus to Diocletian.—Twenty-three Emperors in the Century.—Thirteen murdered by their own soldiers or servants.—Successful wars of Severus, Aurelian, and Probus.—On the murder of Commodus, "Helvius Pertinax, the prefect of the city, a man of virtue, was placed on the throne by the conspirators, who would fain justify their deed in the eyes of the world, and their choice was confirmed by the senate. But the Prætorians had not forgotten their own power on a similar occasion; and they liked not the virtue and regularity of the new monarch. Pertinax was, therefore, speedily deprived of throne and life. Prætorian insolence now attained its height. Regardless of the dignity and honour of the empire, they set it up to auction. The highest bidder was a senator, named Didius Julianus [March, 193]. . . . The legions disdained to receive an emperor from the life-guards. Those of Britain proclaimed their general Clodius Albinus; those of Asia, Pescennius Niger; the Pannonian legions, Septimius Severus. This last was a man of bravery and conduct: by valour and stratagem he successively vanquished his rivals [dêfeating Albinus in an obstinate battle at Lyons, A. D. 197, and finishing the subjugation of his rivals in the east by reducing Byzantium after a siege of three years]. He maintained the superiority of the Roman arms against the Parthians and Caledonians [see Britain: A. D. 208–211]. His reign was vigorous and advantageous to the state; but he wanted either the courage or the power to fully repress the license and insubordination of the soldiery. Severus left the empire [A. D. 211] to his two sons. Caracalla, the elder, a prince of violent and untamable passions, disdained to share empire with any. He murdered his brother and colleague, the more gentle Geta, and put to death all who ventured to disapprove of the deed. A restless ferocity distinguished the character of Caracalla: he was ever at war, now on the banks of the Rhine, now on those of the Euphrates. His martial impetuosity daunted his enemies; his reckless cruelty terrified his subjects. . . . During a Parthian war Caracalla gave offence to Macrinus, the commander of his body-guard, who murdered him [A. D. 217]. Macrinus seized the empire, but had not power to hold it. He and his son Diadumenianus [after defeat in battle at Immæ, near Antioch] . . . were put to death by the army, who proclaimed a supposed son [and actually a second cousin] of their beloved Caracalla. This youth was named Elagabalus, and was priest of the Sun in the temple of Emesa, in Syria. Every vice stained the character of this licentious effeminate youth, whose name is become proverbial for sensual indulgence: he possessed no redeeming quality, had no friend, and was put to death by his own guards, who, vicious as they were themselves, detested vice in him. Alexander Severus, cousin to Elagabalus, but of a totally opposite character, succeeded that vicious prince [A. D. 222]. All estimable qualities were united in the noble and accomplished Alexander. . . . The love of learning and virtue did not in him smother military skill and valour; he checked the martial hordes of Germany, and led the Roman eagles to victory against the Sassanides, who had displaced the Arsacides in the dominion over Persia, and revived the claims of the house of Cyrus over Anterior Asia. Alexander, victorious in war, beloved by his subjects, deemed he might venture on introducing more regular discipline into the army. The attempt was fatal, and the amiable monarch lost his life in the mutiny that resulted [A. D. 235]. Maximin, a soldier, originally a Thracian shepherd, distinguished by his prodigious size, strength and appetite, a stranger to all civic virtues and all civic rules, rude, brutal, cruel, and ferocious, seated himself on the throne of the noble and virtuous prince, in whose murder he had been the chief agent. At Rome, the senate conferred the vacant dignity on Gordian, a noble, wealthy

and virtuous senator, and on his son of the same name, a valiant and spirited youth. But scarcely were they recognized when the son fell in an engagement, and the father slew himself [A. D. 237]. Maximin was now rapidly marching towards Rome, full of rage and fury. Despair gave courage to the senate; they nominated Balbinus and Pupienus [Maximus Pupienus], one to direct the internal, the other the external affairs. Maximin had advanced as far as Aquileia [which he besieged without success], when his horrible cruelties caused an insurrection against him, and he and his son, an amiable youth, were murdered [A. D. 238]. The army was not, however, willing to acquiesce in the claim of the senate to appoint an emperor. Civil war was on the point of breaking out [and Balbinus and Pupienus were massacred by the Prætorians], when the conflicting parties agreed in the person of the third Gordian, a boy of but thirteen years of age [A. D. 238]. Gordian III. was . . . chiefly guided by his father-in-law, Misitheus, who induced him to engage in war against the Persians. In the war, Gordian displayed a courage worthy of any of his predecessors; but he shared what was now become the usual fate of a Roman emperor. He was murdered by Philip, the captain of his guard [A. D. 244]. Philip, an Arabian by birth, originally a captain of freebooters, seized on the purple of his murdered sovereign. Two rivals arose and contended with him for the prize, but accomplished nothing. A third competitor, Decius, the commander of the army of the Danube, defeated and slew him near Verona [A. D. 249]. During the reign of Philip, Rome attained her thousandth year."—T. Keightley, *Outlines of Hist.* (*Lardner's Cabinet Cyclop.*), *pt.* 1, *ch.* 9.—"Decius is memorable as the first emperor who attempted to extirpate the Christian religion by a general persecution of its professors. His edicts are lost; but the records of the time exhibit a departure from the system which had been usually observed by enemies of the church since the days of Trajan. The authorities now sought out Christians; the legal order as to accusations was neglected; accusers ran no risk; and popular clamour was admitted instead of formal information. The long enjoyment of peace had told unfavourably on the church. . . . When, as Origen had foretold, a new season of trial came, the effects of the general relaxation were sadly displayed. On being summoned, in obedience to the emperor's edict, to appear and offer sacrifice, multitudes of Christians in every city rushed to the forum. . . . It seemed, says St. Cyprian, as if they had long been eager to find an opportunity for disowning their faith. The persecution was especially directed against the bishops and clergy. Among its victims were Fabian of Rome, Babylas of Antioch, and Alexander of Jerusalem; while in the lines of other eminent men (as Cyprian, Origen, Gregory Thaumaturgus, and Dionysius of Alexandria) the period is marked by exile or other sufferings. The chief object, however, was not to inflict death on the Christians, but to force them to recantation. With this view they were subjected to tortures, imprisonment and want of food; and under such trials the constancy of many gave way. Many withdrew into voluntary banishment; among these was Paul, a young man of Alexandria, who took up his abode in the desert of the Thebaid, and is celebrated as the first Christian hermit."—J. C. Robertson, *Hist. of the Christian Church*, *bk.* 1, *ch.* 6 (*v.* 1).—"This persecution [of Decius] was interrupted by an invasion of the Goths, who, for the first time, crossed the Danube in considerable numbers, and devastated Mœsia [see Goths: A. D. 244–251]. Decius marched against them, and gained some important advantages; but in his last battle, charging into the midst of the enemy to avenge the death of his son, he was overpowered and slain (A. D. 251). A great number of the Romans, thus deprived of their leader, fell victims to the barbarians; the survivors, grateful for the protection afforded them by the legions of Gallus, who commanded in the neighbourhood, proclaimed that general emperor. Gallus concluded a dishonourable peace with the Goths, and renewed the persecutions of the Christians. His dastardly conduct provoked general resentment; the provincial armies revolted, but the most dangerous insurrection was that headed by Æmilianus, who was proclaimed emperor in Mœsia. He led his forces into Italy, and the hostile armies met at Interamna (Terni); but just as an engagement was about to commence, Gallus was murdered by his own soldiers (A. D. 253), and Æmilianus proclaimed emperor. In three months Æmilianus himself met a similar fate, the army having chosen Valerian, the governor of Gaul, to the sovereignty. Valerian, though now sixty years of age, possessed powers that might have revived the sinking fortunes of the empire, which was now invaded on all sides. The Goths, who had formed a powerful monarchy on the lower Danube and the northern coasts of the Black Sea, extended their territories to the Borysthenes (Dneiper) and Tanais (Don): they ravaged Mœsia, Thrace and Macedon; while their fleets . . . devastated the coasts both of the European and Asiatic provinces [see Goths: A. D. 258–267]. The great confederation of the Franks became formidable on the lower Rhine [see Franks: A. D. 253], and not less dangerous was that of the Allemanni on the upper part of that river. The Carpians and Sarmatians laid Mœsia waste; while the Persians plundered Syria, Cappadocia, and Cilicia. Gallienus, the emperor's son, whom Valerian had chosen for his colleague, and Aurelian, destined to succeed him in the empire, gained several victories over the Germanic tribes; while Valerian marched in person against the Scythians and Persians, who had invaded Asia. He gained a victory over the former in Anatolia, but, imprudently passing the Euphrates, he was surrounded by Sapor's army near Edessa . . . and was forced to surrender at discretion (A. D. 259) [see Persia: A. D. 226–627]. During nine years Valerian languished in hopeless captivity, the object of scorn and insult to his brutal conqueror, while no effort was made for his liberation by his unnatural son. Gallienus succeeded to the throne. . . . At the moment of his accession, the barbarians, encouraged by the captivity of Valerian, invaded the empire on all sides. Italy itself was invaded by the Germans [see Alemanni: A. D. 259], who advanced to Ravenna, but they were forced to retire by the emperor. Gallienus, after this exertion, sunk into complete inactivity; his indolence roused a host of competitors for the empire in the different provinces, commonly called 'the thirty tyrants,' though the number of pretenders did not

exceed 19. . . . Far the most remarkable of them was Odenatus, who assumed the purple at Palmyra, gained several great victories over the Persians, and besieged Sapor in Ctesiphon. . . . But this great man was murdered by some of his own family; he was succeeded by his wife, the celebrated Zenobia, who took the title of Queen of the East. Gallienus did not long survive him; he was murdered while besieging Aureolus, one of his rivals, in Mediolanum (Milan); but before his death he transmitted his rights to Claudius, a general of great reputation (A. D. 268). Most of the other tyrants had previously fallen in battle or by assassination. Marcus Aurelius Claudius, having conquered his only rival, Aureolus, marched against the Germans and Goths, whom he routed with great slaughter [see GOTHS: A. D. 268–270]. He then prepared to march against Zenobia, who had conquered Egypt; but a pestilence broke out in his army, and the emperor himself was one of its victims (A. D. 270). . . . His brother was elected emperor by acclamation; but in 17 days he so displeased the army, by attempting to revive the ancient discipline, that he was deposed and murdered. Aurelian, a native of Sirmium in Pannonia, was chosen emperor by the army; and the senate, well acquainted with his merits, joyfully confirmed the election. He made peace with the Goths, and led his army against the Germans, who had once more invaded Italy [see ALEMANNI: A. D. 270]. Aurelian was at first defeated; but he soon retrieved his loss, and cut the whole of the barbarian army to pieces. His next victory was obtained over the Vandals, a new horde that had passed the Danube; and having thus secured the tranquility of Europe, he marched to rescue the eastern provinces from Zenobia," whom he vanquished and brought captive to Rome (see PALMYRA). This accomplished, the vigorous emperor proceeded to the suppression of a formidable revolt in Egypt, and then to the recovery of Gaul, Spain, and Britain, "which had now for thirteen years been the prey of different tyrants. A single campaign restored these provinces to the empire; and Aurelian, returning to Rome, was honoured with the most magnificent triumph that the city had ever beheld. . . . But he abandoned the province of Dacia to the barbarians, withdrawing all the Roman garrisons that had been stationed beyond the Danube. Aurelian's virtues were sullied by the sternness and severity that naturally belongs to a peasant and a soldier. His officers dreaded his inflexibility," and he was murdered, A. D. 275, by some of them who had been detected in peculations and who dreaded his wrath. The senate elected as his successor Marcus Claudius Tacitus, who died after a reign of seven months. Florian, a brother of Tacitus, was then chosen by the senate; but the Syrian army put forward a competitor in the person of its commander, Marcus Aurelius Probus, and Florian was presently slain by his own troops. "Probus, now undisputed master of the Empire, led his troops from Asia to Gaul, which was again devastated by the German tribes; he not only defeated the barbarians, but pursued them into their own country, where he gained greater advantages than any of his predecessors [see GAUL: A. D. 277 and GERMANY: A. D. 277]. Thence he passed into Thrace, where he humbled the Goths; and, returning to Asia, he completely subdued the insurgent Isaurians, whose lands he divided among his veterans," and commanded peace on his own terms from the king of Persia. But even the power with which Probus wielded his army could not protect him from its licentiousness, and in a sudden mutiny (A. D. 282) he was slain. Carus, captain of the prætorian guards, was then raised to the throne by the army, the senate assenting. He repelled the Sarmatians and defeated the Persians, who had renewed hostilities; but he died, A. D. 283, while besieging Ctesiphon. His son Numerianus was chosen his successor; "but after a few months' reign, he was assassinated by Aper, his father-in-law and captain of his guards. The crime, however, was discovered, and the murderer put to death by the army. Diocletian, said to have been originally a slave, was unanimously saluted Emperor by the army. He was proclaimed at Chalcedon, on the 17th of December, A. D. 284; an epoch that deserves to be remembered, as it marks the beginning of a new era, called 'the Era of Diocletian,' or 'the Era of Martyrs,' which long prevailed in the church, and is still used by the Copts, the Abyssinians, and other African nations." — W. C. Taylor, *Student's Manual of Ancient Hist., ch.* 17, *sect.* 6–7.

ALSO IN: E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, ch.* 5–12 (*v.* 1).

A. D. 213.—First collision with the Alemanni. See ALEMANNI: A. D. 213.

A. D. 238.—Siege of Aquileia by Maximin. See above: A. D. 192–284.

A. D. 258-267.—Naval incursions and ravages of the Goths in Greece and Asia Minor. See GOTHS: A. D. 258–267.

A. D. 284-305.—Reconstitution of the Empire by Diocletian.—Its division and subdivision between two Augusti and two Cæsars.—Abdication of Diocletian.—"The accession of Diocletian to power marks a new epoch in the history of the Roman empire. From this time the old names of the republic, the consuls, the tribunes, and the Senate itself, cease, even if still existing, to have any political significance. The government becomes avowedly a monarchical autocracy, and the officers by whom it is administered are simply the nominees of the despot on the throne. The empire of Rome is henceforth an Oriental sovereignty. Aurelian had already introduced the use of the Oriental diadem. The nobility of the empire derive their positions from the favor of the sovereign; the commons of the empire, who have long lost their political power, cease to enjoy even the name of citizens. The provinces are still administered under the imperial prefects by the magistrates and the assemblies of an earlier date, but the functions of both the one and the other are confined more strictly than ever to matters of police and finance. Hitherto, indeed, the Senate, however intrinsically weak, had found opportunities for putting forth its claims to authority. . . . The chosen of the legions had been for some time past the commander of an army, rather than the sovereign of the state. He had seldom quitted the camp, rarely or never presented himself in the capital. . . . The whole realm might split asunder at any moment into as many kingdoms as there were armies, unless the chiefs of the legions felt themselves controlled by the strength or genius of one more eminent than the rest. . . . The danger of disruption, thus far averted

mainly by the awe which the name of Rome inspired, was becoming yearly more imminent, when Diocletian arose to re-establish the organic connection of the parts, and breathe a new life into the heart of the body politic. The jealous edict of Gallienus . . . had forbidden the senators to take service in the army, or to quit the limits of Italy. The degradation of that once illustrious order, which was thus rendered incapable of furnishing a candidate for the diadem, was completed by its indolent acquiescence in this disqualifying ordinance. The nobles of Rome relinquished all interest in affairs which they could no longer aspire to conduct. The emperors, on their part, ceased to regard them as a substantive power in the state; and in constructing his new imperial constitution Diocletian wholly overlooked their existence. . . . While he disregarded the possibility of opposition at Rome, he contrived a new check upon the rivalry of his distant lieutenants, by associating with himself three other chiefs, welded together by strict alliance into one imperial family, each of whom should take up his residence in a separate quarter of the empire, and combine with all the others in maintaining their common interest. His first step was to choose a single colleague in the person of a brave soldier of obscure origin, an Illyrian peasant, by name Maximianus, whom he invested with the title of Augustus in the year 286. The associated rulers assumed at the same time the fanciful epithets of Jovius and Herculius, auspicious names, which made them perhaps popular in the camps, where the commanding genius of the one and the laborious fortitude of the other were fully recognized. Maximianus was deputed to control the legions in Gaul, to make head against domestic sedition, as well as against the revolt of Carausius [see BRITAIN: A. D. 288–297], a pretender to the purple in Britain, while Diocletian encountered the enemies or rivals who were now rising up in various quarters in the East. His dangers still multiplied, and again the powers of the state were subdivided to meet them. In the year 292 Diocletian created two Cæsars; the one, Galerius, to act subordinately to himself in the East; the other, Constantius Chlorus, to divide the government of the western provinces with Maximian. The Cæsars were bound more closely to the Augusti by receiving their daughters in marriage; but though they acknowledged each a superior in his own half of the empire, and admitted a certain supremacy of Diocletian over all, yet each enjoyed kingly rule in his own territories, and each established a court and capital, as well as an army and a camp. Diocletian retained the wealthiest and most tranquil portion of the realm, and reigned in Nicomedia [see NICOMEDIA] over Asia Minor, Syria, and Egypt; while he intrusted to the Cæsar Galerius, established at Sirmium, the more exposed provinces on the Danube. Maximian occupied Italy, the adjacent islands, and Africa, stationing himself, however, not in Rome, but at Milan. Constantius was required to defend the Rhenish frontier; and the martial provinces of Gaul, Spain, and Britain were given him to furnish the forces necessary for maintaining that important trust. The capital of the Western Cæsar was fixed at Treves. Inspired with a common interest, and controlled by the ascendency of Diocletian himself, all the emperors acted with vigor in their several provinces. Diocletian recovered Alexandria and quieted the revolt of Egypt [see ALEXANDRIA: A. D. 296]. Maximian routed the unruly hordes of Maurentia, and overthrew a pretender to sovereignty in that distant quarter. Constantius discomfited an invading host of Alemanni, kept in check Carausius, who for a moment had seized upon Britain, and again wrested that province from Allectus, who had murdered and succeeded to him. Galerius brought the legions of Illyria to the defence of Syria against the Persians, and though once defeated on the plains of Carrhæ, at last reduced the enemy to submission [see PERSIA: A. D. 226–627]. Thus victorious in every quarter, Diocletian celebrated the commencement of his twentieth year of power with a triumph at the ancient capital, and again taking leave of the imperial city, returned to his customary residence at Nicomedia. The illness with which he was attacked on his journey suggested or fixed his resolution to relieve himself from his cares, and on May 1, in the year 305, being then fifty-nine years of age, he performed the solemn act of abdication at Morgus, in Mæsia, the spot where he had first assumed the purple at the bidding of his soldiers. Strange to say, he did not renounce the object of his ambition alone. On the same day a similar scene was enacted by his colleague Maximian at Milan; but the abdication of Maximian was not, it is said, a spontaneous sacrifice, but imposed upon him by the influence or authority of his elder and greater colleague. Diocletian had established the principle of succession by which the supreme power was to descend. Having seen the completion of all his arrangements, and congratulated himself on the success, thus far, of his great political experiments, he crowned his career of moderation and self-restraint by strictly confining himself during the remainder of his life to the tranquil enjoyment of a private station. Retiring to the residence he had prepared for himself at Salona, he found occupation and amusement in the cultivation of his garden."—C. Merivale, *General Hist. of Rome, ch.* 70.

ALSO IN: E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, ch.* 13.—W. T. Arnold, *The Roman System of Provincial Administration, ch.* 4. —See, also, DIOCLETIAN.

A. D. 287.—Insurrection of the Bagauds in Gaul. See BAGAUDS; also, DEDITITIUS.

A. D. 303-305.—The persecution of Christians under Diocletian.—"Dreams concerning the overthrow of the Empire had long been cast into the forms of prophecies amongst the Christians. . . . There were some to repeat the predictions and to count the proofs of overthrow impending upon the Empire. But there were more, far more, to desire its preservation. Many even laboured for it. The number of those holding offices of distinction at the courts and in the armies implies the activity of a still larger number in inferior stations. . . . Never, on the other hand, had the generality of Christians been the objects of deeper or more bitter suspicions. . . . By the lower orders, they would be hated as conspiring against the customs of their province or the glories of their race. By men of position and of education, they would be despised as opposing every interest of learning, of property, and of rank. Darker still were the sentiments of the sovereigns. By them the

Christians were scorned as unruly subjects, building temples without authority, appointing priests without license, while they lived and died for principles the most adverse to the laws and to the rulers of the Empire. . . . Everywhere they were advancing. Everywhere they met with reviving foes. At the head of these stood the Cæsar, afterwards the Emperor Galerius. He who had been a herdsman of Dacia was of the stamp to become a wanton ruler. He showed his temper in his treatment of the Heathen. He showed it still more clearly in his hostility towards the Christians. . . . He turned to Diocletian. The elder Emperor was in the mood to hear his vindictive son-in-law. Already had Diocletian fulminated his edicts against the Christians. Once it was because his priests declared them to be denounced in an oracle from Apollo, as opposing the worship of that deity. At another time, it was because his soothsayers complained of the presence of his Christian attendants as interfering with the omens on which the Heathen depended. Diocletian was superstitious. But he yielded less to his superstition as a man than to his imperiousness as a sovereign, when he ordered that all employed in the imperial service should take part in the public sacrifices under pain of scourging and dismissal. . . . At this crisis he was accosted by Galerius. Imperious as he was, Diocletian was still circumspect. . . . Galerius urged instant suppression. 'The world,' replied his father-in-law, 'will be thrown into confusion, if we attack the Christians.' But Galerius insisted. Not all the caution of the elder Emperor was proof against the passions thus excited by his son-in-law. The wives of Diocletian and Galerius, both said to have been Christians, interceded in vain. Without consulting the other sovereigns, it was determined between Diocletian and Galerius to sound the alarum of persecution throughout their realms. Never had persecution begun more fearfully. Without a note of warning, the Christians of Nicomedia were startled, one morning, by the sack and demolition of their church. . . . Not until the next day, however, was there any formal declaration of hostilities. An edict then appeared commanding instant and terrible proceedings against the Christians. Their churches were to be razed. Their Scriptures were to be destroyed. They themselves were to be deprived of their estates and offices. . . . Some days or weeks, crowded with resistance as well as suffering, went by. Suddenly a fire broke out in the palace at Nicomedia. It was of course laid at the charge of the Christians. . . . Some movements occurring in the eastern provinces were also ascribed to Christian machinations. . . . The Empresses, suspected of sharing the faith of the sufferers, were compelled to offer public sacrifice. Fiercer assaults ensued. A second edict from the palace ordered the arrest of the Christian priests. A third commanded that the prisoners should be forced to sacrifice according to the Heathen ritual under pain of torture. When the dungeons were filled, and the racks within them were busy with their horrid work, a fourth edict, more searching and more pitiless than any, was published. By this the proper officers were directed to arrest every Christian whom they could discover, and bring him to one of the Heathen temples. . . . Letters were despatched to demand the co-operation of the Emperor Maximian and the Cæsar Constantius. The latter, it is said, refused; yet there were no limits that could be set to the persecution by any one of the sovereigns. . . . None suffered more than the Christians in Britain. . . . The intensity of the persecution was in no degree diminished by the extent over which it spread. . . . Some were thrown into dungeons to renounce their faith or to die amidst the agonies of which they had no fear. Long trains of those who survived imprisonment were sent across the country or beyond the sea to labour like brutes in the public mines. In many cities the streets must have been literally blocked up with the stakes and scaffolds where death was dealt alike to men and women and little children. It mattered nothing of what rank the victims were. The poorest slave and the first officer of the imperial treasury were massacred with equal savageness. . . . The memory of man embraces no such strife, if that can be called a strife in which there was but one side armed, but one side slain."—S. Eliot, *History of the Early Christians, bk.* 3, *ch.* 10 (*v.* 1).

Also in: A. Carr, *The Church and the Roman Empire, ch.* 2.—G. Uhlhorn, *The Conflict of Christianity with Heathenism, bk.* 3, *ch.* 1.

A. D. 305-323.—The wars of Constantine and his rivals.—His triumph.—His reunion of the Empire.—On the abdication of Diocletian and Maximian, Constantius and Galerius, who had previously held the subordinate rank of Cæsars, succeeded to the superior throne, as Augusti. A nephew of Galerius, named Maximin, and one Severus, who was his favorite, were then appointed Cæsars, to the exclusion of Constantine, son of Constantius, and Maxentius, son of Maximian, who might have naturally expected the elevation. Little more than a year afterwards, Constantius died, in Britain, and Constantine was proclaimed Augustus and Emperor, in his place, by the armies of the West. Galerius had not courage to oppose this military election, except so far as to withhold from Constantine the supreme rank of Augustus, which he conferred on his creature, Severus. Constantine acquiesced, for the moment, and contented himself with the name of Cæsar, while events and his own prudence were preparing for him a far greater elevation. In October, 306, there was a successful rising at Rome against Severus, Maxentius was raised to the throne by the voice of the feeble senate and the people, and his father, Maximian, the abdicated monarch, came out of his retirement to resume the purple, in association at first, but afterwards in rivalry with his son. Severus was besieged at Ravenna and, having surrendered, was condemned to death. Galerius undertook to avenge his death by invading Italy, but retreated ignominiously. Thereupon he invested his friend Licinius with the emblems and the rank of the deceased Severus. The Roman world had then six emperors—each claiming the great title of "Augustus": Galerius, Licinius, and Maximin in the East (including Africa), making common cause against Maximian, Maxentius and Constantine in the West. The first, in these combinations, to fall out, were the father and son, Maximian and Maxentius, both claiming authority in Italy. The old emperor appealed to his former army and it declared against him. He fled, taking shelter, first, with his enemy Galerius, but soon

repairing to the court of Constantine, who had married his daughter Fausta. A little later, the dissatisfied and restless old man conspired to dethrone his son-in-law and was put to death. The next year (May, A. D. 311) Galerius died at Nicomedia, and his dominions were divided between Licinius and Maximin. The combinations were now changed, and Constantine and Licinius entered into an alliance against Maxentius and Maximin. Rome and Italy had wearied by this time of Maxentius, who was both vicious and tyrannical, and invited Constantine to deliver them. He responded by a bold invasion of Italy, with a small army of but 40,000 men; defeated the greater army of Maxentius at Turin; occupied the imperial city of Milan; took Verona, after a siege and a desperate battle fought outside its walls, and finished his antagonist in a third encounter (Oct. 28, A. D. 312), at Saxa Rubra, within nine miles of Rome. Maxentius perished in the flight from this decisive field and Constantine possessed his dominions. In the next year, Maximin, rashly venturing to attack Licinius, was defeated near Heraclea, on the Propontis, and died soon afterwards. The six emperors of the year 308 were now (A. D. 313) reduced to two, and the friendship between them was ostentatious. But it endured little longer than a single year. Licinius was accused of conspiring against Constantine, and the latter declared war. The first battle was fought near Cibalis, in Pannonia, the second on the plain of Mardia, in Thrace, and Constantine was the victor in both. Licinius sued for peace and obtained it (December, A. D. 315) by the cession of all his dominion in Europe, except Thrace. For eight years, Constantine was contented with the great empire he then possessed. In 323 he determined to grasp the entire Roman world. Licinius opposed him with a vigor unexpected and the war was prepared for on a mighty scale. It was practically decided by the first great battle, at Hadrianople, on the 3d of July, 323. Licinius, defeated, took refuge in Byzantium, which Constantine besieged. Escaping from Byzantium into Asia, Licinius fought once more at Chrysopolis and then yielded to his fate. He died soon after. The Roman empire was again united and Constantine was its single lord.—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, ch.* 14.

Also in: E. L. Cutts, *Constantine the Great, ch.* 7–22.

A. D. 306.—Constantine's defeat of the Franks. See Franks: A. D. 306.

A. D. 313.—Constantine's Edict of Milan.—Declared toleration of Christianity.—After the extension of the sovereignty of Constantine over the Italian provinces as well as Gaul and the West, he went, in January, A. D. 313, to Milan, and there held a conference with Licinius, his eastern colleague in the empire. One of the results of that conference was the famous Edict of Milan, which recognized Christianity and admitted it to a footing of equal toleration with the paganisms of the empire—in terms as follows: "Wherefore, as I, Constantine Augustus, and I, Licinius Augustus, came under favourable auspices to Milan, and took under consideration all affairs that pertained to the public benefit and welfare, these things among the rest appeared to us to be most advantageous and profitable to all. We have resolved among the first things to ordain, those matters by which reverence and worship to the Deity might be exhibited. That is, how we may grant likewise to the Christians, and to all, the free choice to follow that mode of worship which they may wish. That whatsoever divinity and celestial power may exist may be propitious to us, and to all that live under our government. Therefore, we have decreed the following ordinance, as our will, with a salutary and most correct intention, that no freedom at all shall be refused to Christians, to follow or to keep their observances or worship. But that to each one power be granted to devote his mind to that worship which he may think adapted to himself. That the Deity may in all things exhibit to us His accustomed favour and kindness. . . . And this we further decree, with respect to the Christians, that the places in which they were formerly accustomed to assemble, concerning which also we formerly wrote to your fidelity, in a different form, that if any persons have purchased these, either from our treasurer, or from any other one, these shall restore them to the Christians, without money and without demanding any price. . . . They who as we have said restore them without valuation and price may expect their indemnity from our munificence and liberality."—Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical Hist., bk.* 10, *ch.* 5.

Also in: P. Schaff, *Progress of Religious Freedom, ch.* 2.

A. D. 318-325.—The Arian Controversy and the Council of Nicæa. See Arianism; and Nicæa: A. D. 325.

A. D. 323.—The conversion of Constantine.—His Christianity.—His character.—"The alleged supernatural conversion of Constantine has afforded a subject of doubt and debate from that age to the present. Up to the date of his war against Maxentius, the Emperor believed, like his father, in one god, whom he represented to himself, not with the attributes of Jupiter, best and greatest, father of gods and men, but under the form of Apollo, with the attributes of the glorified youth of manhood, the god of light and life. . . . His conversion to Christianity took place at the period of the war with Maxentius. The chief contemporary authorities on the subject are Lactantius and Eusebius. Lactantius, an African by birth, was a rhetorician (or, as we should call him, professor) at Nicomedia, of such eminence that Constantine entrusted to him the education of his eldest son, Crispus. Writing before the death of Licinius, i. e. before the year 314 A. D., or within two, or at most three, years of the event, Lactantius says, 'Constantine was admonished in his sleep to mark the celestial sign of God on the shields, and so to engage in the battle. He did as he was commanded and marked the name of Christ on the shields by the letter X drawn across them, with the top circumflexed. Armed with this sign his troops proceed,' etc. Eusebius, Bishop of Cæsarea, the historian of the early Church, the most learned Christian of his time, was, after Constantine's conquest of the East, much about the court, in the confidence of the Emperor, and one of his chief advisers in ecclesiastical matters. In his Life of Constantine, published twenty-six years after the Emperor's death, he gives us an interesting account of the moral process of the Emperor's conversion. Reflecting on the approaching contest with Maxentius, and hearing of the

extraordinary rites by which he was endeavouring to win the favour of the gods, 'being convinced that he needed some more powerful aid than his military forces could afford him, on account of the wicked and magical enchantments which were so diligently practised by the tyrant, he began to seek for divine assistance. . . . And while he was thus praying with fervent entreaty, a most marvellous sign appeared to him from heaven, the account of which it might have been difficult to receive with credit, had it been related by any other person. But since the victorious emperor himself long afterwards declared it to the writer of this history, when he was honoured with his acquaintance and society, and confirmed his statement by an oath, who could hesitate to credit the relation, especially since the testimony of after time has established its truth? He said that at mid-day, when the sun was beginning to decline, he saw, with his own eyes, the trophy of a cross of light in the heavens, above the sun, and bearing the inscription, "Conquer by this." At this sight he himself was struck with amazement, and his whole army also, which happened to be following him on some expedition, and witnessed the miracle. He said, moreover, that he doubted within himself what the import of this apparition could be. And while he continued to ponder and reason on its meaning, night imperceptibly drew on; and in his sleep the Christ of God appeared to him with the same sign which he had seen in the heavens, and commanded him to procure a standard made in the likeness of that sign, and to use it as a safeguard in all engagements with his enemies.'" The standard which is said to have had this origin was the famous Labarum.—E. L. Cutts, *Constantine the Great, ch.* 11.—"He [Constantine] was not lacking in susceptibility to certain religious impressions; he acknowledged the peculiar providence of God in the manner in which he had been delivered from dangers, made victorious over all his pagan adversaries, and finally rendered master of the Roman world. It flattered his vanity to be considered the favourite of God, and his destined instrument to destroy the empire of the evil spirits (the heathen deities). The Christians belonging to court were certainly not wanting on their part to confirm him in this persuasion. . . . Constantine must indeed have been conscious that he was striving not so much for the cause of God as for the gratification of his own ambition and love of power; and that such acts of perfidy, mean revenge, or despotic jealousy, as occurred in his political course, did not well befit an instrument and servant of God, such as he claimed to be considered. . . . Even Eusebius, one of the best among the bishops at his court, is so dazzled by what the emperor had achieved for the outward extension and splendour of the church, as to be capable of tracing to the purest motives of a servant of God all the acts which a love of power that would not brook a rival had, at the expense of truth and humanity, put into the heart of the emperor in the war against Licinius. . . . Bishops in immediate attendance on the emperor so far forgot indeed to what master they belonged, that, at the celebration of the third decennium of his reign (the tricennalia), one of them congratulated him as constituted by God the ruler over all in the present world, and destined to reign with the Son of God in the world to come. The feelings of Constantine himself were shocked at such a parallel."—A. Neander, *General Hist. of the Christian Religion and Church, period* 2, *sect.* 1, *A.*—"As he approached the East, he [Constantine] adopted oriental manners; he affected the gorgeous purple of the monarchs of Persia; he decorated his head with false hair of different colours, and with a diadem covered with pearls and gems. He substituted flowing silken robes, embroidered with flowers, for the austere garb of Rome, or the unadorned purple of the first Roman emperors. He filled his palace with eunuchs, and lent an ear to their perfidious calumnies; he became the instrument of their base intrigues, their cupidity, and their jealousy. He multiplied spies, and subjected the palace and the empire, alike, to a suspicious police. He lavished the wealth of Rome on the sterile pomp of stately buildings. . . . He poured out the best and noblest blood in torrents, more especially of those nearly connected with himself. The most illustrious victim of his tyranny was Crispus, his son by his first wife, whom he had made the partner of his empire, and the commander of his armies. . . . In a palace which he had made a desert, the murderer of his father-in-law, his brothers-in-law, his sister, his wife, his son, and his nephew, must have felt the stings of remorse, if hypocritical priests and courtier bishops had not lulled his conscience to rest. We still possess the panegyric in which they represent him as a favourite of Heaven, a saint worthy of our highest veneration; we have also several laws by which Constantine atoned for all his crimes, in the eyes of the priests, by heaping boundless favours on the church. The gifts he bestowed on it, the immunities he granted to persons and to property connected with it, soon directed ambition entirely to ecclesiastical dignities. The men who had so lately been candidates for the honours of martyrdom, now found themselves depositaries of the greatest wealth and the highest power. How was it possible that their characters should not undergo a total change?"—J. C. L. de Sismondi, *Hist. of the Fall of the Roman Empire, ch.* 4 (*v.* 1).—See, also, CHRISTIANITY: A. D. 312–337.

A. D. 330.—Transference of the capital of the Empire to Byzantium (Constantinople). See CONSTANTINOPLE: A. D. 330.

A. D. 337-361.—Redivision of the Empire.—Civil wars between the sons of Constantine and their successors.—Elevation of Julian to the throne.—Before the death of Constantine, "his three sons, Constantine, Constantius, and Constans, had already been successively raised to the rank of Cæsar about the tenth, twentieth, and thirtieth years of his reign. The royal family contained also two other young princes, sons of Dalmatius, one of the half-brothers of Constantine; the elder of these nephews of the Emperor was called Dalmatius, after his father, the other Hannibalianus. . . . Constantine shared—not the Empire, but—the imperial power among his three sons. The eldest, Constantine, was to hold the first rank among the three Augusti, and to take the western Gallic provinces under his especial administration; Constantius was to take the east, viz., Asia, Syria, and Egypt; Constans was to take the central portion of the Empire, Italy, Africa, and Western Illyricum."—E. L. Cutts, *Constantine the Great, ch.* 33.—The father of these three

princes was no sooner dead (A. D. 337) than they made haste to rid themselves of all the possible rivals in a family which seemed too numerous for peace. Two uncles and seven cousins — including Dalmatius and Hannibalianus — with other connections by marriage and otherwise, were quickly put out of the way under one and another pretence and with more or less mockery of legal forms. The three brothers then divided the provinces between them on much the same plan as before; but Constantine, the eldest, now reigned in the new capital of his father, which bore his name. There was peace between them for three years. It was broken by Constantine, who demanded the surrender to him of a part of the dominions of Constans. War ensued and Constantine was killed in one of the earliest engagements of it. Constans took possession of his dominions, refusing any share of them to Constantius, and reigned ten years longer, when he was destroyed, A. D. 350, by a conspiracy in Gaul, which raised to his throne one Magnentius, a soldier of barbarian extraction. Magnentius was acknowledged in Gaul and Italy; but the troops in Illyricum invested their own general, Vetranio, with the purple. Constantius, in the East, now roused himself to oppose these rebellions, and did so with success. Vetranio, an aged man, was intimidated by artful measures and driven to surrender his unfamiliar crown. Magnentius advanced boldly to meet an enemy whom he despised, and was defeated in a great battle fought September 21, A. D. 351, at Mursa (Essek, in modern Hungary, on the Drave). Retreating to Italy, and from Italy to Gaul, he maintained the war for another year, but slew himself finally in despair and the empire had a single ruler, once more. The sole emperor, Constantius, now found his burden of power too great, and sought to share it. Two young nephews had been permitted to live, when the massacre of the house of Constantine occurred, and he turned to these. He raised the elder, Gallus, to the rank of Cæsar, and gave him the government of the præfecture of the East. But Gallus conducted himself like a Nero and was disgraced and executed in little more than three years. The younger nephew, Julian, escaped his brother's fate by great prudence of behavior and by the friendship of the Empress Eusebia. In 355, he, in turn, was made Cæsar and sent into Gaul. Distinguishing himself there in several campaigns against the Germans (see GAUL: A. D. 355-361), he provoked the jealousy of Constantius and of the eunuchs who ruled the imperial court. To strip him of troops, four Gallic legions were ordered to the East, for the Persian war. They rose in revolt, at Paris, proclaimed Julian emperor and forced him to assume the dangerous title. He promptly sent an embassy to Constantius asking the recognition and confirmation of this procedure; but his overtures were rejected with disdain. He then declared war, and conducted an extraordinary expedition into Illyricum, through the Black Forest and down the Danube, occupying Sirmium and seizing the Balkan passes before he was known to have left Gaul. But the civil war so vigorously opened was suddenly arrested at this stage by the death of Constantius (A. D. 361), and Julian became sole emperor without more dispute. He renounced Christianity and is known in history as Julian the Apostate.—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, ch.* 18-22.

A. D. 338-359.—Wars of Constantius with the Persians. See PERSIA: A. D. 226-627.

A. D. 350-361.—Extensive abandonment of Gaul to the Germans.—Its recovery by Julian. See GAUL: A. D. 355-361.

A. D. 361-363.—Julian and the Pagan revival.—"Heathenism still possessed a latent power greater than those supposed who persuaded the Emperors that now it could be easily extirpated. The state of affairs in the West differed from that in the East. In the West it was principally the Roman aristocracy, who with few exceptions still adhered to their ancient religion, and with them the great mass of the people. In the East, on the contrary, Christianity had made much more progress among the masses, and a real aristocracy could scarcely be said to exist. In its stead there was an aristocracy of learning, whose hostility was far more dangerous to Christianity than the aversion of the Roman nobility. The youth still thronged to the ancient and illustrious schools of Miletus, Ephesus, Nicomedia, Antioch, and above all Athens, and the teachers in these schools were almost without exception heathen. . . . There the ancient heathen spirit was imbibed, and with it a contempt for barbarian Christianity. The doctrinal strife in the Christian Church was held up to ridicule, and, alas! with too much reason. For, according to the Emperor's favor and caprice, one doctrine stood for orthodoxy to-day and another to-morrow. To-day it was decreed that Christ was of the same essence with the Father, and all who refused to acknowledge this were deposed and exiled. To-morrow the court theology had swung round, it was decreed that Christ was a created being, and now it was the turn of the other party to go into banishment. The educated heathen thought themselves elevated far above all this in their classic culture. With what secret anger they beheld the way in which the temples were laid waste, the works of art broken to pieces, the memorials of an age of greatness destroyed, and all in favor of a barbarian religion destitute of culture. The old rude forms of Heathenism, indeed, they themselves did not desire, but the refined Heathenism of the Neoplatonic school seemed to them not merely the equal but the superior of Christianity. . . . These were the sources of the re-action against Christianity. Their spirit was embodied in Julian. In him it ascended for the last time the imperial throne, and made the final attempt to stop the triumphal progress of Christianity. But it succeeded only in giving to the world irresistible evidence that the sceptre of the spirit of Antiquity was forever broken. . . . What influenced Julian was chiefly enthusiasm for Greek culture. Even in a religious aspect Polytheism seemed to him superior to Monotheism, because more philosophic. Neoplatonism filled the whole soul of the young enthusiast, and seemed to him to comprehend all the culture of the ancient world in a unified system. But of course his vanity had a great share in the matter, for he naturally received the most devoted homage among the Hellenists, and his rhetorical friends did not stint their flattery. . . He made his entry . . . [into Constantinople] as a declared heathen. Although at the beginning of his campaign he had secretly sacrificed to Bellona, yet

he had attended the church in Vienne. But on the march he put an end to all ambiguity, and publicly offered sacrifices to the ancient gods. The Roman Empire once more had a heathen Emperor. At first all was joy; for as universally as Constantius was hated, Julian was welcomed as a deliverer. Even the Christians joined in this rejoicing. They too had found the arbitrary government of the last few years hard enough to bear. And if some who looked deeper began to feel anxiety, they consoled themselves by the reflection that even a heathen Emperor could not injure the Church so much as a Christian Emperor who used his power in promoting whatever seemed to him at the time to be orthodoxy in the dogmatic controversies of the age. And Julian proclaimed, not the suppression of Christianity, but only complete religious liberty. He himself intended to be a heathen, but no Christian should be disturbed in his faith. Julian was certainly thoroughly in earnest in this. To be a persecutor of the Church, was the last thing he would have thought of. Besides, he was much too fully persuaded of the untruth of Christianity and the truth of Heathenism to persecute. Julian was an enthusiast, like all the rhetoricians and philosophers who surrounded him. He regarded himself as called by a divine voice to the great work of restoring Heathenism, and this was from the beginning avowedly his object. And he was no less firmly convinced that this restoration would work itself out without any use of force; as soon as free scope was given to Heathenism it would, by its own powers, overcome Christianity. . . . The Emperor himself was evidently in all respects a heathen from sincere conviction. In this regard at least he was honest and no hypocrite. The flagrant voluptuousness, which had corrupted the court, was banished, and a large number of useless officials dismissed. The life of the court was to be simple, austere, and pure. Men had never before seen an Emperor who conducted himself with such simplicity, whose table was so economically supplied, and who knew no other employments than hard work, and devoted worship of the gods. A temple was built in the palace, and there Julian offered a daily sacrifice. Often he might be seen serving at the sacrifice himself, carrying the wood and plunging the knife into the victim with his own hand. He remembered every festival which should be celebrated, and knew how to observe the whole half-forgotten ritual most punctiliously. He was equally zealous in performing the duties of his office as Pontifex Maximus. Everywhere he revived the ancient worship which had fallen into neglect. Here a closed temple was re-opened, there a ruined shrine restored, images of the gods were set up again, and festivals which had ceased to be celebrated, were restored. . . . Soon conversions became plentiful; governors, officials, soldiers, made themselves proficient in the ancient cultus; and even a bishop, Pegasius of New Ilium, whom Julian had previously learned to know as a secret friend of the gods, when he had been the Emperor's guide to the classic sites of Troy, changed his religion, and from a Christian bishop became a heathen high-priest. . . . The dream of a restoration of Heathenism nevertheless soon began to prove itself a dream. Though now surrounded by heathen only, Julian could not help feeling that he was really isolated in their midst. He himself was naturally a mystic, and lived in his ideals. His Heathenism was one purified by poetic feeling. But there was little or nothing of this to be found actually existing. His heathen friends were courtiers, who agreed with him without inward conviction. . . . He was far too serious and severely moral for their tastes. They preferred the theatre to the temple, they liked amusement best, and found the daily attendance at worship and the monotonous ceremonies and sacrifices very dull. A measurably tolerant Christian Emperor would doubtless have suited them better than this enthusiastically pious heathen. Blinded as Julian was by his ideal views, he soon could not escape the knowledge that things were not going well. If Heathenism was to revive, it must receive new life within. The restoration must be also a reformation. Strangely enough Julian felt compelled to borrow from Christianity the ways and means for such a reformation. The heathen priests, like the Christian, were to instruct the people, and exhort them to holy living. The heathen, like the Christians, were to care for the poor. . . . While new strength was thus to be infused into Heathenism, other measures were adopted to weaken Christianity. An imperial edict, June 17, A. D. 362, forbade the Christians to act as teachers of the national literature, the ancient classics. It was, the Emperor explained, a contradiction for Christians to expound Homer, Thucydides, or Demosthenes, when they regarded them as godless men and aliens. He would not compel them to change their convictions, but also he could not permit the ancient writers to be expounded by those who took them to task for impiety. . . . This, of course, was not a persecution, if the use of force alone makes a persecution, yet it was a persecution, and in a sense a worse one than any which went before. Julian tried to deprive the Christians of that which should be common to all men,—education. . . . Nevertheless he had to confess to himself that the restoration of Heathenism was making no progress worth speaking of. . . He spent his whole strength, he sacrificed himself, he lived only for the Empire over which Providence had made him lord, and yet found himself alone in his endeavor. Even his heathen friends, the philosophers and rhetoricians, kept at a distance. . . . With such thoughts as these, Julian journeyed to Antioch, in Syria, in order to make preparations there for the great campaign he purposed to make against the Persians. There new disappointments awaited him. He found the shrines of his gods forsaken and desolate. . . . The temple of Apollo was restored with the greatest splendor. Julian went there to offer a sacrifice to the god. He expected to find a multitude of worshippers, but no one even brought oil for a lamp or incense to burn in honor of the deity. Only an old man approached to sacrifice a goose. . . . Shortly afterwards, the newly restored temple burned down in the night. Now the Emperor's wrath knew no bounds. He ascribed the guilt to the Christians; and although the temple, as is probable, caught fire through the fault of a heathen philosopher, who carried a dedicatory lamp about in it without due precautions, many Christians were arrested and tortured. The Church had its martyrs once more; and Julian, discontented with himself and the whole world besides, advanced to new

measures. The cathedral of Antioch was closed and its property confiscated. Julian decreed that the Christians, whose God had forbidden them to kill, should not be intrusted with any office with which judicial functions were connected. . . . Julian himself became more and more restless. He hurried from temple to temple, brought sacrifice after sacrifice; he knelt for hours before his gods and covered their statues with kisses. Then at night he sat in the silence at his writing-table, and gave vent to his bitterness and disgust with every thing. Then he wrote his works full of brilliant wit, thought out and expressed with Greek refinement, but full of bitterest hatred especially against the Galileans and their Carpenter's Son. . . . Finally, his immense preparations for the campaign against the Persians were finished. Julian started, after finally setting over the Antiochians a wretch as governor, with the remark that the man did not deserve to be a governor, but they deserved to be governed by such a one."—G. Uhlhorn, *The Conflict of Christianity with Heathenism, bk.* 3, *ch.* 3.

Also in: G. H. Rendall, *Julian the Emperor.* —B. L. Gildersleeve, *The Emperor Julian* (*Essays and Studies, pp.* 355–400).—Gregory Nazianzen, *Invectives against Julian,* and Libanius, *Funeral Oration upon Julian; trans. by C. W. King.*

A. D. 363.—The Persian expedition of Julian.—His death.—Jovian made Emperor by the retreating army. See Persia: A. D. 226–627.

A. D. 363-379.—Christianity reascendant. —Secret hostility of Paganism.—Reign of Valentinian and Valens.—Approach of the Huns.—The struggle with the Goths.—Elevation of Theodosius to the throne.—When Julian's successor, Jovian, "who did not reign long enough to lead back to Constantinople the army which he had marched from the banks of the Tigris, made public profession of Christianity, he, at the same time, displaced a great number of brave officers and able functionaries, whom Julian had promoted in proportion to their zeal for paganism. From that period, up to the fall of the empire, a hostile sect, which regarded itself as unjustly stripped of its ancient honours, invoked the vengeance of the gods on the heads of the government, exulted in the public calamities, and probably hastened them by its intrigues, though inextricably involved in the common ruin. The pagan faith, which was not attached to a body of doctrine, nor supported by a corporation of priests, nor heightened by the fervour of novelty, scarcely ever displayed itself in open revolt, or dared the perils of martyrdom; but pagans still occupied the foremost rank in letters:—the orators, the philosophers (or, as they were otherwise called, sophists), the historians, belonged, almost without an exception, to the ancient religion. It still kept possession of the most illustrious schools, especially those of Athens and Alexandria; the majority of the Roman senate were still attached to it; and in the breasts of the common people, particularly the rural population, it maintained its power for several centuries, branded, however, with the name of magic. . . . Less than eight months after his elevation to the throne, on the 17th of February, 364, Jovian died in a small town of Galatia. After the expiration of ten days, the army which he was leading home from Persia, at a solemn assembly held at Nice, in Bithynia, chose as his successor the son of a captain from a little village of Pannonia, the count Valentinian, whom his valour and bodily prowess had raised to one of the highest posts of the army. . . . Spite of his savage rudeness, and the furious violence of his temper, the Roman empire found in him an able chief at the moment of its greatest need. Unhappily, the extent of the empire required, at least, two rulers. The army felt this, and demanded a second. . . . Valentinian . . . chose his brother. Valens, with whom he shared his power, had the weak, timid, and cruel character which ordinarily distinguishes cowards. Valentinian, born in the West, . . . reserved the government of it to himself. He ceded to his brother a part of Illyricum on the Danube, and the whole of the East. He established universal toleration by law, and took no part in the sectarian controversies which divided Christendom. Valens adopted the Arian faith, and persecuted the orthodox party. The finances of the empire demanded a reform, which neither of the emperors was in a condition to undertake. They wanted money, and they were ignorant where to seek the long exhausted sources of public wealth. . . . Vast provinces in the interior were deserted; enlistments daily became more scanty and difficult; the magistrates of the 'curiæ' or municipalities, who were responsible both for the contributions and the levies of their respective towns, sought by a thousand subterfuges to escape the perilous honour of the magistrature [see Curia, Municipal, of the Later Roman Empire]. . . . During the twelve years that Valentinian reigned over the West (A. D. 364–376), he redeemed his cruelties by several brilliant victories [see Alemanni: A. D. 365–367]. . . . Valentinian had undertaken the defence of Gaul in person, and generally resided at Treves, then the capital of that vast prefecture; but at the time he was thus occupied, invasions not less formidable had devastated the other provinces of the West [see Britain: A. D. 367–370]. . . . At this period Valens reigned over the Greeks, whose language he did not understand (A. D. 364–378). His eastern frontier was menaced by the Persians, his northern by the Goths. . . . Armenia and Iberia became subject to Persia; but as the people of both these countries were Christian, they remained faithful to the interests of Rome, though conquered by her enemy. . . . The dominion of the Goths extended along the shores of the Danube and the Black Sea, and thirty years had elapsed since they had made any incursion into the Roman territory. But during that period they had gone on increasing in greatness and in power. . . . Spite of the formidable neighbourhood of the Goths and the Persians—spite of the cowardice and the incapacity of Valens—the East had remained at peace, protected by the mere name of Valentinian, whose military talents, promptitude, and severity were known to all the barbarian tribes. But the career of this remarkable man, so dreaded by his enemies and by his subjects, had now reached its term." He died in a fit of rage, from the bursting of a blood-vessel in his chest, November 17, A. D. 375. "His two sons,—Gratian, who was scarcely come to manhood, and Valentinian, still a child,—shared the West between them. . . . Never, however, was the empire in greater

need of an able and vigorous head. The entire nation of the Huns, abandoning to the Sienpi its ancient pastures bordering on China, had traversed the whole north of Asia by a march of 1,300 leagues." The Goths, overwhelmed and flying before them, begged permission to cross the Danube and take refuge in Mœsia and Thrace. They were permitted to do so; but such extortions and outrages were practiced on them, at the same time, that they were exasperated to a passionate hatred. This bore fruit in a general rising in 377. Two years of war ensued, marked by two great battles, that of Ad Salices, or The Willows, which neither side could fully claim, and that of Adrianople, August 9, 378, in which Valens perished, and more than 60,000 of his soldiers fell (see GOTHS: A. D. 376, and 378). "The forces of the East were nearly annihilated at the terrible battle of Adrianople. . . . The Goths . . . advanced, ravaging all around them, to the foot of the walls of Constantinople; and, after some unimportant skirmishes, returned westward through Macedonia, Epirus, and Dalmatia. From the Danube to the Adriatic, their passage was marked by conflagration and blood. . . . No general in the East attempted to take advantage of the anarchy in favour of his own ambition; no army offered the purple to its chief; all dreaded the responsibility of command at so tremendous a crisis. All eyes were turned on the court of Treves, the only point whence help was hoped for. But Gratian, eldest son of Valentinian, and emperor of the West, was only 19. He . . . marched upon Illyricum with his army, when he learned the event of the battle of Adrianople, and the death of Valens, who had been so eager to secure the undivided honours of victory, that he would not wait for his arrival. Incapable of confronting such a tempest, he retreated to Sirmium. The news of an invasion of the Allemans into Gaul recalled him to the defence of his own territory. Danger started up on every hand at once. The empire stood in need of a new chief, and one of approved valour. Gratian had the singular generosity to choose from among his enemies, and from a sense of merit alone. Theodosius, the Spaniard, his father's general, who had successively vanquished the Scots and afterwards the Moors, and who had been unjustly condemned to the scaffold at the beginning of Gratian's reign, had left a son 33 years of age, who bore his name. The younger Theodosius had distinguished himself in the command he held in Mœsia, but was living in retirement and disgrace on his estates in Spain, when, with the confidence of a noble mind, Gratian chose him out, presented him to the army on the 19th of January, 379, and declared him his colleague, and emperor of the East."—J. C. L. de Sismondi, *The Fall of the Roman Empire, ch.* 5 (*v.* 1).

ALSO IN: T. Hodgkin, *Italy and Her Invaders, introd., and bk.* 1, *ch.* 1.

A. D. 378.—Gratian's overthrow of the Alemanni in Gaul. See ALEMANNI: A. D. 378.

A. D. 379-395.—Theodosius and the Goths.—His Trinitarian Edict.—Revolt of Maximus.—Death of Gratian.—Overthrow of Maximus by Theodosius.—Usurpation of Eugenius, and his fall.—Death of Theodosius.—"The first duty that Theodosius had to undertake was to restore the self-confidence and trust in victory of the Roman army, terribly shaken as these qualities had been by the disastrous rout of Hadrianople. This he accomplished by waging a successful guerilla war with the Gothic marauders. Valens had played into the hands of the barbarians by risking everything on one great pitched battle. Theodosius adopted the very opposite policy. He outmanoeuvred the isolated and straggling bands of the Goths, defeated them in one skirmish after another that did not deserve the name of a battle, and thus restored the courage and confidence of the Imperial troops. By the end of 379 he seems to have succeeded in clearing the territory south of the Balkan range of the harassing swarms of the barbarians. In February, 380, he fell sick at Thessalonica (which was his chief basis of operations throughout this period), and this sickness, from which he did not fully recover for some months, was productive of two important results, (1) his baptism as a Trinitarian Christian, (2) a renewal of the war against fresh swarms of barbarians. (1) Theodosius appears up to this point of his career not to have definitively ranged himself on either side of the great Arian controversy, though he had a hereditary inclination towards the Creed of Nicaea. Like his father, however, he had postponed baptism in accordance with the prevalent usage of his day: but now upon a bed of sickness which seemed likely to be one of death, he delayed no longer, but received the rite at the hands of Ascholius, the Catholic Bishop of Thessalonica. Before he was able to resume his post at the head of the legions, he published his celebrated Edict: 'To the people of Constantinople.— We desire that all the nations who are governed by the rule of our Clemency shall practise that religion which the Apostle Peter himself delivered to the Romans, and which it is manifest that the pontiff Damasus, and Peter, Bishop of Alexandria, a man of Apostolic sanctity, do now follow: that according to the discipline of the Apostles and the teaching of the Evangelists they believe in the one Godhead of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, in equal Majesty, and in the holy Trinity. We order all who follow this law to assume the name of Catholic Christians, decreeing that all others, being mad and foolish persons, shall bear the infamy of their heretical dogmas, and that their Conventicles shall not receive the name of Churches: to be punished first by Divine vengeance, and afterwards by that exertion of our power to chastise which we have received from the decree of heaven.' Thus then at length the Caesar of the East was ranged on the side of Trinitarian orthodoxy. Constantine in the latter part of his reign, Constantius, Valens, had all been Arians or semi-Arians, some of them bitter in their heterodoxy. Julian had been a worshipper of the gods of Olympus. Thus for nearly two generations the influence of the Court of Constantinople had been thrown into the scale against the teaching of Athanasius, which was generally accepted throughout the Western realm. Now by the accession of Theodosius to the Trinitarian side, religious unity was restored to the Empire: but at the same time a chasm, an impassable chasm, was opened between the Empire itself and its new Teutonic guests, nearly all of whom held fast to the Arian teaching of their great Apostle Ulfilas. (2) The other consequence of the sickness of Theodosius was, as I have said, a fresh incursion of barbarian hordes,

swarming across the Danube and climbing all the high passes of the Balkans. The work of clearing the country of these marauders had to be all done over again. . . . At length, in the closing months of 380, the provinces south of the Balkans (Macedonia and Thrace) were once more cleared of their barbarian intruders. Peace, in which Gratian concurred, was concluded with the Goths who still doubtless abounded in Moesia [see GOTHS: A. D. 379–382]. . . . The insurrection at Antioch [A. D. 387] displayed the character of Theodosius in a favourable light, as a strong but merciful and magnanimous ruler of men. Very different was the effect on his fame of the insurrection which broke out three years later (390) in the Macedonian city of Thessalonica [see THESSALONICA: A. D. 390]. . . . In the year 383 a military revolt broke out in Britain against the young Emperor Gratian. . . . The army revolted and proclaimed Magnus Clemens Maximus, Emperor. He was, like Theodosius, a native of Spain, and though harsh and perhaps rapacious, a man of ability and experience, not unworthy of the purple if he had come to it by lawful means. Gratian on his side had evidently given some real cause for dissatisfaction to his subjects. . . . Hence it was that when Maximus with the army of Britain landed in Gaul, he shook down the fabric of his power without difficulty. Gratian, finding himself deserted by his troops, escaped from the battle-field, but was overtaken and killed at Lyons. For more than four years, Maximus, satisfied with ruling over the three great Western provinces which had fallen to the share of Gratian, maintained at any rate the appearance of harmony with his two colleagues. . . . At length, in the autumn of 387, Maximus deemed that the time had come for grasping the whole Empire of the West. Lulling to sleep the suspicions of Valentinian and his mother by embassies and protestations of friendship, he crossed the Alps with an army and marched towards Aquileia, where the young Emperor was then dwelling in order to be as near as possible to the dominions of his friendly colleague and protector. Valentinian did not await the approach of his rival, but going down to the port of Grado, took ship and sailed for Thessalonica, his mother and sisters accompanying him. The Emperor and the Senate of Constantinople met the Imperial fugitives at Thessalonica, and discussed the present position of affairs. . . . What the entreaties of the mother might have failed to effect, the tears of the daughter [Galla] accomplished. Theodosius, whose wife Flaccilla had died two years before (385), took Galla for his second wife, and vowed to avenge her wrongs and replace her brother on the throne. He was some time in preparing for the campaign, but, when it was opened, he conducted it with vigour and decision. His troops pressed up the Save valley, defeated those of Maximus in two engagements, entered Aemona (Laybach) in triumph, and soon stood before the walls of Aquileia [July, 388], behind which Maximus was sheltering himself. . . . A mutiny among the troops of Maximus did away with the necessity for a siege," and the usurper, betrayed and delivered to Theodosius, was speedily put to death. Theodosius "handed over to Valentinian II. the whole of the Western Empire, both his own especial share and that which had formerly been held by his brother Gratian. The young Emperor was now 17 years of age; his mother, Justina, had died apparently on the eve of Theodosius's victory, and he governed, or tried to govern alone." But one of his Frankish generals, named Arbogast, gathered all the power of the government into his hands, reduced Valentinian to helpless insignificance, and finally, in May, 392, caused him to be strangled. "The Frankish general, who durst not shock the prejudices of the Roman world by himself assuming the purple, hung that dishonoured robe upon the shoulders of a rhetorician, a confidant, and almost a dependent of his own, named Eugenius. This man, like most of the scholars and rhetoricians of the day, had not abjured the old faith of Hellas. As Arbogast also was a heathen, though worshipping Teutonic rather than Olympian gods, this last revolution looked like a recurrence to the days of Julian, and threatened the hardly-won supremacy of Christianity." Again Theodosius was summoned to the rescue of the West, and, after two years of careful preparation, marched against Eugenius by the same route that he had taken before. The two armies met at a place "half-way between Aemona and Aquileia, where the Julian Alps are crossed, and where a little stream called the Frigidus (now the Wipbach) burst suddenly from a limestone hill." The battle was won by Theodosius after a terrible struggle, lasting two days (September 5–6, A. D. 394). Eugenius was taken prisoner and put to death; Arbogast fell by his own hand. "Theodosius, who was still in the prime of life, had now indeed 'the rule of the world,' without a rival or a colleague except his own boyish sons. . . . Had his life been prolonged, as it well might have been for twenty or thirty years longer, many things might have gone differently in the history of the world. But, little more than four months after the victory of the Frigidus, Theodosius died [January 17, A. D. 395] of dropsy, at Milan."—T. Hodgkin, *The Dynasty of Theodosius, ch.* 4.

ALSO IN: F. W. Farrar, *Lives of the Fathers, ch.* 15: *Ambrose and Theodosius* (*v.* 2).—R. Thornton, *St. Ambrose, ch.* 6–14.

A. D. 388.—Formal establishment of Christianity.—Until the year 384, "paganism was still the constitutional religion of the [Roman] senate. The hall or temple in which they assembled was adorned by the statue and altar of Victory. . . . The senators were sworn on the altar of the goddess to observe the laws of the emperor and of the empire; and a solemn offering of wine and incense was the ordinary prelude of their public deliberations. The removal of this ancient monument was the only injury which Constantius had offered to the superstition of the Romans. The altar of Victory was again restored by Julian, tolerated by Valentinian, and once more banished from the senate by the zeal of Gratian. But the emperor yet spared the statues of the gods which were exposed to the public veneration: four hundred and twenty-four temples or chapels still remained to satisfy the devotion of the people, and in every quarter of Rome the delicacy of the Christians was offended by the fumes of idolatrous sacrifice. But the Christians formed the least numerous party in the senate of Rome." The senate addressed several petitions to Gratian, to the young Valentinian, and to Theodosius for the restoration of the altar of Victory. They were supported by the elo-

quence of the orator Symmachus, and opposed by the energy of Ambrose, the powerful Archbishop of Milan. The question is said to have been, in the end, submitted to the senate, itself, by the Emperor Theodosius (A. D. 388)—he being present in person—"Whether the worship of Jupiter or that of Christ should be the religion of the Romans? The liberty of suffrages, which he affected to allow, was destroyed by the hopes and fears that his presence inspired. . . . On a regular division of the senate, Jupiter was condemned and degraded by the sense of a very large majority."—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, ch.* 28.

A. D. 391-395.—Suppression of Paganism.—"The religious liberty of the Pagans, though considerably abridged by Gratian, was yet greater than had been allowed by the laws of Constantine and his immediate successors. The priests and vestals were deprived of their immunities; the revenues of the temples were confiscated for the service of the State; but the heathen rites of their forefathers were still allowed to those who were conscientiously attached to them, provided they abstained from nocturnal sacrifices and magical incantations. But when Theodosius, in the early part of his reign, prohibited the immolation of victims, their superstition was attacked in its most vital part, and, in the course of a few years, the success of his measures against heresy, and his triumph over Maximus, emboldened him to proceed to steps of a still more decisive kind, and to attempt the entire subversion of the already tottering fabric of paganism. A commission was issued to the præfect of the East, directing him to close all heathen temples within his jurisdiction; and while the imperial officers were engaged in this task, assisted by the clergy, and especially by the monks, with a vigour not always strictly legal, Theodosius gradually increased the rigour of his legislative prohibitions. A law was passed in the year 391, declaring that to enter a heathen temple, with a religious purpose, was an offence liable to a fine of fifteen pounds of gold; and in the following year, not only all public, but even all private and domestic, exercise of heathen rites was interdicted under the severest penalties. In some few instances, the intemperate and tumultous proceedings of the monks in destroying the temples, excited the opposition of the fanatical heathen peasantry, and at Alexandria a serious commotion, fatal to many Christians, was occasioned by the injudicious measures of the patriarch Theophilus. But, generally speaking, the pagans showed little disposition to incur the rigorous penalties of the laws, still less to become martyrs for a religion so little calculated to inspire real faith or fortitude. Some show of zeal in the cause of paganism was made at Rome, where the votaries of the ancient superstition still had a strong party, both among the senate and populace. But the eloquent exertions of Symmachus, the champion of heathenism, were easily baffled by Ambrose, who encountered him with equal ability, better argument, and a confident reliance on the support of his sovereign; and not long after, a more important victory was gained, in an enactment by the senate, carried, through the influence of Theodosius, by an overwhelming majority, that Christianity should for the future be the sole religion of the Roman State. This decisive measure sealed the ruin of paganism in Rome and its dependencies. The senators and nobles hastened to conform, nominally at least, to the dominant religion; the inferior citizens followed their example, and St. Jerome was in a little while able to boast that every heathen altar in Rome was forsaken, and every temple had become a place of desolation."—J. B. S. Carwithen and A. Lyall, *Hist. of the Christian Church, pp.* 63-65.

Also in: P. Schaff, *Hist. of the Christian Church, period* 3, *ch.* 1, *sect.* 7 (*v.* 2).—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, ch.* 28.

A. D. 394-395.—Final division of the Empire between the sons of Theodosius.—Arcadius in the East, Honorius in the West.—Ministries of Rufinus and Stilicho.—Advent of Alaric the Visigoth.—"The division of the Empire between East and West on the accession of the sons of Theodosius [A. D. 395], though it was possibly meant to be less complete than some preceding partitions, proved to be the final one. It is worth while to indicate the line of division, which is sufficiently accurately traced for us in the Notitia. In Africa it was the well-known frontier marked by 'the Altars of the Philaeni,' which separated Libya (or Cyrenaica) on the East from Africa Tripolitana on the West. Modern geographers draw exactly the same line (about 19° E. of Greenwich) as the boundary of Barca and Tripoli. On the Northern shore of the Mediterranean the matter is a little more complicated. Noricum, Pannonia, Savia, and Dalmatia belonged to the West, and Dacia—not the original but the later province of Dacia—to the East. This gives us for the frontier of the Western Empire the Danube as far as Belgrade, and on the Adriatic the modern town of Lissa. The inland frontier is traced by geographers some 60 miles up the Save from Belgrade, then southwards by the Drina to its source, and so across the mountains to Lissa. Thus Sclavonia, Croatia, and Dalmatia in the Austrian Empire, and Croatia, most of Bosnia, Herzegovina, and Montenegro in the state which was lately called Turkey in Europe, belonged to the Western Empire. The later province of Dacia, which fell to the Eastern share, included Servia (Old and New), the south-east corner of Bosnia, the north of Albania, and the west of Bulgaria. By this partition the Prefecture of Illyricum, as constituted by Diocletian, was divided into two nearly equal parts. . . . What makes the subject somewhat perplexing to the student is the tendency to confuse Illyricum the 'province' and Illyricum the 'prefecture,'" the latter of which embraced, in modern geographical terms, Servia, Western Bulgaria, Macedon, Epirus and Greece. —T. Hodgkin, *Italy and Her Invaders, bk.* 1, *ch.* 4, *note C, and ch.* 3 (*v.* 1).—"This decree for a partition, published by Theodosius shortly before his death, appears to have been generally expected and approved. The incapacity of Arcadius and Honorius, of whom the former had only attained his 18th and the latter his 11th year, had not then been discovered. These princes showed more and more clearly, as time went on, that they inherited no share of their father's abilities, their weakness being such as to render their sovereignty little more than nominal. . . . It was never intended that the two jurisdictions should be independent of each other, but rather that the Emperors should be colleagues and coadjutors, the defenders of one

commonwealth. . . . At the time of the decree, belief in the unity and immortality of the 'Sancta Respublica Romana' was universal. . . . Enactments were invariably made in the names of both Emperors; and, so often as a vacancy of either throne occurred, the title of the Caesar elect remained incomplete until his elevation had been approved and confirmed by the occupant of the other. . . . Theodosius left the Roman world in peace, and provided with a disciplined army sufficient, if rightly directed, for its defence; but his choice of the men to whom he confided the guidance of his sons was unfortunate. Rufinus, to whom the guardianship of Arcadius was entrusted, by birth a Gascon, owed his advancement to his eloquence as an advocate, and his plausible duplicity had so far imposed on the confiding nature of Theodosius as to obtain for him the prefecture of the East. Stilicho, the guardian of Honorius, was by descent a Vandal, and is styled by St. Jerome a semi-barbarian. . . . His military abilities, combined with a prepossessing exterior, induced Theodosius to confer upon him the chief command of the imperial forces, and the hand of his niece, Serena."—R. H. Wrightson, *The Sancta Respublica Romana, ch.* 1.—"Stilicho . . . was popular with the army, and for the present the great bulk of the forces of the Empire was at his disposal; for the regiments united to suppress Eugenius had not yet been sent back to their various stations. Thus a struggle was imminent between the ambitious minister who had the ear of Arcadius, and the strong general who held the command and enjoyed the favour of the army. . . . It was the cherished project of Rufinus to unite Arcadius with his only daughter. . . . But he imprudently made a journey to Antioch, in order to execute vengeance personally on the count of the East, who had offended him; and during his absence from Byzantium an adversary stole a march on him. This adversary was the eunuch Eutropius, the lord chamberlain. . . . Determining that the future Empress should be bound to himself and not to Rufinus, he chose Eudoxia, a girl of singular beauty, the daughter of a distinguished Frank, but herself of Roman education. . . . Eutropius showed a picture of the Frank maiden to the Emperor, and engaged his affections for her; the nuptials were arranged by the time Rufinus returned to Constantinople, and were speedily celebrated (27th April 395). This was a blow to Rufinus, but he was still the most powerful man in the East. The event which at length brought him into contact with Stilicho was the rising of the Visigoths, who had been settled by Theodosius in Moesia and Thrace. . . . Under the leadership of Alaric they raised the ensign of revolt, and spread desolation in the fields and homesteads of Macedonia, Moesia, and Thrace, even advancing close to the walls of Constantinople [see Goths: A. D. 395]. . . . It was impossible to take the field against the Goths, because there were no forces available, as the eastern armies were still with Stilicho in the West. Arcadius therefore was obliged to summon Stilicho to send the troops or bring them back immediately, to protect his throne. This summons gave that general the desired opportunity to interfere in the politics of Constantinople; and having, with energetic celerity, arranged matters on the Gallic frontier, he marched overland through Illyricum, and confronted Alaric in Thessaly, whither the Goth had traced his devastating path from the Propontis. . . . It seems that before Stilicho arrived, Alaric had experienced a defeat at the hands of garrison soldiers in Thessaly; at all events he shut himself up in a fortified camp and declined to engage with the Roman general. In the meantime Rufinus induced Arcadius to send a peremptory order to Stilicho to despatch the eastern troops to Constantinople and depart himself whence he had come; the Emperor resented, or pretended to resent, the presence of his cousin as an officious interference. Stilicho yielded so readily that his willingness seems almost suspicious. . . . He consigned the eastern soldiers to the command of a Gothic captain, Gainas, and himself departed to Salona, allowing Alaric to proceed on his wasting way into the lands of Hellas." When Gainas and his army arrived at the gates of Constantinople, the Emperor came out to meet them, with Rufinus by his side. The troops suddenly closed round the latter and murdered him. "We can hardly suppose that the lynching of Rufinus was the fatal inspiration of a moment, but whether it was proposed or approved of by Stilicho, or was a plan hatched among the soldiers on their way to Constantinople, is uncertain."—J. B. Bury, *Hist. of the Later Roman Empire, bk.* 2, *ch.* 1 (*v.* 1).

A. D. 396-398.—Commission of Alaric under the Eastern Empire.—Suppression of the revolt of Gildo in Africa.—Commanding position of Stilicho.—"For the next five or six years the chief power over the feeble soul of Arcadius was divided between three persons, his fair Frankish Empress Eudoxia, Eutropius, the haggard old eunuch who had placed her on the throne, and Gainas the Goth, commander of the Eastern army. Again, in the year 396, did Stilicho, now commanding only the Western forces, volunteer to deliver Greece from the Visigoths. The outset of the campaign was successful. The greater part of Peloponnesus was cleared of the invader, who was shut up in the rugged mountain country on the confines of Elis and Arcadia. The Roman army was expecting soon to behold him forced by famine to an ignominious surrender, when they discovered that he had pierced the lines of circumvallation at an unguarded point, and marched with all his plunder northwards to Epirus. What was the cause of this unlooked-for issue of the struggle? . . . The most probable explanation . . . is that Fabian caution co-operated with the instinct of the Condottiere against pushing his foe too hard. There was always danger for Rome in driving Alaric to desperation: there was danger privately for Stilicho if the dead Alaric should render him no longer indispensable. Whatever might be the cause, by the end of 396 Alaric was back again in his Illyrian eyrie, and thenceforward whatever threats might be directed towards the East the actual weight of his arms was felt only by the West. Partly, at least, this is to be accounted for by the almost sublime cowardice of the ministers of Arcadius, who rewarded his Grecian raids by clothing him with the sacred character of an officer of the Empire in their portion of Illyricum [see Goths: A. D. 395]. The precise title under which he exercised jurisdiction is not stated. . . . During an interval of quiescence, which lasted apparently about four years, the Visigothic King was using the forms of Roman

law, the machinery of Roman taxation, the almost unbounded authority of a Roman provincial governor, to prepare the weapon which was one day to pierce the heart of Rome herself. The Imperial City, during the first portion of this interval, was suffering the pangs of famine. . . . Since the foundation of Constantinople . . . Egypt had ceased to nourish the elder Rome. . . . Rome was thus reduced to an almost exclusive dependence on the harvests of Africa proper (that province of which Carthage was the capital), of Numidia, and of Mauretania. . . . But this supply . . . in the year 397 was entirely stopped by the orders of Gildo, who had made himself virtual master of these three provinces." The elder Theodosius had suppressed in 374 a revolt in Mauretania headed by one Firmus. "The son of a great sheep-farmer, Nabal, he [Firmus] had left behind him several brothers, one of whom, Gildo, had in the year 386 gathered up again some portion of his brother's broken power. We find him, seven years later (in 393), holding the rank of Count of Africa in the Roman official hierarchy. . . . He turned to his own account the perennial jealousy existing between the ministers of the Eastern and Western Courts, renounced his allegiance to Rome, and preferred to transfer it to Constantinople. What brought matters to a crisis was his refusal to allow the grain crops of 397 to be conveyed to Rome. . . . The Roman Senate declared war in the early winter months of 398 against Gildo. Stilicho, who, of course, undertook the fitting out of the expedition, found a suitable instrument for Rome's chastisement in one who had had cruel wrongs of his own to avenge upon Gildo. This was yet another son of Nabal, Mascezel." Mascezel, at the head of nearly 40,000 men, accomplished the overthrow of his brother, who slew himself, or was slain, when he fell into Roman hands. "Thus the provinces of Africa were for the time won back again for the Empire of the West, and Rome had her corn again. . . . The glory and power of Stilicho were now nearly at their highest point. Shortly before the expedition against Gildo he had given his daughter Maria in marriage to Honorius, and the father-in-law of the Emperor might rightly be deemed to hold power with a securer grasp than his mere chief minister."—T. Hodgkin, *Italy and Her Invaders, bk.* 1, *ch.* 4 (*v.* 1).

A. D. 400-403.—First Gothic invasion of Italy under Alaric.—Stilicho's repulse of the invaders. See GOTHS (VISIGOTHS): A. D. 400–403.

A. D. 400-518.—The Eastern Empire.—Expulsion of Gothic soldiery from Constantinople.—Conflict of John Chrysostom and the Empress Eudoxia.—Reigns of Theodosius II., Pulcheria, Marcianus, Leo I., Zeno, and Anastasius.—Persistent vitality of the Byzantine government.—"While Alaric's eyes were turned on Italy, but before he had actually come into conflict with Stilicho, the Court of Constantinople had been the seat of grave troubles. Gainas, the Gothic 'Magister militum' of the East, and his creature, the eunuch Eutropius, had fallen out, and the man of war had no difficulty in disposing of the wretched harem-bred Grand Chamberlain. . . . The Magister militum now brought his army over to Constantinople, and quartered it there to overawe the emperor. It appeared quite likely that ere long the Germans would sack the city; but the fate that befell Rome ten years later was not destined for Constantinople. A mere chance brawl put the domination of Gainas to a sudden end [July, A. D. 400]. . . . The whole population turned out with extemporized arms and attacked the German soldiery. . . . Isolated bodies of the Germans were cut off one by one, and at last their barracks were surrounded and set on fire. The rioters had the upper hand; 7,000 soldiers fell, and the remnant thought themselves lucky to escape. Gainas at once declared open war on the empire, but . . . he was beaten in the field and forced to fly across the Danube, where he was caught and beheaded by Uldes, king of the Huns. . . . The departure of Alaric and the death of Gainas freed the Eastern Romans from the double danger that [had] impended over them. . . . The weak Arcadius was enabled to spend the remaining seven years of his life in comparative peace and quiet. His court was only troubled by an open war between his spouse, the Empress Ælia Eudoxia, and John Chrysostom, the Patriarch of Constantinople. John was a man of saintly life and apostolic fervour, but rash and inconsiderate alike in speech and action. . . . The patriarch's enemies were secretly supported by the empress, who had taken offence at the outspoken way in which John habitually denounced the luxury and insolence of her court. She favoured the intrigues of Theophilus, Patriarch of Alexandria, against his brother prelate, backed the Asiatic clergy in their complaints about John's oppression of them, and at last induced the Emperor to allow the saintly patriarch to be deposed by a hastily-summoned council, the 'Synod of the Oak,' held outside the city. The populace rose at once to defend their pastor; riots broke out, Theodosius was chased back to Egypt, and the Emperor, terrified by an earthquake which seemed to manifest the wrath of heaven, restored John to his place. Next year, however, the war between the empress and the patriarch broke out again. . . . The Emperor, at his wife's demand, summoned another council, which condemned Chrysostom, and on Easter Day, A. D. 404, seized the patriarch in his cathedral by armed force, and banished him to Asia. That night a fire, probably kindled by the angry adherents of Chrysostom, broke out in St. Sophia, which was burnt to the ground. From thence it spread to the neighbouring buildings, and finally to the Senate-house, which was consumed with all the treasures of ancient Greek art of which Constantine had made it the repository. Meanwhile the exiled John was banished to a dreary mountain fastness in Cappadocia, and afterwards condemned to a still more remote prison at Pityus on the Euxine. He died on his way thither. . . . The feeble and inert Arcadius died in A. D. 408, at the early age of thirty-one; his imperious consort had preceded him to the grave, and the empire of the East was left to Theodosius II., a child of seven years, their only son. . . . The little emperor was duly crowned, and the administration of the East undertaken in his name by the able Anthemius, who held the office of Praetorian Praefect. History relates nothing but good of this minister; he made a wise commercial treaty with the king of Persia; he repelled with ease a Hunnish invasion of Moesia; he built a flotilla on the Danube, where Roman war-ships had not been seen since the

death of Valens, forty years before; he reorganized the corn supply of Constantinople; and did much to get back into order and cultivation the desolated north-western lands of the Balkan Peninsula. . . . The empire was still more indebted to him for bringing up the young Theodosius as an honest and god-fearing man. The palace under Anthemius' rule was the school of the virtues; the lives of the emperor and his three sisters, Pulcheria, Arcadia, and Marina, were the model and the marvel of their subjects. Theodosius inherited the piety and honesty of his grandfather and namesake, but was a youth of slender capacity, though he took some interest in literature, and was renowned for his beautiful penmanship. His eldest sister, Pulcheria, was the ruling spirit of the family, and possessed unlimited influence over him, though she was but two years his senior. When Anthemius died in A. D. 414, she took the title of Augusta, and assumed the regency of the East. Pulcheria was an extraordinary woman: on gathering up the reins of power she took a vow of chastity, and lived as a crowned nun for thirty-six years; her fear had been that, if she married, her husband might cherish ambitious schemes against her brother's crown; she therefore kept single herself and persuaded her sisters to make a similar vow. Austere, indefatigable, and unselfish, she proved equal to ruling the realms of the East with success, though no woman had ever made the attempt before. When Theodosius came of age he refused to remove his sister from power, and treated her as his colleague and equal. By her advice he married in A. D. 421, the year that he came of age, the beautiful and accomplished Athenaïs, daughter of the philosopher Leontius. . . . Theodosius' long reign passed by in comparative quiet. Its only serious troubles were a short war with the Persians, and a longer one with Attila, the great king of the Huns, whose empire now stretched over all the lands north of the Black Sea and Danube, where the Goths had once dwelt. In this struggle the Roman armies were almost invariably unfortunate. The Huns ravaged the country as far as Adrianople and Philippopolis, and had to be bought off by the annual payment of 700 lbs. of gold [£31,000]. . . . The reconstruction of the Roman military forces was reserved for the successors of Theodosius II. He himself was killed by a fall from his horse in 450 A. D., leaving an only daughter, who was married to her cousin Valentinian III., Emperor of the West. Theodosius, with great wisdom, had designated as his successor, not his young son-in-law, a cruel and profligate prince, but his sister Pulcheria, who at the same time ended her vow of celibacy and married Marcianus, a veteran soldier and a prominent member of the Senate. The marriage was but formal, for both were now well advanced in years: as a political expedient it was all that could be desired. The empire had peace and prosperity under their rule, and freed itself from the ignominious tribute to the Huns. Before Attila died in 452, he had met and been checked by the succours which Marcianus sent to the distressed Romans of the West. When Marcianus and Pulcheria passed away, the empire came into the hands of a series of three men of ability. They were all bred as high civil officials, not as generals; all ascended the throne at a ripe age; not one of them won his crown by arms, all were peaceably designated either by their predecessors, or by the Senate and army. These princes were Leo I. (457–474), Zeno (474–491), Anastasius (491–518). Their chief merit was that they guided the Roman Empire in the East safely through the stormy times which saw its extinction in the West. While, beyond the Adriatic, province after province was being lopped off and formed into a new Germanic kingdom, the emperors who reigned at Constantinople kept a tight grip on the Balkan Peninsula and on Asia, and succeeded in maintaining their realm absolutely intact. Both East and West were equally exposed to the barbarian in the fifth century, and the difference of their fate came from the character of their rulers, not from the diversity of their political conditions."—C. W. C. Oman, *Story of the Byzantine Empire, ch.* 4–5.—"In spite of the dissimilarity of their personal conduct, the general policy of their government [i. e. of the six emperors between Arcadius and Justinian] is characterised by strong features of resemblance. . . . The Western Empire crumbled into ruins, while the Eastern was saved, in consequence of these emperors having organised the system of administration which has been most unjustly calumniated, under the name of Byzantine. The highest officers, and the proudest military commanders, were rendered completely dependent on ministerial departments and were no longer able to conspire or rebel with impunity. The sovereign was no longer exposed to personal danger, nor the treasury to open peculation. But, unfortunately, the central executive power could not protect the people from fraud with the same ease as it guarded the treasury; and the emperors never perceived the necessity of intrusting the people with the power of defending themselves from the financial oppression of the subaltern administration."—G. Finlay, *Greece under the Romans, ch.* 2, *sect.* 11.

A. D. 404-408.—The Western Empire: The last gladiatorial show.—Retreat of Honorius and the imperial court to Ravenna.—Invasion of Radagaisus.—Alliance with Alaric the Goth.—Fall and death of Stilicho.—"After the retreat of the barbarians, Honorius was directed to accept the dutiful invitation of the senate, and to celebrate in the imperial city the auspicious era of the Gothic victory and of his sixth consulship. The suburbs and the streets, from the Milvian bridge to the Palatine mount, were filled by the Roman people, who, in the space of a hundred years, had only thrice been honoured with the presence of their sovereigns [whose residence had been at Constantinople, at Treves, or at Milan]. . . . The emperor resided several months in the capital. . . . The people were repeatedly gratified by the attention and courtesy of Honorius in the public games. . . . In these games of Honorius, the inhuman combats of gladiators polluted for the last time the amphitheatre of Rome. . . . The recent danger to which the person of the emperor had been exposed in the defenceless palace of Milan urged him to seek a retreat in some inaccessible fortress of Italy, where he might securely remain, while the open country was covered by a deluge of barbarians; . . . and in the 20th year of his age the Emperor of the West, anxious only for his personal safety, retired to the perpetual confinement of the walls and morasses of Ravenna.

The example of Honorius was imitated by his feeble successors, the Gothic kings, and afterwards the exarchs, who occupied the throne and palace of the emperors; and till the middle of the 8th century Ravenna was considered as the seat of government and the capital of Italy. The fears of Honorius were not without foundation, nor were his precautions without effect. While Italy rejoiced in her deliverance from the Goths, a furious tempest was excited among the nations of Germany, who yielded to the irresistible impulse that appears to have been gradually communicated from the eastern extremity of the continent of Asia [by the invasion of the Huns, which Gibbon considers to have been the impelling cause of the great avalanche of barbarians from the north that swept down upon Italy under Radagaisus in 406—see RADAGAISUS]. . . . Many cities of Italy were pillaged or destroyed; and the siege of Florence by Radagaisus is one of the earliest events in the history of that celebrated republic, whose firmness checked and delayed the unskilful fury of the barbarians." Stilicho came to the relief of the distressed city, "and the famished host of Radagaisus was in its turn besieged." The barbarians, surrounded by well guarded entrenchments, were forced to surrender, after many had perished from want of food. The chief was beheaded; his surviving followers were sold as slaves. Meantime, Alaric, the Gothic king, had been taken into the pay of the Empire. "Renouncing the service of the Emperor of the East, Alaric concluded with the Court of Ravenna a treaty of peace and alliance, by which he was declared master-general of the Roman armies throughout the præfecture of Illyricum; as it was claimed, according to the true and ancient limits, by the minister of Honorius." This arrangement with Alaric caused great dissatisfaction in the army and among the people, and was a potent cause of the fall and death of Stilicho, which occurred A. D. 408. He was arrested and summarily executed, at Ravenna, on the mandate of his ungrateful and worthless young master, whose trembling throne he had upheld for thirteen years.—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, ch.* 30 (*v.* 3).

A. D. 406-500.—The breaking of the Rhine barrier.—The great Teutonic invasion and occupation of the Western Empire.—"Up to the year 406 the Rhine was maintained as the frontier of the Roman Empire against the numerous barbarian races and tribes that swarmed uneasily in central Europe. From the Flavian Emperors until the time of Probus (282), the great military line from Coblenz to Kehlheim on the Danube had been really defended, though often overstepped and always a strain on the Romans, and thus a tract of territory (including Baden and Würtemberg) on the east shore of the Upper Rhine, the titheland as it was called, belonged to the Empire. But in the fourth century it was as much as could be done to keep off the Alemanni and Franks who were threatening the provinces of Gaul. The victories of Julian and Valentinian produced only temporary effects. On the last day of December 406 a vast company of Vandals, Suevians, and Alans crossed the Rhine. The frontier was not really defended; a handful of Franks who professed to guard it for the Romans were easily swept aside, and the invaders desolated Gaul at pleasure for the three following years. Such is the bare fact which the chroniclers tell us, but this migration seems to have been preceded by considerable movements on a large scale along the whole Rhine frontier, and these movements may have agitated the inhabitants of Britain and excited apprehensions there of approaching danger. Three tyrants had been recently elected by the legions in rapid succession; the first two, Marcus and Gratian, were slain, but the third Augustus, who bore the auspicious name of Constantine, was destined to play a considerable part for a year or two on the stage of the western world [see BRITAIN: A. D. 407]. It seems almost certain that these two movements, the passage of the Germans across the Rhine and the rise of the tyrants in Britain, were not without causal connection; and it also seems certain that both events were connected with the general Stilicho. The tyrants were elevated in the course of the year 406, and it was at the end of the same year that the Vandals crossed the Rhine. Now the revolt of the legions in Britain was evidently aimed against Stilicho. . . . There is direct contemporary evidence . . . that it was by Stilicho's invitation that the barbarians invaded Gaul; he thought that when they had done the work for which he designed them he would find no difficulty in crushing them or otherwise disposing of them. We can hardly avoid supposing that the work which he wished them to perform was to oppose the tyrant of Britain—Constantine, or Gratian, or Marcus, whoever was tyrant then; for it is quite certain that, like Maximus, he would pass into Gaul, where numerous Gallo-Roman adherents would flock to his standards. Stilicho died before Constantine was crushed, and the barbarians whom he had so lightly summoned were still in the land, harrying Gaul, destined soon to harry and occupy Spain and seize Africa. From a Roman point of view Stilicho had much to answer for in the dismemberment of the Empire; from a Teutonic point of view, he contributed largely to preparing the way for the foundation of the German kingdoms."—J. B. Bury, *A History of the Later Roman Empire, bk.* 2, *ch.* 6 (*v.* 1).—"If modern history must have a definite beginning, the most convenient beginning for it is the great Teutonic invasion of Gaul in the year 407. Yet the nations of modern Europe do not spring from the nations which then crossed the Rhine, or from any intermixture between them and the Romans into whose land they made their way. The nations which then crossed the Rhine were the Vandals, Suevians, and Alans. . . . None of these nations made any real settlements in Gaul; Gaul was to them simply the high road to Spain. There they did settle, though the Vandals soon forsook their settlement, and the Alans were soon rooted out of theirs. The Suevian kept his ground for a far longer time; we may, if we please, look on him as the Teutonic forefather of Leon, while we look on the Goth as the Teutonic forefather of Castile. Here we have touched one of the great national names of history; the Goth, like the Frank, plays quite another part in Western Europe from the Alan, the Suevian, and the Vandal. . . . Now both Franks and Goths had passed into the Empire long before the invasion of 407. One branch of the Franks . . . was actually settled on Roman lands, and, as Roman subjects, did their best to withstand the great

invasion. What then makes that invasion so marked an epoch? . . . The answer is that the invasion of 407 not only brought in new elements, but put the existing elements into new relations to one another. Franks and Goths put on a new character and begin a new life. The Burgundians pass into Gaul, not as a road to Spain, but as a land in which to find many homes. They press down to the south-eastern corner of the land, while the Frank no longer keeps himself in his north-eastern corner, while in the south-west the Goth is settled as for a while the liegeman of Cæsar, and in the north-west a continental Britain springs into being. Here in truth are some of the chiefest elements of the modern world, and though none of them are among the nations that crossed the Rhine in 407, yet the new position taken by all of them is the direct consequence of that crossing. In this way, in Gaul and Spain at least, the joint Vandal, Alan, and Suevian invasion is the beginning of the formation of the modern nations, though the invading nations themselves form no element in the later life of Gaul and only a secondary element in the later life of Spain. The later life of these lands, and that of Italy also, has sprung of the settlement of Teutonic nations in a Roman land, and of the mutual influences which Roman and Teuton have had on one another. Roman and Teuton lived side by side, and out of their living side by side has gradually sprung up a third thing different from either, a thing which we cannot call either Roman or Teutonic, or more truly a thing which we may call Roman and Teutonic and some other things as well, according to the side of it which we look at. This third thing is the Romance element in modern Europe, the Romance nations and their Romance tongues."—E. A. Freeman, *The Chief Periods of European History, pp.* 87–90.—"The true Germanic people who occupied Gaul were the Burgundians, the Visigoths, and the Franks. Many other people, many other single bands of Vandals, Alani, Suevi, Saxons, &c., wandered over its territory; but of these, some only passed over it, and the others were rapidly absorbed by it; these are partial incursions which are without any historical importance. The Burgundians, the Visigoths, and the Franks, alone deserve to be counted among our ancestors. The Burgundians definitively established themselves in Gaul between the years 406 and 413; they occupied the country between the Jura, the Saône, and the Durance; Lyons was the centre of their dominion. The Visigoths, between the years 412 and 450, spread themselves over the provinces bounded by the Rhone, and even over the left bank of the Rhone to the south of the Durance, the Loire, and the Pyrenees: their king resided at Toulouse. The Franks, between the years 481 and 500, advanced in the north of Gaul, and established themselves between the Rhine, the Scheldt, and the Loire, without including Brittany and the western portions of Normandy; Clovis had Soissons and Paris for his capitals. Thus, at the end of the fifth century, was accomplished the definitive occupation of the territory of Gaul by the three great German tribes. The condition of Gaul was not exactly the same in its various parts, and under the dominion of these three nations. There were remarkable differences between them. The Franks were far more foreign, German, and barbarous, than the Burgundians and the Goths. Before their entrance into Gaul, these last had had ancient relations with the Romans; they had lived in the eastern empire, in Italy; they were familiar with the Roman manners and population. We may say almost as much for the Burgundians. Moreover, the two nations had long been Christians. The Franks, on the contrary, arrived from Germany in the condition of pagans and enemies. Those portions of Gaul which they occupied became deeply sensible of this difference, which is described with truth and vivacity in the seventh of the 'Lectures upon the History of France,' of M. Augustin Thierry. I am inclined, however, to believe that it was less important than has been commonly supposed. If I do not err, the Roman provinces differed more among themselves than did the nations which had conquered them. You have already seen how much more civilized was southern than northern Gaul, how much more thickly covered with population, towns, monuments, and roads. Had the Visigoths arrived in as barbarous a condition as that of the Franks, their barbarism would yet have been far less visible and less powerful in Gallia Narbonensis and in Aquitania; Roman civilization would much sooner have absorbed and altered them. This, I believe, is what happened; and the different effects which accompanied the three conquests resulted rather from the differences of the conquered than from that of the conquerors."—F. Guizot, *Hist. of Civilization, v.* 2, *lect.* 8.—"The invasion of the barbarians was not like the torrent which overwhelms, but rather like a slow, persistent force which undermines, disintegrates, and crumbles. The Germans were not strangers to the Roman Empire when they began their conquests. . . . It is well known that many of the Roman Emperors were barbarians who had been successful soldiers in the Imperial army; that military colonies were established on the frontiers composed of men of various races under the control of Roman discipline; that the Goths, before they revolted against the authority of the Emperor, were his chosen troops; that the great Alaric was a Roman general; that the shores of the Danube and the Rhine, which marked the limits of the Empire, were lined with cities which were at the same time Roman colonies and peopled with men of the Teutonic races. When the barbarians did actually occupy the territory their movement seems at first to have been characterized by a strange mixture of force with a sentiment of awe and reverence for the Roman name. In Italy and in Gaul they appropriated to themselves two-thirds of the lands, but they sought to govern their conquests by means of the Roman law and administration, a machine which proved in their hands, by the way, a rather clumsy means of government. They robbed the provincials of all the movable property they possessed, but the suffering they inflicted is said not to have been as great as that caused by the exactions of the Roman taxgatherer. The number of armed invaders has doubtless been exaggerated. The whole force of the Burgundian tribe, whose territory, in the southeast of modern France, extended to the Rhone at Avignon, did not, it is said, exceed sixty thousand in all, while the armed bands of Clovis, who changed the destinies not only of Gaul but of Europe, were not greater than one-tenth of that number.

The great change in their life was, as I have said, that they ceased to be wanderers; they became, in a measure at least, fixed to the soil; and in contrast with the Romans, they preferred to live in the country and not in the towns. In this they followed their Teutonic habits, little knowing what a mighty change this new distribution of population was to cause in the social condition of Europe. They retained, too, their old military organization, and, after attempts more or less successful to use the Roman administration for the ordinary purposes of government, they abandoned it, and ruled the countries they conquered by simple military force, under their Dukes and Counts, the Romans generally being allowed in their private relations to govern themselves by the forms of the Roman law." —C. J. Stillé, *Studies in Mediæval History, ch.* 2.— "The coming in of the Germans brought face to face the four chief elements of our civilization: the Greek with its art and science, much of it for the time forgotten; the Roman with its political institutions and legal ideas, and furnishing the empire as the common ground upon which all stood; the Christian with its religious and moral ideas; and the German with other political and legal ideas, and with a reinforcement of fresh blood and life. By the end of the sixth century these all existed side by side in the nominal Roman empire. It was the work of the remaining centuries of the middle ages to unite them into a single organic whole — the groundwork of modern civilization. But the introduction of the last element, the Germans, was a conquest — a conquest rendered possible by the inability of the old civilization any longer to defend itself against their attack. It is one of the miracles of history that such a conquest should have occurred, the violent occupation of the empire by the invasion of an inferior race, with so little destruction of civilization, with so complete an absorption, in the end, of the conqueror by the conquered. It must be possible to point out some reasons why the conquest of the ancient world by the Germans was so little what was to be expected. In a single word, the reason is to be found in the impression which the world they had conquered made upon the Germans. They conquered it, and they treated it as a conquered world. They destroyed and plundered what they pleased, and it was not a little. They took possession of the land and they set up their own tribal governments in place of the Roman. And yet they recognized, in a way, even the worst of them, their inferiority to the people they had overcome. They found upon every side of them evidences of a command over nature such as they had never acquired: cities, buildings, roads, bridges, and ships; wealth and art, skill in mechanics and skill in government, the like of which they had never known; ideas firmly held that the Roman system of things was divinely ordained and eternal; a church strongly organized and with an imposing ceremonial, officered by venerable and saintly men, and speaking with an overpowering positiveness and an awful authority that did not yield before the strongest barbarian king. The impression which these things made upon the mind of the German must have been profound. In no other way can the result be accounted for. Their conquest was a physical conquest, and as a physical conquest it was complete, but it scarcely went farther. In government and law there was little change for the Roman; in religion and language, none at all. Other things, schools and commercial arrangements for instance, the Germans would have been glad to maintain at the Roman level if they had known how. Half unconsciously they adopted the belief in the divinely founded and eternal empire, and in a vague way recognized its continuance after they had overthrown it."— G. B. Adams, *Civilization During the Middle Ages, ch.* 5.—See, also, Gaul: A. D. 406–409, 5–8th Centuries, and 5–10th Centuries.

A. D. 408-410.— The three sieges and the sacking of the Imperial city by Alaric.—Death of the Gothic chieftain.—Having rid himself of the great minister and general whose brain and arm were the only hope of his dissolving empire, Honorius proceeded to purge his army and the state of barbarians and heretics. He "removed all who professed religious opinions different from his own, from every public office; . . . and, to complete the purification of his army, ordered a general massacre of all the women and children of the barbarians, whom the soldiers in his service had delivered up as hostages. In one day and hour these innocent victims were given up to slaughter and their property to pillage. These hostages had been left in all the Italian cities by the barbarian confederates, as a guarantee for their fidelity to Rome; when they learned that the whole had perished, in the midst of peace, in contempt of all oaths, one furious and terrific cry of vengeance arose, and 30,000 soldiers, who had been the faithful servants of the empire, at once passed over to the camp of Alaric [then in Illyria], and urged him to lead them on to Rome. Alaric, in language the moderation of which Honorius and his ministers ascribed to fear, demanded reparation for the insults offered him, and strict observance of the treaties concluded with him. The only answer he obtained was couched in terms of fresh insult, and contained an order to evacuate all the provinces of the empire." On this provocation, Alaric crossed the Alps, in October, A. D. 408, meeting no resistance till he reached Ravenna. He threatened that city, at first, but the contemptible Emperor of the West was safe in his fen-fastness, and the Goth marched on to Rome. He "arrived before Rome [in the autumn of A. D. 408] 619 years after that city had been threatened by Hannibal. During that long interval her citizens had never looked down from her walls upon the banner of an enemy [a foreign invader] waving in their plains. . . . Alaric did not attempt to take Rome by assault: he blockaded the gates, stopped the navigation of the Tiber, and soon famine took possession of a city which was eighteen miles in circumference and contained above a million of inhabitants. . . . At length, the Romans had recourse to the clemency of Alaric; and, by means of a ransom of five thousand pounds of gold and a great quantity of precious effects, the army was induced to retire into Tuscany." The standard of Alaric was now joined by 40,000 barbarian slaves, who escaped from their Italian masters, and by a large reinforcement of Goths from the Danube, led by the brother-in-law of Alaric, Ataulphus, or Athaulphus (Adolphus, in its modern form) by name. The Visigothic king offered peace to the empire if it would relinquish to him a kingdom in Noricum, Dalmatia and Venetia, with a yearly payment of gold; in the

end his demands fell until they extended to Noricum, only. But the fatuous court at Ravenna refused all terms, and Alaric marched back to Rome. Once more, however, he spared the venerable capital, and sought to attain his ends by requiring the senate to renounce allegiance to Honorius and to choose a new emperor. He was obeyed and Priscus Attalus, the præfect of the city, was formally invested with the purple. This new Augustus made Alaric and Ataulphus his chief military officers, and there was peace for a little time. But Attalus, unhappily, took his elevation with seriousness and did not recognize the commands that were hidden in the advice which he got from his Gothic patron. Alaric found him to be a fool and stripped his purple robe from his shoulders within less than a year. Then, failing once more to negotiate terms of peace with the worthless emperor shut up in Ravenna, he laid siege to Rome for the third time—and the last. "On the 24th of April, 410, the year 1163 from the foundation of the august city, the Salarian gate was opened to him in the night, and the capital of the world, the queen of nations, was abandoned to the fury of the Goths. Yet this fury was not without some tinge of pity; Alaric granted a peculiar protection to the churches, which were preserved from all insult, together with their sacred treasures, and all those who had sought refuge within their walls. While he abandoned the property of the Romans to pillage, he took their lives under his protection; and it is affirmed that only a single senator perished by the sword of the barbarians. The number of plebeians who were sacrificed appears not to have been thought a matter of sufficient importance even to be mentioned. At the entrance of the Goths, a small part of the city was given up to the flames; but Alaric soon took precautions for the preservation of the rest of the edifices. Above all, he had the generosity to withdraw his army from Rome on the sixth day, and to march it into Campania, loaded, however, with an immense booty. Eleven centuries later, the army of the Constable de Bourbon showed less veneration." Alaric survived the sack of Rome but a few months, dying suddenly in the midst of preparations that he made for invading Sicily. He was buried in the bed of the little river Bisentium, which flows past the town of Cozenza, the stream being diverted for the purpose and then turned back to its course.—J. C. L. de Sismondi, *Fall of the Roman Empire, ch.* 6.

Also in: E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, ch.* 31.—T. Hodgkin, *Italy and Her Invaders, bk.* 1, *ch.* 7.

A. D. 409-414.—Invasion of Spain by the Vandals, Sueves and Alans. See Spain: A. D. 409-414.

A. D. 410.—Abandonment of Britain. See Britain: A. D. 410.

A. D. 410-419.—Treaty with the Visigoths.—Their settlement in Aquitaine.—Founding of their kingdom of Toulouse. See Goths (Visigoths): A. D. 410-419.

A. D. 410-420.—The barbarian attack on Gaul joined by the Franks. See Franks: A. D. 410-420.

A. D. 412-453.—Mixed Roman and barbarian administration in Gaul. See Gaul: A. D. 412-453.

A. D. 423-450.—Death of Honorius.—Reign of Valentinian III. and his mother Placidia.—Legal separation of the Eastern and Western Empires.—The disastrous reign of Honorius, emperor of the West, was ended by his death in 423. The nearest heir to the throne was his infant nephew, Valentinian, son of his sister Placidia. The latter, after being a captive in the hands of the Goths and after sharing the Visigothic throne for some months, as wife of king Ataulphus, had been restored to her brother on her Gothic husband's death. Honorius forced her, then, to marry his favorite, the successful general, Constantius, whom he raised to the rank of Augustus and associated with himself on the throne of the West. But Constantius soon died, leaving his widow with two children—a daughter and a son. Presently, on some quarrel with Honorius, Placidia withdrew from Ravenna and took refuge at Constantinople, where her nephew Theodosius occupied the Eastern throne. She and her children were there when Honorius died, and in their absence the Western throne was usurped by a rebel named John, or Joannes, the Notary, who reigned nearly two years. With the aid of forces from the Eastern Empire he was unseated and beheaded and the child Valentinian was invested with the imperial purple, A. D. 425. For the succeeding twenty-five years his mother, Placidia, reigned in his name. As compensation to the court at Constantinople for the material aid received from it, the rich province of Dalmatia and the troubled provinces of Pannonia and Noricum, were now severed from the West and ceded to the Empire of the East. At the same time, the unity of the Roman government was formally and finally dissolved. "By a positive declaration, the validity of all future laws was limited to the dominions of their peculiar author; unless he should think proper to communicate them, subscribed with his own hand, for the approbation of his independent colleague."—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, ch.* 33.

Also in: J. B. Bury, *Hist. of the Later Roman Empire, ch.* 6-8.

A. D. 428-439.—Conquests of the Vandals in Spain and Africa. See Vandals: A. D. 428; and 429-439.

A. D. 441-446.—Destructive invasion of the Eastern Empire by the Huns.—Cession of territory and payment of tribute to Attila. See Huns: A. D. 441-446.

A. D. 446.—The last appeal from Britain. See Britain: A. D. 446.

A. D. 451.—Great invasion of Gaul by the Huns.—Their defeat at Chalons. See Huns: A. D. 451.

A. D. 452.—Attila's invasion of Italy.—The frightful devastation of his hordes.—Origin of Venice. See Huns: A. D. 452; and Venice: A. D. 452.

A. D. 455.—Pillage of the city by the Vandals.—"The sufferings and the ignominy of the Roman empire were increased by a new calamity which happened in the year of Valentinian's death [murdered by an usurper, Petronius Maximus A. D. 455]. Eudoxia, the widow of that emperor, who had afterwards become [through compulsion] the wife of Maximus, avenged the murder of her first husband by plotting against her second; reckless how far she involved her country in the ruin. She invited to Rome Genseric, king of the Vandals, who, not content with having conquered and devastated Africa,

made every effort to give a new direction to the rapacity of his subjects, by accustoming them to maritime warfare, or, more properly speaking, piracy. His armed bands, who, issuing from the shores of the Baltic, had marched over the half of Europe, conquering wherever they went, embarked in vessels which they procured at Carthage, and spread desolation over the coasts of Sicily and Italy. On the 12th of June, 455, they landed at Ostia. Maximus was killed in a seditious tumult excited by his wife. Defence was impossible; and, from the 15th to the 29th of June, the ancient capital of the world was pillaged by the Vandals with a degree of rapacity and cruelty to which Alaric and the Goths had made no approach. The ships of the pirates were moored along the quays of the Tiber, and were loaded with a booty which it would have been impossible for the soldiers to carry off by land."—J. C. L. de Sismondi, *Fall of the Roman Empire, ch.* 8 (*v.* 1).—"On the whole, it is clear from the accounts of all the chroniclers that Gaiseric's [or Genseric's] pillage of Rome, though insulting and impoverishing to the last degree, was in no sense destructive to the Queen of cities. Whatever he may have done in Africa, in Rome he waged no war on architecture, being far too well employed in storing away gold and silver and precious stones, and all manner of costly merchandise in those insatiable hulks which were riding at anchor by Ostia. Therefore, when you stand in the Forum of Rome or look upon the grass-grown hill which was once the glorious Palatine, blame if you like the Ostrogoth, the Byzantine, the Lombard, above all, the Norman, and the Roman baron of the Middle Ages, for the heart-breaking ruin that you see there, but leave the Vandal uncensured, for, notwithstanding the stigma conveyed in the word 'vandalism,' he is not guilty here."—T. Hodgkin, *Italy and Her Invaders, bk.* 3, *ch.* 2 (*v.* 2).

A. D. 455-476.—Barbarian masters and imperial puppets.—From Count Ricimer to Odoacer.—The ending of the line of Roman Emperors in the West, called commonly the Fall of the Western Empire.—"After the death of Valentinian III., the unworthy grandson of the great Theodosius [March 16, A. D. 455], the first thought of the barbarian chiefs was, not to destroy or usurp the Imperial name, but to secure to themselves the nomination of the emperor. Avitus, chosen in Gaul under the influence of the West Gothic King of Toulouse, Theoderic II., was accepted for a time as the western emperor, by the Roman Senate and by the Court of Constantinople. But another barbarian, Ricimer the Sueve, ambitious, successful, and popular, had succeeded to the command of the 'federated' foreign bands which formed the strength of the imperial army in Italy. Ricimer would not be a king, but he adopted as a settled policy the expedient, or the insulting jest, of Alaric. . . . He deposed Avitus, and probably murdered him. Under his direction, the Senate chose Majorian. Majorian was too able, too public-spirited, perhaps too independent, for the barbarian Patrician; Majorian, at a moment of ill-fortune was deposed and got rid of." After Majorian, one Severus (A. D. 461–467), and after Severus a Greek, Anthemius (A. D. 467–472), nominated at Constantinople, wore the purple at the command of Count Ricimer. When, after five years of sovereignty, Anthemius quarreled with his barbarian master, the latter chose a new emperor — the senator Olybrius — and conducted him with an army to the gates of Rome, in which the imperial court had once more settled itself. Anthemius, supported by the majority of the senate and people, resisted, and Rome sustained a siege of three months. It was taken by storm, on the 11th of July, A. D. 472, and suffered every outrage at the hands of the merciless victors. Anthemius was slain and his enemy, Ricimer, died a few weeks later. Olybrius followed the latter to the grave in October. Ricimer's place was filled by his nephew, a refugee Burgundian king, Gundobad, who chose for emperor an unfortunate officer of the imperial guard, named Glycerius. Glycerius allowed himself to be deposed the next year by Julius Nepos and accepted a bishopric in place of the throne; but later circumstances gave the emperor-bishop an opportunity to assassinate his supplanter and he did not hesitate to do so. By this time, the real power had passed to another barbarian "patrician" and general, Orestes, former secretary of Attila, and Orestes proclaimed his own son emperor. To this son "by a strange chance, as if in mockery of his fortune, had been given the names of the first king and the first emperor of Rome, Romulus Augustus, soon turned in derision into the diminutive 'Augustulus.' But Orestes failed to play the part of Ricimer. A younger and more daring barbarian adventurer, Odoacer the Herule, or Rugian, bid higher for the allegiance of the army. Orestes was slain, and the young emperor was left to the mercy of Odoacer. In singular and significant contrast to the common usage when a pretender fell, Romulus Augustulus was spared. He was made to abdicate in legal form; and the Roman Senate, at the dictation of Odoacer, officially signified to the Eastern emperor, Zeno, their resolution that the separate Western Empire should cease, and their recognition of the one emperor at Constantinople, who should be supreme over West and East. Amid the ruin of the empire and the state, the dethroned emperor passed his days, in such luxurious ease as the times allowed, at the Villa of Lucullus at Misenum; and Odoacer, taking the Teutonic title of king, sent to the emperor at Constantinople the imperial crown and robe which were to be worn no more at Rome or Ravenna for more than three hundred years. Thus in the year 476 ended the Roman empire, or rather, the line of Roman emperors, in the West."—R. W. Church, *Beginning of the Middle Ages, ch.* 1.—"When, at Odoacer's bidding, Romulus Augustulus, the boy whom a whim of fate had chosen to be the last native Cæsar of Rome, had formally announced his resignation to the senate, a deputation from that body proceeded to the Eastern court to lay the insignia of royalty at the feet of the Eastern Emperor Zeno. The West, they declared, no longer required an Emperor of its own; one monarch sufficed for the world; Odoacer was qualified by his wisdom and courage to be the protector of their state, and upon him Zeno was entreated to confer the title of patrician and the administration of the Italian provinces. The Emperor granted what he could not refuse, and Odoacer, taking the title of King ['not king of Italy, as is often said'— foot-note], continued the consular office, respected the civil and ecclesiasti-

cal institutions of his subjects, and ruled for fourteen years as the nominal vicar of the Eastern Emperor. There was thus legally no extinction of the Western Empire at all, but only a reunion of East and West. In form, and to some extent also in the belief of men, things now reverted to their state during the first two centuries of the Empire, save that Byzantium instead of Rome was the centre of the civil government. The joint tenancy which had been conceived by Diocletian, carried further by Constantine, renewed under Valentinian I. and again at the death of Theodosius, had come to an end; once more did a single Emperor sway the sceptre of the world, and head an undivided Catholic Church."—J. Bryce, *The Holy Roman Empire, ch.* 3.

Also in: T. Hodgkin, *Italy and Her Invaders, bk.* 3, *ch.* 4–8.—J. B. Bury, *Hist. of the Later Roman Empire, pref. and bk.* 3, *ch.* 5 (*v.* 1).

A. D. 476.—Causes of the decay of the Empire and the significance of its fall in the West.—"Thus in the year 476 ended the Roman empire, or rather, the line of Roman emperors, in the West. Thus it had become clear that the foundations of human life and society, which had seemed under the first emperors eternal, had given way. The Roman empire was not the 'last word' in the history of the world; but either the world was in danger of falling into chaos, or else new forms of life were yet to appear, new ideas of government and national existence were to struggle with the old for the mastery. The world was not falling into chaos. Europe, which seemed to have lost its guidance and its hope of civilization in losing the empire, was on the threshold of a history far grander than that of Rome, and was about to start in a career of civilization to which that of Rome was rude and unprogressive. In the great break-up of the empire in the West, some parts of its system lasted, others disappeared. What lasted was the idea of municipal government, the Christian Church, the obstinate evil of slavery. What disappeared was the central power, the imperial and universal Roman citizenship, the exclusive rule of the Roman law, the old Roman paganism, the Roman administration, the Roman schools of literature. Part of these revived; the idea of central power under Charles the Great, and Otto his great successor; the appreciation of law, though not exclusively Roman law; the schools of learning. And under these conditions the new nations—some of mixed races, as in France, Spain, and Italy; others simple and homogeneous, as in Germany, England, and the Scandinavian peninsula—begin their apprenticeship of civilization."—R. W. Church, *The Beginning of the Middle Ages, ch.* 1.—"The simple facts of the fall of the Empire are these. The Imperial system had been established . . . to protect the frontier. This it did for two centuries with eminent success. But in the reign of Marcus Aurelius . . . there occurred an invasion of the Marcomanni, which was not repulsed without great difficulty, and which excited a deep alarm and foreboding throughout the Empire. In the third century the hostile powers on every frontier began to appear more formidable. The German tribes, in whose discord Tacitus saw the safety of the Empire, present themselves now no longer in separate feebleness, but in powerful confederations. We hear no more the insignificant names of Chatti and Chauci; the history of the third century is full of Alemanni, Franks, and Goths. On the eastern frontier, the long decayed power of the Parthians now gives place to a revived and vigorous Persian Empire. The forces of the Empire are more and more taxed to defend it from these powerful enemies. . . . It is evident that the Roman world would not have steadily receded through centuries before the barbaric, had it not been decidedly inferior in force. To explain, then, the fall of the Empire, it is necessary to explain the inferiority in force of the Romans to the barbarians. This inferiority of the Romans, it is to be remembered, was a new thing. At an earlier time they had been manifestly superior. When the region of barbarism was much larger; when it included warlike and aggressive nations now lost to it, such as the Gauls; and when, on the other hand, the Romans drew their armies from a much smaller area, and organized them much less elaborately, the balance had inclined decidedly the other way. In those times the Roman world, in spite of occasional reverses, had on the whole steadily encroached on the barbaric. . . . Either, therefore, a vast increase of power must have taken place in the barbaric world, or a vast internal decay in the Roman. Now the barbaric world had actually received two considerable accessions of force. It had gained considerably, through what influences we can only conjecture, in the power and habit of co-operation. As I have said before, in the third century we meet with large confederations of Germans, whereas before we read only of isolated tribes. Together with this capacity of confederation we can easily believe that the Germans had acquired new intelligence, civilization, and military skill. Moreover, it is practically to be considered as a great increase of aggressive force, that in the middle of the fourth century they were threatened in their original settlements by the Huns. The impulse of desperation which drove them against the Roman frontier was felt by the Romans as a new force acquired by the enemy. But we shall soon see that other and more considerable momenta must have been required to turn the scale. . . . We are forced, . . . to the conclusion that the Roman Empire, in the midst of its greatness and civilization, must have been in a stationary and unprogressive, if not a decaying condition. Now what can have been the cause of this unproductiveness or decay? It has been common to suppose a moral degeneration in the Romans, caused by luxury and excessive good fortune. To support this it is easy to quote the satirists and cynics of the Imperial time, and to refer to such accounts as Ammianus gives of the mingled effeminacy and brutality of the aristocracy of the capital in the fourth century. But the history of the wars between Rome and the barbaric world does not show us the proofs we might expect of this decay of spirit. We do not find the Romans ceasing to be victorious in the field, and beginning to show themselves inferior in valor to their enemies. The luxury of the capital could not affect the army. . . . Nor can it be said that luxury corrupted the generals, and through them the army. On the contrary, the Empire produced a remarkable series of capable generals. . . . Whatever the remote and ultimate cause may have been, the immediate cause to which the fall of the Empire can be traced is a physical, not a

moral, decay. In valor, discipline, and science, the Roman armies remained what they had always been, and the peasant emperors of Illyricum were worthy successors of Cincinnatus and Caius Marius. But the problem was how to replenish those armies. Men were wanting; the Empire perished for want of men. The proof of this is in the fact that the contest with barbarism was carried on by the help of barbarian soldiers. . . . It must have been because the Empire could not furnish soldiers for its own defence, that it was driven to the strange expedient of turning its enemies and plunderers into its defenders. . . . Nor was it only in the army that the Empire was compelled to borrow men from barbarism. To cultivate the fields whole tribes were borrowed. From the time of Marcus Aurelius, it was a practice to grant lands within the Empire, sometimes to prisoners of war, sometimes to tribes applying for admission. . . . The want of any principle of increase in the Roman population is attested at a much earlier time. In the second century before Christ, Polybius bears witness to it; and the returns of the census from the Second Punic War to the time of Augustus show no steady increase in the number of citizens that cannot be accounted for by the extension of citizenship to new classes. . . . Precisely as we think of marriage, the Roman of Imperial times thought of celibacy,—that is, as the most comfortable but the most expensive condition of life. Marriage with us is a pleasure for which a man must be content to pay; with the Romans it was an excellent pecuniary investment, but an intolerably disagreeble one. Here lay, at least in the judgment of Augustus, the root of the evil. To inquire into the causes of this aversion to marriage in this place would lead me too far. We must be content to assume that, owing partly to this cause and partly to the prudential check of infanticide, the Roman population seems to have been in ordinary times almost stationary. The same phenomenon had shown itself in Greece before its conquest by the Romans. There the population had even greatly declined; and the shrewd Polybius explains that it was not owing to war or plague, but mainly to a general repugnance to marriage, and reluctance to rear large families, caused by an extravagantly high standard of comfort. . . . Perhaps enough has now been said to explain that great enigma, which so much bewilders the reader of Gibbon; namely, the sharp contrast between the age of the Antonines and the age which followed it. A century of unparalleled tranquillity and virtuous government is followed immediately by a period of hopeless ruin and dissolution. A century of rest is followed, not by renewed vigor, but by incurable exhaustion. Some principle of decay must clearly have been at work, but what principle? We answer: it was a period of sterility or barrenness in human beings; the human harvest was bad. And among the causes of this barrenness we find, in the more barbarous nations, the enfeeblement produced by the too-abrupt introduction of civilization, and universally the absence of industrial habits, and the disposition to listlessness which belongs to the military character."—J. R. Seeley, *Roman Imperialism, pp.* 47-61.—"At no period within the sphere of historic records was the commonwealth of Rome anything but an oligarchy of warriors and slave-owners, who indemnified themselves for the restraint imposed on them by their equals in the forum by aggression abroad and tyranny in their households. The causes of its decline seem to have little connexion with the form of government established in the first and second centuries. They were in full operation before the fall of the Republic, though their baneful effects were disguised and perhaps retarded by outward successes, by extended conquests, and increasing supplies of tribute or plunder. The general decline of population throughout the ancient world may be dated even from the second century before our era. The last age of the Republic was perhaps the period of the most rapid exhaustion of the human race; but its dissolution was arrested under Augustus, when the population recovered for a time in some quarters of the empire, and remained at least stationary in others. The curse of slavery could not but make itself felt again, and demanded the destined catastrophe. Whatever evil we ascribe to the despotism of the Cæsars, we must remark that it was Slavery that rendered political freedom and constitutional government impossible. Slavery fostered in Rome, as previously at Athens, the spirit of selfishness and sensuality, of lawlessness and insolence, which cannot consist with political equality, with political justice, with political moderation. The tyranny of the emperors was . . . only the tyranny of every noble extended and intensified. The empire became no more than an ergastulum or barracoon on a vast scale, commensurate with the dominions of the greatest of Roman slaveholders. . . . We have noticed already the pestilence which befel Italy and many of the provinces in the reign of Aurelius. There is reason to believe that this scourge was no common disorder, that it was of a type new at least in the West, and that, as a new morbific agent, its ravages were more lasting, as well as more severe, than those of an ordinary sickness. . . . At another time, when the stamina of ancient life were healthier and stronger, such a visitation might possibly have come and gone, and, however fatal at the moment, have left no lasting traces; but periods seem to occur in national existence when there is no constitutional power of rallying under casual disorders. The sickness which in the youth of the commonwealth would have dispelled its morbid humours and fortified its system, may have proved fatal to its advancing years, and precipitated a hale old age into palsied decrepitude. The vital powers of the empire possessed no elasticity; every blow now told upon it with increasing force; the blows it slowly or impatiently returned were given by the hands of hired barbarians, not by the strength of its own right arm. Not sickness alone, but famines, earthquakes, and conflagrations, fell in rapid succession upon the capital and the provinces. Such casualties may have occurred at other periods not less frequently or disastrously; but these were observed, while the others passed unnoticed, because the courage of the nation was now broken no less than its physical vigour, and, distressed and terrified, it beheld in every natural disorder the stroke of fate, the token of its destined dissolution. Nor indeed was the alarm unfounded. These transient faintings and sicknesses were too truly the symptoms of approaching collapse. The long line of northern frontier, from Odessus to the island of the Batavi, was skirted by a

fringe of fire, and through the lurid glare loomed the wrathful faces of myriads, Germans, Scythians, and Sarmatians, all armed for the onslaught in sympathy or concert."—C. Merivale, *Hist. of the Romans under the Empire, ch.* 18 (*v.* 7).—"Under the humane pretext of gratifying the world with a flattering title, an Antoninus, in one of his edicts, called by the name of Roman citizens the tributaries of the Roman empire, those men whom a proconsul might legally torture, flog with rods, or crush with labour and taxes. Thus the power of that formerly inviolable title, before which the most shameless tyranny stopped short, was contradicted; thus perished that ancient safety-cry which made the executioners fall back; I am a Roman citizen. From that period Rome no longer existed; there was a court and provinces: we do not understand by that word what it now signifies in the vulgar languages, but what it signified primitively in the Roman language, a country conquered by arms; we mean to say, that the primitive distinction between conquering Rome and those it had conquered, then became established between the men in the palace and those out of the palace; that Rome itself lived only for one family, and a handful of courtiers, as formerly the nations it had conquered had only lived by it. It was then that the name of subjugated, subjecti, which our language has corrupted into that of subjects, was transported from the conquered inhabitants of the East or Gaul, to the victorious inhabitants of Italy, attached in future to the yoke of a small number of men, as these had been attached to their yoke; the property of those men, as well as the others, had been their property, worthy, in a word, of the degrading title of subjects, subjecti, which must be taken literally. Such was the order of things which had been gradually forming since the time of Augustus; each emperor gloried in hastening the moment of its perfection; Constantine gave it the finishing stroke. He effaced the name of Rome from the Roman standards, and put in its place the symbol of the religion which the empire had just embraced. He degraded the revered name of the civil magistrature below the domestic offices of his house. An inspector of the wardrobe took precedence of the consuls. The aspect of Rome importuned him; he thought he saw the image of liberty still engraved on its old walls; fear drove him thence; he fled to the coasts of Byzantia, and there built Constantinople, placing the sea as a barrier between the new city of the Cæsars and the ancient city of the Brutus. If Rome had been the home of independence, Constantinople was the home of slavery; from thence issued the dogmas of passive obedience to the Church and throne; there was but one right—that of the empire; but one duty—that of obedience. The general name of citizen, which was equivalent, in language, to men living under the same law, was replaced by epithets graduated according to the credit of the powerful or the cowardice of the weak. The qualifications of Eminence, Royal Highness, and Reverence, were bestowed on what was lowest and most despicable in the world. The empire, like a private domain, was transmitted to children, wives, and sons-in-law; it was given, bequeathed, substituted; the universe was exhausting itself for the establishment of the family; taxes increased immoderately; Constantinople alone was exempted; that privilege of Roman liberty was the price of its infamy. The rest of the cities and nations were treated like beasts of burden, which are used without scruple, flogged when they are restive, and killed when there is cause to fear them. Witness the population of Antioch, condemned to death by the pious Theodosius; and that of Thessalonica, entirely massacred by him for a tax refused, and an unfortunate creature secured from the justice of his provosts. Meanwhile savage and free nations armed against the enslaved world, as if to chastise it for its baseness. Italy, oppressed by the empire, soon found pitiless revengers in its heart. Rome was menaced by the Goths. The people, weary of the imperial yoke, did not defend themselves. The men of the country, still imbued with the old Roman manners and religion, those men, the only ones whose arms were still robust and souls capable of pride, rejoiced to see among them free men and gods resembling the ancient gods of Italy. Stilico, the general to whom the empire entrusted its defence, appeared at the foot of the Alps; he called to arms, and no one arose; he promised liberty to the slaves, he lavished the treasures of the fisc; and out of the immense extent of the empire, he only assembled 40,000 men, the fifth part of the warriors that Hannibal had encountered at the gates of free Rome."—A. Thierry, *Narratives of the Merovingian Era and Historical Essays, essay* 13.—"It was not the division into two empires, nor merely the power of external enemies, that destroyed the domination of Rome. Republican Rome had ended in monarchy by the decadence of her institutions and customs, by the very effect of her victories and conquests, by the necessity of giving to this immense dominion a dominus. But after she had begun to submit to the reality of a monarchy, she retained the worship of republican forms. The Empire was for a long time a piece of hypocrisy; for it did not dare to give to its rulers the first condition of stability, a law of succession. The death of every emperor was followed by troubles, and the choice of a master of the world was often left to chance. At length the monarchy had to be organized, but thenceforth it was absolute, without restraint or opposition. Its proposed aim was to exploit the world, an aim which in practice was carried to an extreme. Hence it exhausted the orbis romanus."—E. Lavisse, *General View of the Political History of Europe, ch.* 1.

A. D. 486.—The last Roman sovereignty in Gaul. See GAUL: A. D. 457–486.

A. D. 488.—Theodoric the king of the Ostrogoths authorized and commissioned by the Emperor Zeno to conquer a kingdom in Italy. See GOTHS (OSTROGOTHS): A. D. 473–488.

A. D. 488-526.—The Ostrogothic kingdom of Theodoric.—It was in the autumn of the year 488 that Theodoric, commissioned by the Eastern Emperor, Zeno, to wrest Italy from Odoacer (or Odovacar), broke up his camp or settlement on the Danube, in the neighborhood of Sistova, and moved towards the west. The movement was a national migration—of wives and children as well as of warriors—and the total number is estimated at not less than 200,000. Following the course of the Danube, the Gothic host met with no opposition until it came to Singidunum, near the junction of the Save. There, on the banks of a stream called the Ulca, they fought a great

battle with the Gepidæ, who held possession of Pannonia, and who disputed their advance. Victorious in this encounter, Theodoric pushed on, along the course of the Save; but the movement of his cumbrous train was so slow and the hardships of the march so great, that nearly a year passed before he had surmounted the passes of the Julian Alps and entered Italy. He found Odoacer waiting to give him battle on the Isonzo; but the forces of the latter were not courageous enough or not faithful enough for their duty, and the invading Goths forced the passage of the stream on the 28th of August, 489. Odoacer retreated to Verona, followed by Theodoric, and there, on the 30th of September, a great and terrible battle was fought, from which not many of the Rugian and Herulian troops of Odoacer escaped. Odoacer, himself, with some followers, got clear of the rout and made their way to the safe stronghold of Ravenna. For a time, Odoacer's cause seemed abandoned by all who had supported him; but it was a treacherous show of submission to the victor. Theodoric, ere long, found reactions at work which recruited the forces of his opponent and diminished his own. He was driven to retreat to Ticinum (Pavia) for the winter. But having solicited and received aid from the Visigoths of southern Gaul, he regained, in the summer of 490 (August 11) in a battle on the Adda, not far from Milan, all the ground that he had lost, and more. Odoacer was now driven again into Ravenna, and shut up within its walls by a blockade which was endured until February in the third year afterwards (493), when famine compelled a surrender. Theodoric promised life to his rival and respect to his royal dignity; but he no sooner had the old self-crowned king Odoacer in his power than he slew him with his own hand. Notwithstanding this savagery in the inauguration of it, the reign of the Ostrogothic king in Italy appears to have been, on the whole, wise and just, with more approximation to the chivalric half-civilization of later mediæval times than appears in the government of any of his Gothic or German neighbors. "Although Theoderic did not care to run the risk of offending both his Goths and the Court of Constantinople by calling himself Cæsar or Emperor, yet those titles would have exactly expressed the character of his rule — so far at least as his Roman subjects were concerned. When the Emperor Anastasius in 497 acknowledged him as ruler of Italy, he sent him the purple cloak and the diadem of the Western emperors; and the act showed that Anastasius quite understood the difference between Theoderic's government and that of Odovacar. In fact, though not in name, the Western empire had been restored with much the same institutions it had had under the best of the Cæsars." The reign of Theodoric, dating it, as he did, from his first victory on Italian soil, was thirty-seven years in duration. When he died, August 30, A. D. 526, he left to his grandson, Athalaric, a kingdom which extended, beyond Italy, over Rhætia, Noricum, Pannonia and Illyricum (the modern Austrian empire south and west of the Danube), together with Provence in southern Gaul and a district north of it embracing much of modern Dauphiné. His government extended, likewise, over the Visigothic kingdom, as guardian of its young king, his grandson. But this great kingdom of the heroic Ostrogoth was not destined to endure. One who lived the common measure of life might have seen the beginning of it and the end. It vanished in one quarter of a century after he who founded it was laid away in his great tomb at Ravenna, leaving nothing to later history which can be counted as a survival of it,—not even a known remnant of the Ostrogothic race.—H. Bradley, *Story of the Goths, ch.* 16–20.—"Theodoric professed a great reverence for the Roman civilization. He had asked for and obtained from the Emperor Anastasius the imperial insignia that Odovakar had disdainfully sent back to Constantinople, and he gave up the dress of the barbarians for the Roman purple. Although he lived at Ravenna he was accustomed to consult the Roman senate, to whom he wrote: 'We desire, conscript fathers, that the genius of liberty may look with favor upon your assembly.' He established a consul of the West, three prætorian prefects, and three dioceses,—that of northern Italy, that of Rome, and that of Gaul. He retained the municipal government, but appointed the decurions himself. He reduced the severity of the taxes, and his palace was always open to those who wished to complain of the iniquities of the judges. . . . Thus a barbarian gave back to Italy the prosperity which she had lost under the emperors. The public buildings, aqueducts, theatres, and baths were repaired, and palaces and churches were built. The uncultivated lands were cleared and companies were formed to drain the Pontine marshes and the marshes of Spoleto. The iron mines of Dalmatia and a gold mine in Bruttii were worked. The coasts were protected from pirates by numerous flotillas. The population increased greatly. Theodoric, though he did not know how to write, gathered around him the best literary merit of the time,—Boethius, the bishop Ennodius, and Cassiodorus. The latter, whom he made his minister, has left us twelve books of letters. Theodoric seems in many ways like a first sketch of Charlemagne. Though himself an Arian, he respected the rights of the Catholics from the first. . . . When, however, the Emperor Justin I. persecuted the Arians in the East, he threatened to retaliate, and as a great commotion was observed among his Italian subjects, he believed that a conspiracy was being formed against himself. . . . The prefect Symmachus and his son-in-law, Boethius, were implicated. Theodoric confined them in the tower of Pavia, and it was there that Boethius wrote his great work, The Consolations of Philosophy. They were both executed in 525. Theodoric, however, finally recognized their innocence, and felt such great regret that his reason is said to have been unbalanced and that remorse hastened his end."—V. Duruy, *Hist. of the Middle Ages, bk.* 1, *ch.* 3.—"The personal greatness of Theodoric overshadowed Emperor and Empire; from his palace at Ravenna, by one title or another, by direct dominion, as guardian, as elder kinsman, as representative of the Roman power, as head by natural selection of the whole Teutonic world, he ruled over all the western lands save one; and even to the conquering Frank he could say, Thus far shalt thou come and no further. In true majesty such a position was more than Imperial; moreover there was nothing in the rule of Theodoric which touched the Roman life of Italy. . . . As far as we can see, it was the very greatness of Theodoric which kept his power

from being lasting. Like so many others of the very greatest of men, he set on foot a system which he himself could work, but which none but himself could work. He sought to set up a kingdom of Goths and Romans, under which the two nations should live side by side, distinct but friendly, each keeping its own law and doing its own work. And for one life-time the thing was done. Theodoric could keep the whole fabric of Roman life untouched, with the Goth standing by as an armed protector. He could, as he said, leave to the Roman consul the honours of government and take for the Gothic king only the toils. Smaller men neither could nor would do this. . . . It was the necessary result of his position that he gave Italy one generation of peace and prosperity such as has no fellow for ages on either side of it, but that, when he was gone, a fabric which had no foundation but his personal qualities broke down with a crash."—E. A. Freeman, *Chief Periods of European Hist., lect.* 3.

Also in: The same, *The Goths at Ravenna* (*Hist. Essays, v.* 3, *ch.* 4).—T. Hodgkin, *Italy and Her Invaders, bk.* 4, *ch.* 6–13 (*v.* 3).—Cassiodorus, *Letters; trans. and ed. by T. Hodgkin.*—H. F. Stewart, *Boethius, ch.* 2.

A. D. 527-565.—The reign of Justinian.—"In the year after the great Theoderic died (526), the most famous in the time of Eastern emperors, since Constantine, began his long and eventful reign (527–567). Justinian was born a Slavonian peasant, near what was then Sardica, and is now Sofia; his original Slave name, Uprawda, was latinized into Justinian, when he became an officer in the imperial guard. Since the death of the second Theodosius (450), the Eastern emperors had been, as they were continually to be, men not of Roman or Greek, but of barbarian or half barbarian origin, whom the imperial city and service attracted, naturalized, and clothed with civilized names and Roman character. Justinian's reign, so great and so unhappy, was marked by magnificent works, the administrative organization of the empire, the great buildings at Constantinople, the last and grandest codification of Roman law [see Corpus Juris Civilis]. But it was also marked by domestic shame, by sanguinary factions [see Circus, Factions of the Roman], by all the vices and crimes of a rapacious and ungrateful despotism. Yet it seemed for a while like the revival of the power and fortune of Rome. Justinian rose to the highest ideas of imperial ambition; and he was served by two great masters of war, foreigners in origin like himself, Belisarius the Thracian, and Narses the Armenian, who were able to turn to full account the resources, still enormous, of the empire, its immense riches, its technical and mechanical skill, its supplies of troops, its military traditions, its command of the sea. Africa was wrested from the Vandals [see Vandals: A. D. 533–534]; Italy from the successors of Theoderic [see below]; much of Spain from the West Goths."—R. W. Church, *The Beginning of the Middle Ages, ch.* 6.—"In spite of the brilliant events which have given the reign of Justinian a prominent place in the annals of mankind, it is presented to us in a series of isolated and incongruous facts. Its chief interest is derived from the biographical memorials of Belisarius, Theodora, and Justinian; and its most instructive lesson has been drawn from the influence which its legislation has exercised on foreign nations. The unerring instinct of mankind has, however, fixed on this period as one of the greatest eras in man's annals. The actors may have been men of ordinary merit, but the events of which they were the agents effected the mightiest revolutions in society. The frame of the ancient world was broken to pieces, and men long looked back with wonder and admiration at the fragments which remained, to prove the existence of a nobler race than their own. The Eastern Empire, though too powerful to fear any external enemy, was withering away from the rapidity with which the State devoured the resources of the people. . . . The life of Belisarius, either in its reality or its romantic form, has typified his age. In his early youth, the world was populous and wealthy, the empire rich and powerful. He conquered extensive realms and mighty nations and led kings captive to the footstool of Justinian, the lawgiver of civilisation. Old age arrived; Belisarius sank into the grave suspected and impoverished by his feeble and ungrateful master; and the world, from the banks of the Euphrates to those of the Tagus, presented the awful spectacle of famine and plague [see Plague: A. D. 542–594], of ruined cities, and of nations on the brink of extermination. The impression on the hearts of men was profound."—G. Finlay, *Greece under the Romans, ch.* 3, *sect.* 1.

Also in: Lord Mahon, *Life of Belisarius.*

A. D. 528-556.—The Persian Wars and the Lazic War of Justinian. See Persia: A. D. 226–627; also, Lazica.

A. D. 535-553.—Fall of the Gothic kingdom of Theodoric.—Recovery of Italy by the Emperor Justinian.—The long Gothic siege of Rome.—The siege, capture and pillage by Totila.—The forty days of lifeless desolation in the great city.—On the death of the great Theodoric, the Ostrogothic crown passed, not to his daughter, Amalasuntha, but to her son, Athalaric, a child of eight or ten years. The boy-king died at the age of sixteen, and Amalasuntha assumed the regal power and title, calling one of her cousins, named Theodatus, or Theodahad, to the throne, to share it with her. She had powerful enemies in the Gothic court and the ungrateful Theodatus was soon in conspiracy with them. Amalasuntha and her partisans were overcome, and the unhappy queen, after a short imprisonment on a little island in the lake of Bolsena, was put to death. These dissensions in the Gothic kingdom gave encouragement to the Eastern emperor, the ambitious Justinian, to undertake the reconquest of Italy. His great general, Belisarius, had just vanquished the Vandals (see Vandals: A. D. 533–534) and restored Carthaginian Africa to the imperial domain. With far smaller forces than that achievement demanded, Belisarius was now sent against the Goths. He landed, first, in Sicily (A. D. 535), and the whole island was surrendered to him, almost without a blow. The following spring (having crossed to Carthage meantime and quelled a formidable revolt), he passed the straits from Messina and landed his small army in Italy. Marching northwards, he encountered his first opposition at Neapolis—modern Naples—where he was detained for twenty days by the stout resistance of the city. It was surprised, at length, by a storming party

which crept through one of the aqueducts of the town, and it suffered fearfully from the barbarians of the Roman army before Belisarius could recover control of his savage troops. Pausing for a few months to organize his easy conquest of southern Italy, he received, before he marched to Rome, the practical surrender of the capital. On the 9th of December, 536, he entered the city and the Gothic garrison marched out. The Goths, meantime, had deposed the cowardly Theodatus and raised to the throne their most trusty warrior, Witigis. They employed the winter of 537 in gathering all their available forces at Ravenna, and in the spring they returned to Rome, 150,000 strong, to expel the Byzantine invader. Belisarius had busily improved the intervening months, and the long-neglected fortifications of the city were wonderfully restored and improved. At the beginning of March, the Goths were thundering at the gates of Rome; and then began the long siege, which endured for a year and nine days, and which ended in the discomfiture of the huge army of the besiegers. Their retreat was a flight and great numbers were slain by the pursuing Romans. "The numbers and prowess of the Goths were rendered useless by the utter incapacity of their commander. Ignorant how to assault, ignorant how to blockade, he allowed even the sword of Hunger to be wrested from him and used against his army by Belisarius. He suffered the flower of the Gothic nation to perish, not so much by the weapons of the Romans as by the deadly dews of the Campagna." After the retreat of the Goths from Rome, the conquest of Italy would have been quickly completed, no doubt, if the jealousy of Justinian had not hampered Belisarius, by sending the eunuch Narses — who proved to be a remarkable soldier, in the end — to divide the command with him. As it was, the surrender to Belisarius of the Gothic capital, Ravenna, by the Gothic king, Witigis, in the spring of 540, seemed to make the conquest an accomplished fact. The unconquered Gothic warriors then held but two important cities — Verona and Pavia. Milan they had retaken after losing it, and had practically destroyed, massacring the inhabitants (see MILAN: A. D. 539). But now they chose a new king, Ildibad, who reigned promisingly for a year and was slain; then another, who wore the crown but five months; and, lastly, they found a true royal chief in the knightly young warrior Baduila, or Totila, by whose energy and valor the Gothic cause was revived. Belisarius had been recalled by his jealous master, and the quarrels of eleven generals who divided his authority gave every opportunity to the youthful king. Defeating the Roman armies in two battles, at Faenza and in the valley of Mugello, near Florence, he crossed the Apennines, passed by Rome, besieged and took Naples and Cumæ and overran all the southern provinces of Italy, in 542 and 543, finding everywhere much friendliness among the people, whom the tax-gatherers of Justinian had alienated by their merciless rapacity. In 544, Belisarius, restored to favor and command only because of the desperate need of his services, came back to Italy to recover what his successors had lost; but he came almost alone. Without adequate troops, he could only watch, from Ravenna, and circumscribe a little, the successes of his enterprising antagonist. The latter, having strengthened his position well, in central as well as in southern Italy, applied himself to the capture of Rome. In May, 546, the Gothic lines were drawn around the city and a blockade established which soon produced famine and despair. An attempt by Belisarius to break the leaguer came to naught, and Rome was betrayed to Totila on the 17th of December following. He stayed the swords of his followers when they began to slay, but gave them full license to plunder. When the great city had been stripped and most of its inhabitants had fled, he resolved to destroy it utterly; but he was dissuaded from that most barbarous design by a letter of remonstrance from Belisarius. Contenting himself, then, with throwing down a great part of the walls, he withdrew his whole army — having no troops to spare for an adequate garrison — and took with him every single surviving inhabitant (so the historians of the time declare), so that Rome, for the space of six weeks or more (January and February, 547), was a totally deserted and silent city. At the end of that time, Belisarius threw his army inside of the broken walls, and repaired them with such celerity that Totila was baffled when he hastened back to expel the intruders. Three times the Goths attacked and were repulsed; the best of their warriors were slain; the prestige of their leader was lost. But, once more, jealousies and enmities at Constantinople recalled Belisarius and the Goths recovered ground. In 549 they again invested Rome and it was betrayed to them, as before, by a part of the garrison. Totila now made the great city — great even in its ruins — his capital, and exerted himself to restore its former glories. His arms for a time were everywhere successful. Sicily was invaded and stripped of its portable wealth. Sardinia and Corsica were occupied; the shores of Greece were threatened. But in 552 the tide of fortune was turned once more in favor of Justinian, — this time by his second great general, the eunuch Narses. In one decisive battle fought that year, in July, at a point on the Flaminian Way where it crosses the Apennines, the army of the Goths was broken and their king was slain. The remnant which survived crowned another king, Teias; but, he, too, perished, the following March, in a battle fought at the foot of Mount Vesuvius, and the Ostrogothic kingdom was at an end. Rome was already recovered — the fifth change of masters it had undergone during the war — and one by one, all the strong places in the hands of the Goths were given up. The restoration of Italy to the Empire was complete. — T. Hodgkin, *Italy and Her Invaders, bk. 4, ch. 16; bk. 5, ch. 1–24.* — "Of all ages in history the sixth is the one in which the doctrine that the Roman Empire came to an end at some time in the fifth sounds most grotesque. Again the Roman armies march to victory, to more than victory, to conquest, to conquests more precious than the conquests of Cæsar or of Trajan, to conquests which gave back Rome herself to her own Augustus. We may again be met with the argument that we have ourselves used so often; that the Empire had to win back its lost provinces does indeed prove that it had lost them; but no one seeks to prove that the provinces had not been lost; what the world is loth to understand is that there was still life enough in the Roman power to win them back again. I say the Roman

power; what if I said the Roman commonwealth? It may startle some to hear that in the sixth century, nay in the seventh, the most common name for the Empire of Rome is still 'respublica.' No epithet is needed; there is no need to say that the 'respublica' spoken of is 'respublica Romana.' It is the Republic which wins back Italy, Africa, and Southern Spain from their Teutonic masters. . . . The point of the employment of the word lies in this, that it marks the unbroken being of the Roman state; in the eyes of the men of the sixth century the power which won back the African province in their own day was the same power which had first won it well-nigh seven hundred years before. The consul Belisarius was the true successor of the consul Scipio."—E. A. Freeman, *The Chief Periods of European History, lect.* 4.

Also in: E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, ch.* 41 *and* 43.—J. B. Bury, *Hist. of the Later Roman Empire, bk.* 4, *ch.* 5–7 (*v.* 1).—R. H. Wrightson, *The Sancta Respublica Romana, ch.* 5–7.—Lord Mahon, *Life of Belisarius.*

A. D. 541.—Extinction of the office of Consul. See Consul, Roman.

A. D. 554-800.—The Exarchate of Ravenna.—On the final overthrow and annihilation of the Gothic monarchy in Italy by the decisive victories of the eunuch Narses, its throne at Ravenna was occupied by a line of vice-royal rulers, named exarchs, who represented the Eastern Roman emperor, being appointed by him and exercising authority in his name. "Their jurisdiction was soon reduced to the limits of a narrow province; but Narses himself, the first and most powerful of the exarchs, administered above fifteen years the entire kingdom of Italy. . . . A duke was stationed for the defence and military command of each of the principal cities; and the eye of Narses pervaded the ample prospect from Calabria to the Alps. The remains of the Gothic nation evacuated the country or mingled with the people. . . . The civil state of Italy, after the agitation of a long tempest, was fixed by a pragmatic sanction, which the emperor promulgated at the request of the pope. Justinian introduced his own jurisprudence into the schools and tribunals of the West. . . . Under the exarchs of Ravenna, Rome was degraded to the second rank. Yet the senators were gratified by the permission of visiting their estates in Italy, and of approaching without obstacle the throne of Constantinople: the regulation of weights and measures was delegated to the pope and senate; and the salaries of lawyers and physicians, of orators and grammarians, were destined to preserve or rekindle the light of science in the ancient capital. . . . During a period of 200 years Italy was unequally divided between the kingdom of the Lombards and the exarchate of Ravenna. . . . Eighteen successive exarchs were invested, in the decline of the empire, with the full remains of civil, of military and even of ecclesiastical power. Their immediate jurisdiction, which was afterwards consecrated as the patrimony of St. Peter, extended over the modern Romagna, the marshes or valleys of Ferrara and Commachio, five maritime cities from Rimini to Ancona, and a second inland Pentapolis, between the Adriatic coast and the hills of the Apennine. Three subordinate provinces—of Rome, of Venice, and of Naples—which were divided by hostile lands from the palace of Ravenna, acknowledged, both in peace and war, the supremacy of the exarch. The duchy of Rome appears to have included the Tuscan, Sabine, and Latin conquests of the first 400 years of the city, and the limits may be distinctly traced along the coast, from Civita Vecchia to Terracina, and with the course of the Tiber from Ameria and Narni to the port of Ostia. The numerous islands from Grado to Chiozza composed the infant dominion of Venice; but the more accessible towns on the continent were overthrown by the Lombards, who beheld with impotent fury a new capital rising from the waves. The power of the dukes of Naples was circumscribed by the bay and the adjacent isles, by the hostile territory of Capua, and by the Roman colony of Amalphi. . . . The three islands of Sardinia, Corsica, and Sicily still adhered to the empire. . . . Rome was oppressed by the iron sceptre of the exarchs, and a Greek, perhaps a eunuch, insulted with impunity the ruins of the Capitol. But Naples soon acquired the privilege of electing her own dukes; the independence of Amalphi was the fruit of commerce; and the voluntary attachment of Venice was finally ennobled by an equal alliance with the Eastern empire."—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, ch.* 43 *and* 45.

A. D. 565-628.—Decline of the Eastern Empire.—Thickening calamities.—Reigns of Justinus II., Tiberius Constantinus, Maurice, and Phocas.—Brief brightening of events by Heraclius.—His campaigns against the Persians.—"The thirty years which followed the death of Justinian are covered by three reigns, those of Justinus II. (565–578), Tiberius Constantinus (578–582), and Maurice (582–602). These three emperors were men of much the same character as the predecessors of Justinian; each of them was an experienced official of mature age, who was selected by the reigning emperor as his most worthy successor. . . . Yet under them the empire was steadily going down hill: the exhausting effects of the reign of Justinian were making themselves felt more and more, and at the end of the reign of Maurice a time of chaos and disaster was impending, which came to a head under his successor. . . . The misfortunes of the Avaric and Slavonic war [see Avars] were the cause of the fall of the Emperor Maurice. . . . Maurice sealed his fate when, in 602, he issued orders for the discontented army of the Danube to winter north of the river, in the waste marshes of the Slavs. The troops refused to obey the order, and chased away their generals. Then electing as their captain an obscure centurion, named Phocas, they marched on Constantinople. Maurice armed the city factions, the 'Blues' and 'Greens,' and strove to defend himself. But when he saw that no one would fight for him, he fled across the Bosphorus with his wife and children, to seek refuge in the Asiatic provinces, where he was less unpopular than in Europe. Soon he was pursued by orders of Phocas, whom the army had now saluted as emperor, and caught at Chalcedon. The cruel usurper had him executed, along with all his five sons, the youngest a child of only three years of age. . . . For the first time since Constantinople had become the seat of empire the throne had been won by armed rebellion and the murder of the legitimate ruler.

BURR & McINTYRE CO. LITH PHILA


EUROPE
at the DEATH of the
EMPEROR JUSTINIAN
565 A.D.
EAST ROMAN EMPIRE
RACE DIVISIONS
CELTIC PEOPLES
SLAVIC PEOPLES
LITHUANIAN PEOPLES
URAL ALTAIC PEOPLES
SCANDINAVIANS
ANGLES, SAXONS, JUTES ETC.
THE GERMANIC STATES AND PEOPLES ALL APPEAR IN DIFFERENT SHADES OF PINK.
FINNISH PEOPLES
LITHUANIAN PEOPLES
SLAVS
HUNS
URAL ALTAIC PEOPLES
BULGARIANS
GOTHS
KINGDOM OF THE GEPIDAE
COLCHIS
IBERIA
PERSIA
THRACIA
ASIANA
PONTICA
ITALIA
GREECE
CRETE
CYPRUS
RHODUS
PALESTINA
KINGDOM OF THE GHASSANIDES
AEGYPTUS
Singidunum
Philippopolis
Hadrianopolis
Constantinopolis
Nicomedia
Sinope
Amisus
Trapezus
Thessalonica
Edessa
Larissa
Corinthus
Athenae
Miletus
Laodicea
Caesarea
Ancyra
Tarsus
Antiochia
Triphilis
Damascus
Tyrus
Alexandria
Pelusium
Nisibis
Hamadan
Ctesiphon
Seleucia
Edessa
Amida
45
50
55
60
40
35
30
25

. . . Phocas was a mere brutal soldier — cruel, ignorant, suspicious, and reckless, and in his incapable hands the empire began to fall to pieces with alarming rapidity. He opened his reign with a series of cruel executions of his predecessor's friends, and from that moment his deeds of bloodshed never ceased. . . . The moment that Phocas had mounted the throne, Chosroës of Persia declared war on him, using the hypocritical pretext that he wished to revenge Maurice, for whom he professed a warm personal friendship. This war was far different from the indecisive contests in the reigns of Justinian and Justin II. In two successive years the Persians burst into North Syria and ravaged it as far as the sea; but in the third they turned north and swept over the hitherto untouched provinces of Asia Minor. In 608 their main army penetrated across Cappadocia and Galatia right up to the gates of Chalcedon. The inhabitants of Constantinople could see the blazing villages across the water on the Asiatic shore. . . . Plot after plot was formed in the capital against Phocas, but he succeeded in putting them all down, and slew the conspirators with fearful tortures. For eight years his reign continued. . . . Africa was the only portion of the Roman Empire which in the reign of Phocas was suffering neither from civil strife nor foreign invasion. It was well governed by the aged exarch Heraclius, who was so well liked in the province that the emperor had not dared to depose him. Urged by desperate entreaties from all parties in Constantinople to strike a blow against the tyrant, and deliver the empire from the yoke of a monster, Heraclius at last consented." He sent his son — who bore the same name, Heraclius — with a fleet, to Constantinople. Phocas was at once abandoned by his troops and was given up to Heraclius, whose sailors slew him. "Next day the patriarch and the senate hailed Heraclius [the younger] as emperor, and he was duly crowned in St. Sophia on October 5, A. D. 610. . . . Save Africa and Egypt and the district immediately around the capital, all the provinces were overrun by the Persian, the Avar and the Slav. The treasury was empty, and the army had almost disappeared, owing to repeated and bloody defeats in Asia Minor. Heraclius seems at first to have almost despaired. . . . For the first twelve years of his reign he remained at Constantinople, endeavouring to reorganize the empire, and to defend at any rate the frontiers of Thrace and Asia Minor. The more distant provinces he hardly seems to have hoped to save, and the chronicle of his early years is filled with the catalogue of the losses of the empire. . . . In 614 the Persian army appeared before the holy city of Jerusalem, took it after a short resistance and occupied it with a garrison. But the populace rose and slaughtered the Persian troops, when Shahrbarz had departed with his main army. This brought him back in wrath: he stormed the city and put 90,000 Christians to the sword, only sparing the Jewish inhabitants. Zacharias, Patriarch of Jerusalem, was carried into captivity, and with him went what all Christians then regarded as the most precious thing in the world — the wood of the 'True Cross' [see JERUSALEM: A. D. 615]. . . . The horror and rage roused by the loss of the 'True Cross' and the blasphemies of King Chosroës brought about the first real outburst of national feeling that we meet in the history of the Eastern Empire. . . . Heraclius made no less than six campaigns (A. D. 622-627) in his gallant and successful attempt to save the half-ruined empire. He won great and well-deserved fame, and his name would be reckoned among the foremost of the world's warrior-kings if it had not been for the misfortunes which afterwards fell on him in his old age. His first campaign cleared Asia Minor of the Persian hosts, not by a direct attack, but by skilful strategy. . . . In his next campaigns Heraclius endeavoured to liberate the rest of the Roman Empire by a similar plan: he resolved to assail Chosroës at home, and force him to recall the armies he kept in Syria and Egypt to defend his own Persian provinces. In 623-4 the Emperor advanced across the Armenian mountains and threw himself into Media. . . . Chosroës . . . fought two desperate battles to cover Ctesiphon. His generals were defeated in both, but the Roman army suffered severely. Winter was at hand, and Heraclius fell back on Armenia. In his next campaign he recovered Roman Mesopotamia. . . . But 626 was the decisive year of the war. The obstinate Chosroës determined on one final effort to crush Heraclius, by concerting a joint plan of operations with the Chagan of the Avars. While the main Persian army watched the emperor in Armenia, a great body under Shahrbarz slipped south of him into Asia Minor and marched on the Bosphorus. At the same moment the Chagan of the Avars, with the whole force of his tribe and of his Slavonic dependents, burst over the Balkans and beset Constantinople on the European side. The two barbarian hosts could see each other across the water, and even contrived to exchange messages, but the Roman fleet, sailing incessantly up and down the strait, kept them from joining forces. . . . In the end of July 80,000 Avars and Slavs, with all sorts of siege implements, delivered simultaneous assaults along the land front of the city, but they were beaten back with great slaughter." They suffered even more on trying to encounter the Roman galleys with rafts. "Then the Chagan gave up the siege in disgust and retired across the Danube." Meantime Heraclius was wasting Media and Mesopotamia, and next year he ended the war by a decisive victory near Nineveh, as the result of which he took the palace of Dastagerd, "and divided among his troops such a plunder as had never been seen since Alexander the Great captured Susa. . . . In March, 628, a glorious peace ended the 26 years of the Persian war. Heraclius returned to Constantinople in the summer of the same year with his spoils, his victorious army, and his great trophy, the 'Holy Wood.' . . . The quiet for which he yearned was to be denied him, and the end of his reign was to be almost as disastrous as the commencement. The great Saracen invasion was at hand, and it was at the very moment of Heraclius' triumph that Mahomet sent out his famous circular letter to the kings of the earth, inviting them to embrace Islam."—C. W. C. Oman, *The Story of the Byzantine Empire, ch.* 9-10.

ALSO IN: J. B. Bury, *Hist. of the Later Roman Empire, bk.* 4, *pt.* 2, *and bk.* 5, *ch.* 1-3 (*v.* 2).—See, also, PERSIA: A. D. 226-627.

A. D. 568-573.—Invasion of the Lombards. —Their conquest of northern Italy.—Their kingdom. See LOMBARDS: A. D. 568-573; and 573-754.

A. D. 590-640.—Increasing influence and importance of the Bishop of Rome.—Circumstances under which his temporal authority grew.—"The fall of the shadowy Empire of the West, and the union of the Imperial power in the person of the ruler of Constantinople, brought a fresh accession of dignity and importance to the Bishop of Rome. The distant Emperor could exercise no real power over the West. The Ostrogothic kingdom in Italy scarcely lasted beyond the lifetime of its great founder Theodoric. The wars of Justinian only served to show how scanty were the benefits of the Imperial rule. The invasion of the Lombards united all dwellers in Italy in an endeavour to escape the lot of servitude and save their land from barbarism. In this crisis it was found that the Imperial system had crumbled away, and that the Church alone possessed a strong organisation. In the decay of the old municipal aristocracy the people of the towns gathered round their bishops, whose sacred character inspired some respect in the barbarians, and whose active charity lightened the calamities of their flocks. In such a state of things Pope Gregory the Great raised the Papacy [A. D. 590] to a position of decisive eminence, and marked out the course of its future policy. The piety of emperors and nobles had conferred lands on the Roman Church, not only in Italy, but in Sicily, Corsica, Gaul, and even in Asia and Africa, until the Bishop of Rome had become the largest landholder in Italy. To defend his Italian lands against the incursions of the Lombards was a course suggested to Gregory by self-interest; to use the resources which came to him from abroad as a means of relieving the distress of the suffering people in Rome and Southern Italy was a natural prompting of his charity. In contrast to this, the distant Emperor was too feeble to send any effective help against the Lombards, while the fiscal oppression of his representatives added to the miseries of the starving people. The practical wisdom, administrative capacity, and Christian zeal of Gregory I. led the people of Rome and the neighbouring regions to look upon the Pope as their head in temporal as well as in spiritual matters. The Papacy became a national centre to the Italians, and the attitude of the Popes towards the Emperor showed a spirit of independence which rapidly passed into antagonism and revolt. Gregory I. was not daunted by the difficulties nor absorbed by the cares of his position at home. When he saw Christianity threatened in Italy by the heathen Lombards, he boldly pursued a system of religious colonisation. While dangers were rife at Rome, a band of Roman missionaries carried Christianity to the distant English, and in England first was founded a Church which owed its existence to the zeal of the Roman bishop. Success beyond all that he could have hoped for attended Gregory's pious enterprise. The English Church spread and flourished, a dutiful daughter of her mother-church of Rome. England sent forth missionaries in her turn, and before the preaching of Willibrod and Winifred heathenism died away in Friesland, Franconia, and Thuringia. Under the new name of Boniface, given him by Pope Gregory II., Winifred, as Archbishop of Mainz, organised a German Church, subject to the successor of S. Peter. The course of events in the East also tended to increase the importance of the See of Rome. The Mohammedan conquests destroyed the Patriarchates of Antioch and Jerusalem, which alone could boast of an apostolical foundation. Constantinople alone remained as a rival to Rome; but under the shadow of the Imperial despotism it was impossible for the Patriarch of Constantinople to lay claim to spiritual independence. The settlement of Islam in its eastern provinces involved the Empire in a desperate struggle for its existence. Henceforth its object no longer was to reassert its supremacy over the West, but to hold its ground against watchful foes in the East. Italy could hope for no help from the Emperor, and the Pope saw that a breach with the Empire would give greater independence to his own position, and enable him to seek new allies elsewhere."—M. Creighton, *Hist. of the Papacy during the Period of the Reformation, introd., ch.* 1 (*v.* 1).

Also in: T. W. Allies, *The Holy See and the Wandering of the Nations, ch.* 5.—See, also, Christianity: A. D. 553–800; and Papacy: A. D. 461–604, and after.

A. D. 632-709.—The Eastern Empire.—Its first conflicts with Islam.—Loss of Syria, Egypt, and Africa. See Mahometan Conquest: A. D. 632–639, to 647–709.

A. D. 641-717.—The Eastern Empire.—The period between the death of Heraclius and the advent of Leo III. (the Isaurian) is covered, in the Eastern Empire, by the following reigns: Constantine III. and Heracleonas (641); Constans II. (641–668); Constantine IV. (668–685); Justinian II. (685–711); Leontius and Absimarus (usurpers, who interrupted the reign of Justinian II. from 695 to 698 and from 698 to 704); Philippicus (711–713); Anastasius II. (713–716); Theodosius III. (716–717).

A. D. 717-800.—The Eastern Roman Empire: should it take the name of the Byzantine Empire?—and when?—"The precise date at which the eastern Roman empire ceased to exist has been variously fixed. Gibbon remarks, 'that Tiberius [A. D. 578–582] by the Arabs, and Maurice [A. D. 582–602] by the Italians, are distinguished as the first of the Greek Cæsars, as the founders of a new dynasty and empire.' But if manners, language, and religion are to decide concerning the commencement of the Byzantine empire, the preceding pages have shown that its origin must be carried back to an earlier period; while, if the administrative peculiarities in the form of government be taken as the ground of decision, the Roman empire may be considered as indefinitely prolonged with the existence of the title of Roman emperor, which the sovereigns of Constantinople continued to retain as long as Constantinople was ruled by Christian princes. . . . The period . . . at which the Roman empire of the East terminated is decided by the events which confined the authority of the imperial government to those provinces where the Greeks formed the majority of the population; and it is marked by the adoption of Greek as the language of the government, by the prevalence of Greek civilisation, and by the identification of the nationality of the people, and the policy of the emperors with the Greek church. For, when the Saracen conquests had severed from the empire all those provinces which possessed a native population distinct from the Greeks, by language, literature, and religion, the central government of Constantinople was grad-

ually compelled to fall back on the interests and passions of the remaining inhabitants, who were chiefly Greeks. . . . Yet, as it was by no means identified with the interests and feelings of the native inhabitants of Hellas, it ought correctly to be termed Byzantine, and the empire is, consequently, justly called the Byzantine empire. . . . Even the final loss of Egypt, Syria, and Africa only reveals the transformation of the Roman empire, when the consequences of the change begin to produce visible effects on the internal government. The Roman empire seems, therefore, really to have terminated with the anarchy which followed the murder of Justinian II. [A. D. 711], the last sovereign of the family of Heraclius; and Leo III., or the Isaurian [A. D. 717–741], who identified the imperial administration with ecclesiastical forms and questions, must be ranked as the first of the Byzantine monarchs, though neither the emperor, the clergy, nor the people perceived at the time the moral change in their position, which makes the establishment of this new era historically correct. Under the sway of the Heraclian family [A. D. 610–711], the extent of the empire was circumscribed nearly within the bounds which it continued to occupy during many subsequent centuries. . . . The geographical extent of the empire at the time of its transition from the Roman to the Byzantine empire affords evidence of the influence which the territorial changes produced by the Saracen conquests exercised in conferring political importance on the Greek race. The frontier towards the Saracens of Syria commenced at Mopsuestia in Cilicia, the last fortress of the Arab power. It ran along the chains of Mounts Amanus and Taurus to the mountainous district to the north of Edessa and Nisibis, called, after the time of Justinian, the Fourth Armenia, of which Martyropolis was the capital. It then followed nearly the ancient limits of the empire until it reached the Black Sea, a short distance to the east of Trebizond. . . . In Europe, Mount Hæmus [the Balkans] formed the barrier against the Bulgarians, while the mountainous ranges which bound Macedonia to the north-west, and encircle the territory of Dyrrachium, were regarded as the limits of the free Sclavonian states. . . . Istria, Venice, and the cities on the Dalmatian coast, still acknowledged the supremacy of the empire. . . . In the centre of Italy, the exarchate of Ravenna still held Rome in subjection, but the people of Italy were entirely alienated. . . . The cities of Gaëta, Naples, Amalfi, and Sorento, the district of Otranto, and the peninsula to the south of the ancient Sybaris, now called Calabria, were the only parts [of southern Italy] which remained under the Byzantine government. Sicily, though it had begun to suffer from the incursions of the Saracens, was still populous and wealthy."—G. Finlay, *Greece under the Romans, ch. 5, sect. 1 and 7.*—Dissenting from the view presented above, Professor Freeman says: "There is no kind of visible break, such as is suggested by the change of name, between the Empire before Leo and the Empire after him. The Emperor of the Romans reigned over the land of Romania after him as well as before him. . . . Down to the fall of Constantinople in the East, down to the abdication of Francis II. in the West, there was no change of title; the Emperor of the Romans remained Emperor of the Romans, however shifting might be the extent of his dominions. But from 800 to 1453 there were commonly two, sometimes more, claimants of the title. The two Empires must be distinguished in some way; and, from 800 to 1204, 'Eastern' and 'Western' seem the simplest forms of distinction. But for 'Eastern' it is just as easy, and sometimes more expressive, to say 'Byzantine'; only it is well not to begin the use of either name as long as the Empire keeps even its nominal unity. With the coronation of Charles the Great [800] that nominal unity comes to an end. The Old Rome passes away from even the nominal dominion of the prince who reigns in the New."—E. A. Freeman, *Historical Essays, series 3, p. 244.*—See Byzantine Empire.

A. D. 728-733.—Beginnings of Papal Sovereignty.—The Iconoclastic controversy.—Rupture with the Byzantine Emperor.—Practical independence assumed by the Pope. See Papacy: A. D. 728–774; and Iconoclastic Controversy.

A. D. 751.—Fall of the Exarchate of Ravenna. See Papacy: A. D. 728–774.

A. D. 754-774.—Struggle of the Popes against the Lombards.—Their deliverance by Pippin and Charlemagne.—Fall of the Lombard kingdom. See Lombards: A. D. 754–774; also, Papacy: A. D. 728–774, and 755–774.

A. D. 800.—Coronation of Charlemagne.—The Empire revived. See Franks: A. D. 768–814; and Germany: A. D. 800.

A. D. 843-951.—The breaking up of Charlemagne's Empire and founding of the Holy Roman Empire. See Italy: A. D. 843–951; Franks: A. D. 814–962; and Germany: A. D. 814–843, to 936–973.

A. D. 846-849.—Attack by the Saracens.— "A fleet of Saracens from the African coast presumed to enter the mouth of the Tiber, and to approach a city which even yet, in her fallen state, was revered as the metropolis of the Christian world. The gates and ramparts were guarded by a trembling people; but the tombs and temples of St. Peter and St. Paul were left exposed in the suburbs of the Vatican and of the Ostian Way. Their invisible sanctity had protected them against the Goths, the Vandals, and the Lombards; but the Arabs disdained both the Gospel and the legend; and their rapacious spirit was approved and animated by the precepts of the Koran. The Christian idols were stripped of their costly offerings. . . . In their course along the Appian Way, they pillaged Fundi and besieged Gaëta." The diversion produced by the siege of Gaëta gave Rome a fortunate respite. In the interval, a vacancy occurred on the papal throne, and Pope Leo IV. by unanimous election, was raised to the place. His energy as a temporal prince saved the great city. He repaired its walls, constructed new towers and barred the Tiber by an iron chain. He formed an alliance with the cities of Gaëta, Naples, and Amalfi, still vassals of the Greek empire, and brought their galleys to his aid. When, therefore, in 849, the Saracens from Africa returned to the attack, they met with a terrible repulse. An opportune storm assisted the Christians in the destruction of their fleet, and most of the small number who escaped death remained captives in the hands of the Romans and their allies.—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, ch. 52.*

A. D. 903-964.—The reign of the courtesans and their brood.—Interference of Otho the Great.—His revival of the Empire.—"During these changes [in the breaking up of the empire of Charlemagne], Rome became a sort of theocratic democracy, governed by women and priests; a state of things which, in the barbarism of the middle ages, was only possible at Rome. Theodora, a woman of patrician descent, equally celebrated for her beauty and her daring, obtained great power in Rome, which she prolonged by the charms of her two daughters. The city of Saint Peter was ruled by this trio of courtesans. The mother, Theodora, by her familiar commerce with several of the Roman barons, had obtained possession of the castle of Saint Angelo, at the entrance of Rome, on one of the principal bridges over the Tiber; and she had made it an abode of pleasure and a fortress, whence she corrupted and oppressed the Church. Her daughters, Marozia and Theodora, disposed of the pontificate by their own arts, or through their lovers, and occasionally bestowed it on the lovers themselves. Sergius III., after a contested election and seven years' exile, was recalled to the see of Rome by the interest of Marozia, by whom he had had a son, who afterwards became Pope. The younger Theodora was no less ambitious and influential than her sister. She loved a young clerk of the Roman Church, for whom she had first obtained the bishopric of Bologna, and then the archbishopric of Ravenna. Finding it irksome to be separated from him by a distance of 200 miles, she procured his nomination to the papacy, in order to have him near her; and he was elected Pope in 912, under the title of John X. . . . After a pontificate of fourteen years, John was displaced by the same means to which he owed his elevation." Marozia, who had married Guy, Duke of Tuscany, conspired with her husband against the Pope and he was put out of the way. That accomplished, "Marozia allowed the election of two Popes successively, whose pontificate was obscure and short; and then she raised to the papal see a natural son of hers, it is said, by Pope Sergius III., her former lover. This young man took the name of John XI., and Marozia, his mother, having soon after lost her husband, Guy, was sought in marriage by Hugh, King of Italy, and his brother by the mother's side. But it would appear that the people of Rome were growing weary of the tyranny of this shameless and cruel woman." King Hugh was driven from Rome by a revolt, in which another son of Marozia, named Alberic, took the lead. "Alberic, the leader of this popular rising, was proclaimed consul by the Romans, who still clung to the traditions of the republic; he threw his mother, Marozia, into prison, and set a guard over his brother, Pope John; and thus, invested with the popular power, he prepared to defend the independence of Rome against the pretensions of Hugh and the forces of Lombardy. Alberic, master of Rome under the title of patrice and senator, exercised, during twenty-three years, all the rights of sovereignty. The money was coined with his image, with two sceptres across; he made war and peace, appointed magistrates and disposed of the election and of the power of the Popes, who, in that interval, filled the See of Rome, John XI., Leo VII., Stephen IX., Martin III., and Agapetus II. The name of this subject and imprisoned papacy was none the less revered beyond the limits of Rome. . . . Alberic died lord of Rome, and had bequeathed his power to his son Octavian, who, two years afterwards, on the death of Agapetus II., caused himself, young as he was, to be named Pope by those who already acknowledged him as patrice."—A. F. Villemain, *Life of Gregory VII., introd., period* 6.—"He [Octavian] was elected Pope on the 23d of March, A. D. 956. His promotion was a disgraceful calamity. He brought to the chair of St. Peter only the vices and dissolute morals of a young debauchee; and though Luitprand must have exaggerated the disorders of this Pope, yet there remains enough of truth in the account to have brought down the scandal of the pontificate through succeeding ages, like a loud blasphemy, which makes angels weep and hell exult. Octavian assumed the name of John XII. This first example of a change of name on ascending the pontifical chair has since passed into a custom with all the Sovereign Pontiffs."—Abbé J. E. Darras, *General Hist. of the Catholic Church, period* 4, *ch.* 7.—Finding it hard to defend his independence against the king of Italy, Pope John XII. made the mistake, fatal to himself, of soliciting help from the German king Otho the Great. Otho came, made himself master of Italy, revived the empire of Charlemagne, was crowned with the imperial crown of Rome, by the Pope [see Roman Empire, The Holy; and Germany: A. D. 936–973], and then purged the Roman See by causing the bestial young pope who crowned him to be deposed. John was subsequently reinstated by the Romans, but died soon after,—A. D. 964.—H. H. Milman, *Hist. of Latin Christianity, bk.* 5, *ch.* 12.—The state of things at Rome described in the above has been fitly styled by some writers "a pornocracy."

A. D. 962-1057.—Futile attempts of the German Emperors to reform the Papacy.—Chronic disorganization of the city.—"It had not been within the power of the Emperor Otto I. to establish a permanent reformation in Rome. . . . The previous scandalous scenes were renewed, and a slight amelioration of things under the Popes Gregory V. and Silvester II., whom Otto III. placed on the papal throne [A. D. 997–1003], was but transitory. . . . For the third time it became necessary for an emperor, in this instance Henry III., to constitute himself the preserver and purifier of the papacy, first at Sutri and afterwards at Rome. At that period the papal chair was occupied within twelve years by five German popes [Clement II. to Victor II.—A. D. 1046–1057], since amongst the Roman clergy no fitting candidate could be found. These popes, with one exception, died almost immediately, poisoned by the unhealthy atmosphere of Rome; one only, Leo IX., under Hildebrand's guidance, left any lasting trace of his pontificate, and laid the foundation of that Gregorian system which resulted in papal supremacy. . . . Rome was assuming more and more the character of a sacerdotal city; the old wealthy patrician families had either disappeared or migrated to Constantinople; and as the seat of government was either at Constantinople or Ravenna, there was no class of state officials in Rome. But the clergy had become rich upon the revenues of the vast possessions of St. Peter. . . . Without manufactures, trade, or industry of their own, the people of Rome were induced

NINTH CENTURY.

CONTEMPORANEOUS EVENTS.

A. D.

801. Conquest of Barcelona from the Moors by the Franks.
805. Charlemagne's subjugation of the Avars.—Creation of the Austrian march.
806. Division of the Empire by Charlemagne between his sons formally planned.
809. Death of the Caliph Haroun al Raschid.
812. Civil war between the sons of the Caliph Haroun al Raschid; siege of Bagdad.
814. Death of Charlemagne, and accession of Louis the Pious, his only surviving son.
816. Death of Pope Leo III.; election of Stephen IV.
817. Partition of the Empire of the Franks by Louis the Pious.
826. Grant of a county between the Rhine and Moselle to Harold of Jutland, by the Emperor.
827. Beginning of Moslem conquest of Sicily.
830. First rebellion of the sons of the Emperor Louis the Pious.
833. Second rebellion of the sons of the Emperor's sons; the "Field of Lies"; deposition of the Emperor Louis the Pious.—Death of the Caliph Mamun, son of Haroun al Raschid.
834. Restoration of Louis the Pious.
835. Invasion of the Netherlands and sacking of Utrecht by the Northmen.
836. Burning of Antwerp and ravaging of Flanders by the Northmen.—Death of Ecgberht, the first king of all the English.
837. First expedition of the Northmen up the Rhine.
838. Asia Minor invaded by the Caliph Motassem; the Amorian War.
840. Third rebellion of the sons of the Frankish Emperor Louis the Pious; his death; civil war.
841. Expedition of the Northmen up the Seine; their capture of Rouen.
842. The Oath of Strasburg.
843. Conquest by the Mahometans of Messina in Sicily.—Partition Treaty of Verdun between the sons of the Emperor Louis the Pious; formation of the realms of Louis the German and Charles the Bald, which grew into the kingdoms of Germany and France.
845. First attack of the Northmen on Paris; their destruction of Hamburg.
846. Rome attacked by the Moslems.
847. Siege and capture of Bordeaux by the Northmen.
849. Birth of Alfred the Great (d. 901).
852. Revolt against the Moslems in Armenia.
854. Ravages of the Northmen on the Loire checked at Orleans.
855. Death of Lothaire, Emperor of the Franks, and civil war between his sons.—First footing of the Danes established in England.
857. Deposition of Ignatius, Patriarch of Constantinople, and elevation of Photius.
860. Discovery of Iceland by the Northmen.*
861. Formation of the Duchy of France; origin of the House of Capet.—Paris surprised by the Northmen.
863. Papal decree against the Eastern Patriarch, Photius.—Creation of the County of Flanders by Charles the Bald.
864. Mission of Cyril and Methodius to the Slavonians.
865. First Varangian or Russian attack on Constantinople.
866. Beginning of the permanent conquests of the Danes in England.
871. Moslem fortress of Bari, in southern Italy, surrendered to the Franks and Greeks.—Accession of Alfred the Great to the throne of Wessex.
875. Death of Louis II., Emperor of the Franks and king of Italy; imperial coronation of Charles the Bald.
876. The Seine entered by the Northmen under Rollo.
877. Death of the Emperor, Charles the Bald, and accession of Louis the Stammerer.—Founding of the kingdom of Provence by Count Boso.
878. Capture by the Moslems of Syracuse in Sicily.
880. Ravages of the Northmen in Germany; battles of the Ardennes and Ebbsdorf.—Defeat of the Danes by the English King Alfred at Ethandun; Peace of Wedmore.*
881. Accession of Charles the Fat, king of Germany and Italy.
884. Temporary reunion of the Empire of the Franks under Charles the Fat.
885. Siege of Paris by the Northmen under Rollo.
887. Deposition of the Emperor, Charles the Fat.
888. Death of Charles the Fat and final disruption of the Empire of the Franks; founding of the kingdom of Transjurane Burgundy.—The crown of France in dispute between Eudes, Count of Paris, and the Carolĭng heir, Charles the Simple.
889. Second siege of Paris by Rollo.
890. Third siege of Paris and siege of Bayeux by Rollo.
891. Defeat of the Danes at Louvain by King Arnulf.
894. Arnulf of Germany made Emperor.
895. Rome taken by the Emperor Arnulf.
898. Death of Eudes, leaving Charles the Simple sole king of France.
899. Death of the Emperor Arnulf; accession of Louis the Child to the German throne.
900. Italy ravaged in the north by the Hungarians.

* Uncertain date.

TENTH CENTURY.

CONTEMPORANEOUS EVENTS.

A. D.

901. Death of the English king, Alfred the Great, and accession of his son, Edward the Elder. —Founding of the Samanide dynasty in Khorassan.

904. Sergius III. made Pope; beginning of the rule of the courtesans at Rome.

909. Founding of the Fatimite caliphate in Africa.

910. Founding of the monastery of Clugny in France.

911. Death of the Emperor Louis the Child, extinguishing the Carolingian dynasty in Germany, and election of Conrad the Franconian.—Defeat of the Northmen at Chartres in France; cession of Normandy to Rollo.

912. Baptism of the Norman Duke Rollo.

914. Elevation of John X. to the papal throne by the courtesan, Theodora.*

916. Imperial coronation in Italy of Berengar.

919. Election of the Saxon Duke, Henry the Fowler, to the kingship of Germany.—Establishment of the Danish kingdom of Dublin.

923. The crown of France disputed with Charles the Simple by Rudolph, of Burgundy.

924. Devastation of Germany by the Hungarians; truce agreed upon for nine years.—Lapse of the imperial title on the death of Berengar.—Commendation of Scotland to the West Saxon King.

925. Death of the English king, Edward the Elder, and accession of his son Ethelstan.

928. Overthrow and imprisonment of Pope John X. by the courtesan Marozia.*

929. Death of Charles the Simple in France.

931. John XI., son of the courtesan Marozia, made Pope.*

932. Domination of Rome by the Pope's brother, Alberic.

936. Election of Otho, called the Great, to the throne of Germany.—Death of Rudolph of Burgundy and restoration of the Carolingians to the French throne.

937. Ethelstan's defeat of Danes, Britons and Scots at the battle of Brunnaburgh.—Invasion of France by the Hungarians.

940. Death of the English king, Ethelstan, and accession of his brother Edmund.

946. Death of the English king, Edmund, and accession of his brother Edred.

951. First expedition of Otho the Great into Italy; founding of the Holy Roman Empire (afterwards so called).

954. Death of Alberic, tyrant of Rome, his son, Octavian, succeeding him.—Death of the Carolingian king of France, Louis IV., called "d'Outremer"; accession of Lothaire.

955. Germany invaded by the Hungarians; their decisive defeat on the Lech.—Death of the English king, Edred, and accession of his nephew, Edwig.

956. Assumption of the Papal throne by Octavian, as John XII.

957. Revolt against the English king Edwig; division of the kingdom with his brother Edgar.*

959. Death of Edwig and accession of Edgar; Abbot Dunstan made Archbishop of Canterbury.

961. The crown of Italy taken by Otho the Great, of Germany.

962. Imperial coronation of Otho the Great at Rome; revival of the Western Empire.

963. Expulsion and deposition of Pope John XII.; election of Leo VIII.

964. Expulsion of Pope Leo VIII.; return and death of John XII.; siege and capture of Rome by the Emperor.

965. Death of Pope Leo VIII.; election, expulsion, and forcible restoration of John XIII.

967. Conquest of Egypt by the Fatimite caliph.*

969. Murder of the Eastern Emperor Nicephorus Phocas by John Zimisces, his successor.

972. Marriage of Otho, the Western Emperor's son, to the Byzantine princess, Theophano.—Death of Pope John XIII., and election of Pope Benedict VI.

973. Death of the Emperor Otho the Great; accession of Otho II.

974. Murder of Pope Benedict VI.

975. Election of Pope Benedict VII.—Death of the English king Edgar; accession of his son Edward the Martyr.

979. Death of Edward the Martyr; accession of Ethelred the Unready.*

983. Death of the Emperor Otho II.; accession of Otho III. to the German throne, under the regency of his mother, Theophano.—First visit of Erik the Red to Greenland.

984. Election of Pope John XIV.

985. Murder of Pope John XIV.; election of Pope John XV.

986. Death of Lothaire, king of France; accession of his son Louis V.

987. Death of Louis V., the last of the Carolingian kings; election of Hugh Capet.

988. Death of Dunstan, Archbishop of Canterbury.—Cherson acquired by the Romans.

991. Invasion of England by Vikings from Norway; battle of Maldon.

996. Death of Hugh Capet, king of France; accession of his son, Robert II.—Death of Pope John XV.; election of Gregory V.—Imperial coronation of Otho III.

997. Insurrection of peasants in Normandy.—Rebellion of Crescentius in Rome; expulsion of the Pope.

998. Overthrow of Crescentius at Rome.—Excommunication of King Robert of France.

999. Gerbert raised by the Emperor to the Papal chair, as Sylvester II.

1000. Expectations of the end of the world.—Pilgrimages of the Emperor Otho.—Royal title conferred on Duke Stephen of Hungary, by the Pope.—Christianity formally adopted in Iceland.

* Uncertain date.

to rely upon exactions levied upon the foreigner, and upon profits derived from ecclesiastical institutions. . . . Hence the unvarying sameness in the political history of Rome from the 5th to the 15th century."—J. I. von Döllinger, *Studies in European History, ch.* 3.—See PAPACY: A. D. 887–1046.

A. D. 1077-1102.—Donation of the Countess Matilda to the Holy See. See PAPACY: A. D. 1077–1102.

A. D. 1081-1084.—Surrender to Henry IV.—Terrible Norman visitation.—Four years after his humiliation of himself before the pope at Canossa (see CANOSSA), Henry IV. ("King of the Romans" and claiming the imperial coronation, which the pope refused him), entered Italy with an army to enforce his demands. He had recovered his authority in Germany; the rival set up against him was slain; northern Italy was strong in his support. For three successive years Henry marched his army to the walls of Rome and made attempts to enter, by force, or intrigue, or by stress of blockade, and every year, when the heats of summer came, he found himself compelled to withdraw. At last, the Romans, who had stood firm by Gregory VII., tired of the siege, or the gold which purchased their fidelity (some say) gave out, and they opened their gates. Pope Gregory took refuge in his impregnable Castle of St. Angelo, and Henry, bringing with him the anti-pope whom his partisans had set up, was crowned by the latter in the Church of St. Peter. But the coveted imperial crown was little more than settled upon his head when news came of the rapid approach of Robert Guiscard, the Norman conqueror of southern Italy, with a large army, to defend the legitimate pope. Henry withdrew from Rome in haste and three days afterwards Robert Guiscard's army was under its walls. The Romans feared to admit these terrible champions of their pope; but the vigilance and valor of the Normans surprised a gate, and the great city was in their power. They made haste to conduct Gregory to his Lateran Palace and to receive his blessing; then they "spread through the city, treating it with all the cruelty of a captured town, pillaging, violating, murdering, wherever they met with opposition. The Romans had been surprised, not subdued. For two days and nights they brooded over their vengeance; on the third day they broke out in general insurrection. . . . The Romans fought at advantage, from their possession of the houses and their knowledge of the ground. They were gaining the superiority; the Normans saw their peril. The remorseless Guiscard gave the word to fire the houses. . . . The distracted inhabitants dashed wildly into the streets, no longer endeavouring to defend themselves, but to save their families. They were hewn down by hundreds. . . . Nuns were defiled, matrons forced, the rings cut from their living fingers. Gregory exerted himself, not without success, in saving the principal churches. It is probable, however, that neither Goth nor Vandal, neither Greek nor German, brought such desolation on the city as this capture by the Normans. From this period dates the desertion of the older part of the city, and its gradual extension over the site of the modern city, the Campus Martius. . . . Many thousand Romans were sold publicly as slaves; many carried into the remotest parts of Calabria." When Guiscard withdrew his destroying army from the ruins of Rome, Gregory went with him and never returned. He died not long after at Salerno.—H. H. Milman, *Hist. of Latin Christianity, bk.* 7, *ch.* 3.

ALSO IN: A. F. Villemain, *Life of Gregory VII., bk.* 9.—See, also, GERMANY: A. D. 973–1122, and PAPACY: A. D. 1056–1122.

A. D. 1122-1250.—Conflict of the Popes with the Hohenstaufen Emperors. See PAPACY: A. D. 1122–1250; and GERMANY: A. D. 1138–1268.

A. D. 1145-1155.—The Republic of Arnold of Brescia.—Arnold of Brescia—so-called from his native city in Lombardy—was a disciple of Abelard, and not so much a religious as a political reformer. "On all the high mysterious doctrines of the Church, the orthodoxy of Arnold was unimpeachable; his personal life was that of the sternest monk; he had the most earnest sympathy with the popular religion. . . . He would reduce the clergy to their primitive and apostolic poverty; confiscate all their wealth, escheat all their temporal power. . . . His Utopia was a great Christian republic, exactly the reverse of that of Gregory VII." In 1145, Arnold was at Rome, where his doctrines had gone before him, and where the citizens had already risen in rebellion against the rule of the pope. "His eloquence brought over the larger part of the nobles to the popular side; even some of the clergy were infected by his doctrines. The republic, under his influence, affected to resume the constitution of elder Rome. . . . The Capitol was rebuilt and fortified; even the church of St. Peter was sacrilegiously turned into a castle. The Patrician took possession of the Vatican, imposed taxes, and exacted tribute by violence from the pilgrims. Rome began again to speak of her sovereignty of the world." The republic maintained itself until 1155, when a bolder pope—the Englishman, Adrian or Hadrian IV.—had mounted the chair of St. Peter, and confronted Arnold with unflinching hostility. The death of one of his Cardinals, killed in a street tumult, gave the pope an opportunity to place the whole city under an interdict. "Religion triumphed over liberty. The clergy and the people compelled the senate to yield. Hadrian would admit of no lower terms than the abrogation of the republican institutions; the banishment of Arnold and his adherents. The republic was at an end, Arnold an exile; the Pope again master in Rome." A few months later, Arnold of Brescia, a prisoner in the hands of Frederick Barbarossa, then coming to Rome for the imperial crown, was given up to the Pope and was executed in some summary way, the particulars of which are in considerable dispute.—H. H. Milman, *Hist. of Latin Christianity, bk.* 8, *ch.* 6–7.

ALSO IN: J. Miley, *Hist. of the Papal States, bk.* 6.

A. D. 1155.—Tumult at the coronation of Frederick Barbarossa. See ITALY: A. D. 1154–1162.

A. D. 1167.—The taking of the city by Frederick Barbarossa. See ITALY: A. D. 1166–1167.

A. D. 1198-1216.—The establishing of Papal Sovereignty in the States of the Church. See PAPACY: A. D. 1198–1216.

A. D. 1215.—The beginning in Italy of the strife of the Guelphs and Ghibellines. See ITALY: A. D. 1215.

13-14th Centuries.—The turbulence of the Roman nobles.—The strife of the Colonna and the Ursini.—"In the beginning of the 11th century Italy was exposed to the feudal tyranny, alike oppressive to the sovereign and the people. The rights of human nature were vindicated by her numerous republics, who soon extended their liberty and dominion from the city to the adjacent country. The sword of the nobles was broken; their slaves were enfranchised; their castles were demolished; they assumed the habits of society and obedience. . . . But the feeble and disorderly government of Rome was unequal to the task of curbing her rebellious sons, who scorned the authority of the magistrate within and without the walls. It was no longer a civil contention between the nobles and plebeians for the government of the state. The barons asserted in arms their personal independence; their palaces and castles were fortified against a siege; and their private quarrels were maintained by the numbers of their vassals and retainers. In origin and affection they were aliens to their country; and a genuine Roman, could such have been produced, might have renounced these haughty strangers, who disdained the appellation of citizens, and proudly styled themselves the princes of Rome. After a dark series of revolutions, all records of pedigree were lost; the distinction of surnames was abolished; the blood of the nations was mingled in a thousand channels; and the Goths and Lombards, the Greeks and Franks, the Germans and Normans, had obtained the fairest possessions by royal bounty or the prerogative of valour. . . . It is not my design to enumerate the Roman families which have failed at different periods, or those which are continued in different degrees of splendour to the present time. The old consular line of the Frangipani discover their name in the generous act of breaking or dividing bread in a time of famine; and such benevolence is more truly glorious than to have enclosed, with their allies the Corsi, a spacious quarter of the city in the chains of their fortifications. The Savelli, as it should seem a Sabine race, have maintained their original dignity; the obsolete surname of the Capizucchi is inscribed on the coins of the first senators; the Conti preserve the honour, without the estate, of the counts of Signia; and the Annibaldi must have been very ignorant, or very modest, if they had not descended from the Carthaginian hero. But among, perhaps above, the peers and princes of the city, I distinguish the rival houses of Colonna and Ursini [or Orsini]. . . . About the end of the thirteenth century the most powerful branch [of the Colonna] was composed of an uncle and six brothers, all conspicuous in arms or in the honours of the Church. Of these Peter was elected senator of Rome, introduced to the Capitol in a triumphant car, and hailed in some vain acclamations with the title of Cæsar; while John and Stephen were declared Marquis of Ancona and Count of Romagna by Nicholas IV., a patron so partial to their family that he has been delineated in satirical portraits, imprisoned, as it were, in a hollow pillar. After his decease their haughty behaviour provoked the displeasure of the most implacable of mankind. The two cardinals, the uncle and the nephew, denied the election of Boniface VIII.; and the Colonna were oppressed for a moment by his temporal and spiritual arms. He proclaimed a crusade against his personal enemies; their estates were confiscated; their fortresses on either side of the Tiber were besieged by the troops of St. Peter and those of the rival nobles; and after the ruin of Palestrina, or Prænestе, their principal seat, the ground was marked with a ploughshare, the emblem of perpetual desolation [see PAPACY: A. D. 1294–1348]. . . . Some estimate may be formed of their wealth by their losses, of their losses by the damages of 100,000 gold florins which were granted them against the accomplices and heirs of the deceased pope. All the spiritual censures and disqualifications were abolished by his prudent successors; and the fortune of the house was more firmly established by this transient hurricane. . . . . But the first of the family in fame and merit was the elder Stephen, whom Petrarch loved and esteemed as a hero superior to his own times and not unworthy of ancient Rome. . . . Till the ruin of his declining age, the ancestors, the character, and the children of Stephen Colonna exalted his dignity in the Roman republic and at the Court of Avignon. The Ursini migrated from Spoleto; the sons of Ursus, as they are styled in the twelfth century, from some eminent person who is only known as the father of their race. But they were soon distinguished among the nobles of Rome by the number and bravery of their kinsmen, the strength of their towers, the honours of the senate and sacred college, and the elevation of two popes, Celestin III. and Nicholas III., of their name and lineage. . . . The Colonna embraced the name of Ghibellines and the party of the empire; the Ursini espoused the title of Guelphs and the cause of the Church. The eagle and the keys were displayed in their adverse banners; and the two factions of Italy most furiously raged when the origin and nature of the dispute were long since forgotten. After the retreat of the popes to Avignon they disputed in arms the vacant republic; and the mischiefs of discord were perpetuated by the wretched compromise of electing each year two rival senators. By their private hostilities the city and country were desolated."—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, ch.* 69.—"Had things been left to take their natural course, one of these families, the Colonna, for instance, or the Orsini, would probably have ended by overcoming its rivals, and have established, as was the case in the republics of Romagna and Tuscany, a 'signoria,' or local tyranny, like those which had once prevailed in the cities of Greece. But the presence of the sacerdotal power, as it had hindered the growth of feudalism, so also it stood in the way of such a development as this, and in so far aggravated the confusion of the city."—J. Bryce, *The Holy Roman Empire, ch.* 16.

A. D. 1300.—The Jubilee. See PAPACY: A. D. 1294–1348.

A. D. 1305-1377.—Withdrawal of the Papal court from Rome and settlement at Avignon.—The "Babylonish Captivity." See PAPACY: A. D. 1294–1348, to 1352–1378.

A. D. 1312.—Resistance to the entry and coronation of Henry VII. See ITALY: A. D. 1310–1313.

A. D. 1328.—Imperial coronation of Louis IV. of Bavaria. See ITALY: A. D. 1313–1330.

A. D. 1347-1354.—The revolution of Rienzi, the last Tribune.—"The Holy City had no gov-

ernment. She was no longer the Imperial Rome, nor the Pontifical Rome. The Teutonic Cæsars had abandoned her. The Popes had also fled from the sacred hill of the Vatican to the slimy Gallic city, Avignon. . . . The real masters of the city were the princes or barons, who dwelt in their fortified castles in the environs, or their strong palaces within. The principal among them were masters of different parts of the city. The celebrated old family of the Colonnas reigned, it may be said, over the north of the city, towards the Quirinal. . . . The new family of the Orsini extended their sway along the Tiber from the Campo-di-Fiore, to the Church of St. Peter, comprising the castle of St. Angelo. The Savelli, less powerful, possessed a part of the Aventine, with the theatre of Marcellus, and the Conti, the huge tower which bears their name, on Cæsar's Forum. Other members of the nobility, in the country, were possessors of small fortified cities, or castles. . . . Rome, subjected to such a domination, had become almost deserted. The population of the seven-hilled city had come down to about 30,000 souls. When the barons were at peace with each other, which, however, was a rare occurrence, they combined to exercise their tyranny over the citizens and the serfs, to rob and plunder the farmers, travellers, and pilgrims. Petrarch wrote to the Pope at this period, that Rome had become the abode of demons, the receptacle of all crimes, a hell for the living. . . . Rienzi was then 28 years old. . . . His function of notary (assessore) to the Roman tribunals, would seem to infer that he was considered a peaceful, rational citizen. It appears, however, that he brought in the exercise of his official duties, the excited imagination and generosity of heart which characterized his nature. He gloried in being surnamed the Consul of orphans, of widows, and of the poor. His love for the humble soon became blended with an intense hatred for the great: one of his brothers was killed accidentally by a Roman baron, without his being able to obtain any satisfaction. . . . Rienzi had always been noted for his literary and poetical taste; he was considered as deeply versed in the knowledge of antiquity, and as the most skilful in deciphering and explaining the numerous inscriptions with which Rome abounded. . . . The least remains of antiquity became for him a theme of declamatory addresses to the people, on the present state of Rome, on the iniquities that surrounded him. Followed by groups that augmented daily, and which listened to him with breathless interest, he led them from ruin to ruin, to the Forum, to the tombs of the Christian martyrs, thus associating every glory, and made the hearts of the people throb by his mystical eloquence. . . . No remedy being brought to the popular grievances, an insurrection broke out. The senator was expelled; thirteen good men (buoni uomini) were installed in the Capitol and invested with dictatorial powers. It was a Guelfic movement; Rienzi was mixed with it; but without any preëminent participation. This new government resolved to send an embassy to the Pope, at Avignon, and Rienzi formed part of it. Such was the first real public act in the life of Cola di Rienzi. The embassy was joined by Petrarch. . . . The Pope would not hear of leaving his new splendid palace, and the gentle population of Avignon, for the heap of ruins and the human turbulence of Rome." But "Cardinal Aymeric was named to represent the Pope at Rome, as Legate, and a Colonna and an Orsini invested with the senatorial dignity, in order to restore order in the Eternal City, in the name of the Pontiff. Rienzi indulged in the most extravagant exultation. He wrote a highly enthusiastic address to the Roman people. But his illusion was not of long duration. The new Legate only attended to the filling of the Papal Treasury. The nobility, protected by the new senators, continued their course of tyranny. Riénzi protested warmly against such a course of iniquities, in the council. One day he spoke with a still greater vehemence of indignation, when one of the members of the council struck him in the face, others hissed out at him sneeringly, calling him the Consul of orphans and widows. From that day he never appeared at any of its meetings; his hatred had swollen, and must explode. . . . He went straight to the people (popolo minuto), and prepared a revolution. To render his exhortations to the people more impressive, he made use of large allegorical pictures, hastily drawn, and which form a curious testimony of his mystical imagination, as well as of his forensic eloquence. . . . Finally, he convoked the people at the Capitol for the 20th of May, 1347, the day of Pentecost, namely, under the invocation of the Holy Ghost. Rienzi had heard, with fervour, thirty masses during the preceding night. On that day he came out at 12 o'clock armed, with his head uncovered, followed by 25 partisans; three unfurled standards were carried before him, bearing allegorical pictures. This time his address was very brief—merely stating, that from his love for the Pope and the salvation of the people, he was ready to encounter any danger. He then read the laws which were to insure the happiness of Rome. They were, properly speaking, a summary of reforms, destined to relieve the people from their sufferings, and intended to realize, what he proclaimed, must become the good state [or Good Estate], il buono stato. . . . By this outline of a new constitution, the people were invested with the property and government of the city as well as of its environs; the Pontifical See, bereft of the power it had exercised during several centuries; and the nobility deprived of what they considered as their property, to assist the public poverty. The revolution could not be more complete; and it is needless to add, that Rienzi was clamorously applauded, and immediately invested with full powers to realize and organize the buono stato, of which he had given the programme. He declined the title of Rector, and preferred the more popular name of Tribune. Nothing was fixed as to the duration of this extraordinary popular magistracy. The new government was installed at the Capitol, the Senators expelled, and the whole revolution executed with such rapidity, that the new Tribune might well be strengthened in his belief that he was acting under the protection of the Holy Ghost. He was careful, nevertheless, not to estrange the Pontifical authority, and requested that the apostolical vicar should be offered to be adjoined to him, which the prelate accepted, however uncertain and perilous the honour appeared to be. During the popular enthusiasm, old Stephen Colonna, with the more formidable of the barons, who had been away, returned to Rome in haste;

he expressed publicly his scorn, and when the order came from Rienzi for him to quit the city, he replied that he would soon come and throw that madman out of one of the windows of the Capitol. Rienzi ordered the bells to be rung, the people instantly assembled in arms, and that proudest of the barons was obliged to fly to Palestrina. The next day it was proclaimed that all the nobles were to come, to swear fealty to the Roman people, and afterwards withdraw to their castles, and protect the public roads. John, the son of old Colonna, was the first who presented himself at the Capitol, but it was with the intention of braving and insulting the Tribune. When he beheld the popular masses in close array, he felt awed, and took the oath to protect the people — protect the roads — succour the widows and orphans, and obey the summons of the Tribune. The Orsini, Savelli, Gaetani, and many others, came after him and followed his example. Rienzi, now sole master, without opponents, gave a free course to the allurements of authority. . . . The tolls, taxes, and imposts which pressed upon the people were abolished by Rienzi, in the first instance, and afterwards, the taxes on the bridges, wine, and bread; but he endeavoured to compensate such an enormous deficit by augmenting the tax on salt, which was not yet unpopular, besides an impost on funded property. He was thus making hasty, serious, even dangerous engagements with the people, which it might not be in his power to keep. . . . For the present, calmness and security were reigning in the city. . . . The Tribune received the congratulations of all the ambassadors; the changes he had effected appeared miraculous. . . . He believed implicitly that he was the founder of a new era. The homage profusely lavished upon him by all the Italian Republics, and even by despotic sovereigns confirmed him in his conviction. . . . One nobleman alone, the Prefect of Vico, secretly supported by the agent of the Pontifical patrimony, refused to submit and to surrender the three or four little cities in his jurisdiction. Rienzi led rapidly against him an army of 8,000 men, and attacked the rebellious Prefect so suddenly and skilfully, that the latter surrendered unconditionally. This success inflamed the head and imagination of Rienzi, and with it commenced the mystical extravagances and follies which could not fail to cause his ruin." —Prof. De Vericour, *Rienzi, the last of the Tribunes* (*Dublin Univ. Mag.*, 1860.—*Eclectic Mag.*, *Sept.*, 1860).—"Rienzi's head was turned by his success. He assumed the pomp of a sovereign. He distributed titles, surrounded himself with ceremonies, and multiplied feasts and processions. . . . He desired to be ennobled, and to have the title of Knight, as well as Tribune. To celebrate his installation as Knight, a splendid series of ceremonies was arranged," at the end of which he "made an address, in which he cited the Pope, and Lewis of Bavaria, and Charles of Bohemia, to give reasons for any claims they had on Rome; and pointing his sword to three points of the compass, he exclaimed, 'This is mine, and this is mine, and this is mine.'. . . Folly had quite got the better of him now, and his vanity was leading him swiftly to ruin. . . . Shortly afterwards he issued a proclamation that he had discovered a conspiracy against the people and himself, and declared that he would cut off the heads of all those concerned in it. The conspirators were seized and brought forward, and among them were seen the chief of the princely families of Rome. Solemn preparations were made for their execution, when Rienzi, suddenly and without reason, not only pardoned them all, but conferred upon them some of the most important charges and offices of the state. No sooner were these nobles and princes free out of Rome than they began seriously to conspire to overthrow Rienzi and his government. They assembled their soldiers, and, after devastating the country, threatened to march upon Rome itself. The Tribune, who was no soldier, attempted to intimidate his enemies by threats; but finding that the people grew clamorous for action, he at last took up arms, and made a show of advancing against them. But after a few days, during which he did nothing except to destroy still more of the Campagna, he returned to Rome, clothed himself in the Imperial robes, and received a legate from the Pope. . . . His power soon began to crumble away under him; and when, shortly afterwards, he endeavoured to prevail upon the people to rise and drive out the Count of Minorbino, who had set his authority at defiance, he found that his day was past. . . . He then ordered the trumpets of silver to sound, and, clothed in all his pomp, he marched through Rome, accompanied by his small band of soldiers, and on the 15th October, 1347, intrenched himself in the Castle St. Angelo. Still the influence of his name and his power was so great, that it was not till three days after that the nobles ventured to return to Rome, and then they found that Cola's power had vanished. It faded away like a carnival pageant, as that gay procession entered the Castle St. Angelo. There he remained until the beginning of March, and then fled, and found his way to Civita Vecchia, where he stayed with a nephew of his for a short time. But his nephew having been arrested, he again returned to Rome secretly, and was concealed in Castle St. Angelo by one of the Orsini who was friendly to him and his party. . . . Cola soon after fled to Naples, fearing lest he should be betrayed into the hands of the Cardinals. Rome now fell into a state of anarchy and confusion even worse than when he assumed the reins of power. Revolutions occurred. Brigandage was renewed. . . . In 1353 Rienzi returned with Cardinal Albornos, the legate of the Pope. He was received with enthusiasm, and again installed in power. But he was embarrassed in all his actions by the Cardinal, who sought only to make use of him, while he himself exercised all the power. The title of Senator of Rome was conferred on him, and the people forgave him. . . . But Rienzi had lost the secret of his power in losing his enthusiasm. . . . At last, in October 1353, a sedition broke out, and the mob rushed to the Capitol with cries of 'Death to the traitor Rienzi!'. . . He appeared on the balcony clothed in his armour as Knight, and, with the standard of the people in his hand, demanded to be heard. But the populace refused to listen to him. . . . At last he decided to fly. Tearing off his robes, he put on the miserable dress of the porter, rushed down the flaming stairs and through the burning chambers, . . . and at last reached the third floor. . . . At this very moment his arm was seized, and a voice said, 'Where are you going?' He saw that all was lost. But, at bay,

he did nothing mean. Again there was a flash of heroic courage, not unworthy of him. He threw off his disguise, and disdaining all subterfuges, said, 'I am the Tribune!' He was then led out through the door . . . to the base of the basalt lions, where he had made his first great call upon the people. Standing there, undaunted by its tumultuous cries, he stood for an hour with folded arms, and looked around upon the raging crowd. At last, profiting by a lull of silence, he lifted his voice to address them, when suddenly an artisan at his side, fearing perhaps the result of his eloquence, and perhaps prompted by revenge, plunged his pike in his breast, and he fell. The wild mob rushed upon his corpse."—W. W. Story, *Castle St. Angelo, ch.* 4.

ALSO IN: H. H. Milman, *Hist. of Latin Christianity, bk.* 12, *ch.* 10–11 (*v.* 5).—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, ch.* 70.

A. D. 1367-1369.—Temporary return of Urban V. from Avignon. See PAPACY: A. D. 1352–1378.

A. D. 1377-1379.—Return of the Papal court.—Election of Urban VI. and the Great Schism.—Battles in the city.—Siege and partial destruction of Castle St. Angelo. See PAPACY: A. D. 1377–1417.

A. D. 1405-1414.—Rising in the city and flight of Pope Innocent VII.—Sacking of the Vatican.—Surrender of the city to Ladislas, king of Naples.—Expulsion of the Neapolitans and their return. See ITALY (SOUTHERN): A. D. 1386–1414.

A. D. 1447-1455.—The pontificate of Nicolas V.—Building of the Vatican Palace and founding of the Vatican Library.—The Porcaro revolt. See ITALY: A. D. 1447–1480.

A. D. 1492-1503.—Under the Borgias. See PAPACY: A. D. 1471–1513.

A. D. 1494.—Charles VIII. and the French army in the city. See ITALY: A. D. 1494–1496.

A. D. 1526.—The city taken and the Vatican plundered by the Colonnas and the Spaniards. See ITALY: A. D. 1523–1527.

A. D. 1527.—The capture and the sacking of the city by the army of Constable Bourbon.—Captivity of the Pope. See ITALY: A. D. 1523–1527; 1527; and 1527–1529.

A. D. 1537-1563.—Inclinations towards the Reformation.—Catholic reaction. See PAPACY: A. D. 1537–1563.

A. D. 1600-1656.—The great families and the Roman population.—"A numerous, powerful, and wealthy aristocracy surrounded the papal throne; the families already established imposed restraints on those that were but newly rising; from the self-reliance and authoritative boldness of monarchy, the ecclesiastical sovereignty was passing to the deliberation, sobriety, and measured calmness of aristocratic government. . . . There still flourished those old and long-renowned Roman races, the Savelli, Conti, Orsini, Colonna, and Gaetani. . . . The Colonna and Orsini made it their boast, that for centuries no peace had been concluded between the princes of Christendom, in which they had not been included by name. But however powerful these houses may have been in earlier times, they certainly owed their importance in those now before us to their connection with the Curia and the popes. . . . Under Innocent X., there existed for a considerable time, as it were, two great factions, or associations of families. The Orsini, Cesarini, Borghesi, Aldobrandini, Ludovisi, and Giustiniani were with the Pamfili; while opposed to them, was the house of Colonna and the Barberini. . . . In the middle of the seventeenth century there were computed to be fifty noble families in Rome of three hundred years standing, thirty-five of two hundred, and sixteen of one hundred years. None were permitted to claim a more ancient descent, or were generally traced to an obscure, or even a low origin. . . . But by the side of the old families there rose up various new ones. All the cardinals and prelates of the Curia proceeded according to the pope's example, and each in proportion to his means employed the surplus of his ecclesiastical revenue for the aggrandizement of his kindred, the foundation of a new family. There were others which had attained to eminence by judicial appointments, and many were indebted for their elevation to being employed as bankers in the affairs of the Dataria. Fifteen families of Florence, eleven from Genoa, nine Portuguese, and four French, are enumerated as having risen to more or less consideration by these means, according to their good fortune or talents; some of them, whose reputation no longer depended on the affairs of the day, became monarchs of gold; as for example, the Guicciardini and Doni, who connected themselves, under Urban VIII., with the Giustiniani, Primi, and Pallavicini. But even, without affairs of this kind, families of consideration were constantly repairing to Rome, not only from Urbino, Rieti, and Bologna, but also from Parma and Florence. . . . Returns of the Roman population are still extant, and by a comparison of the different years, we find a most remarkable result exhibited, as regards the manner in which that population was formed. Not that its increase was upon the whole particularly rapid, this we are not authorized to assert. In the year 1600 the inhabitants were about 110,000; fifty-six years afterwards they were somewhat above 120,000, an advance by no means extraordinary; but another circumstance here presents itself which deserves attention. At an earlier period, the population of Rome had been constantly fluctuating. Under Paul IV. it had decreased from 80,000 to 50,000; in a score or two of years it had again advanced to more than 100,000. And this resulted from the fact that the court was then formed principally of unmarried men, who had no permanent abode there. But, at the time we are considering, the population became fixed into settled families. This began to be the case towards the end of the sixteenth century, but took place more particularly during the first half of the seventeenth. . . . After the return of the popes from Avignon, and on the close of the schism, the city, which had seemed on the point of sinking into a mere village, extended itself around the Curia. But it was not until the papal families had risen to power and riches—until neither internal discords nor external enemies were any longer to be feared, and the incomes drawn from the revenues of the church or state secured a life of enjoyment without the necessity for labour, that a numerous permanent population arose in the city."—L. Ranke, *Hist. of the Popes, bk.* 8, *sect.* 7 (*v.* 2).

A. D. 1797-1798.—French intrigues and occupation of the city.—Formation of the Roman Republic.—Expulsion of the Pope. See FRANCE: A. D. 1797–1798 (DECEMBER—MAY).

A. D. 1798 (November).—Brief expulsion of the French by the Neapolitans. See FRANCE: A. D. 1798–1799 (AUGUST—APRIL).

A. D. 1799.—Overthrow of the Roman Republic.—Expulsion of the French. See FRANCE: A. D. 1799 (AUGUST—DECEMBER).

A. D. 1800.—The Papal government re-established by Napoleon. See FRANCE: A. D. 1800–1801 (JUNE—FEBRUARY).

A. D. 1808-1809.—Napoleon's quarrel with the Pope.—Captivity of Pius VII.—French occupation.—Declared to be a free and imperial city. See PAPACY: A. D. 1808–1814.

A. D. 1810.—The title of King of Rome given to Napoleon's son. See PAPACY: A. D. 1808–1814.

A. D. 1813.—Papal Concordat with Napoleon. See PAPACY: A. D. 1808–1814.

A. D. 1814.—Occupation by Murat for the Allies.—Return of the Pope. See ITALY: A. D. 1814: and PAPACY: A. D. 1808–1814.

A. D. 1815.—Restoration of the works of art taken by Napoleon. See FRANCE: A. D. 1815 (JULY—NOVEMBER).

A. D. 1831-1832.—Revolt of the Papal States, suppressed by Austrian troops. See ITALY: A. D. 1830–1832.

A. D. 1846-1849.—Liberal reforms of Pope Pius IX.—His breach with the extremists.—Revolution, and flight of the Pope.—Intervention of France.—Garibaldi's defense of the city.—Its capture and occupation by the French.—Overthrow of the Roman Republic. See ITALY: A. D. 1848–1849.

A. D. 1859-1861.—First consequences of the Austro-Italian war.—Absorption of the Papal States in the new kingdom of Italy. See ITALY: A. D. 1859–1861.

A. D. 1867-1870.—Garibaldi's attempt.—His defeat at Mentana.—Italian troops in the city.—The king of Italy takes possession of his capital. See ITALY: A. D. 1867–1870.

A. D. 1869-1870.—The Œcumenical Council of the Vatican. See PAPACY: A. D. 1869–1870.

A. D. 1870-1871.—End of Papal Sovereignty.—Occupation of the city as the capital of the kingdom of Italy. See ITALY: A. D. 1867–1870; and PAPACY: A. D. 1870.

ROMERS-WAALE, Naval battle of (1574). See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1573–1574.

ROMMANY. See GYPSIES.

ROMULUS, Legendary founder of Rome. See ROME: B. C. 753–510.....**Romulus Augustulus, the last Roman Emperor of the old line, in the West, A. D. 475–476.**

RONCAGLIA, The Diets of. See ITALY: A. D. 961–1039.

RONCESVALLES, The ambuscade of. See SPAIN: A. D. 778.

ROOD, Holy (or Black Rood) of Scotland. See HOLY ROOD OF SCOTLAND.

ROOF OF THE WORLD.—The Pamir high plateau, which is a continuation of the Bolor range, is called by the natives "Bamiduniya," or the Roof of the World.—T. E. Gordon, *The Roof of the World, ch.* 9.

ROOSEBECK OR ROSEBECQUE, Battle of (1382). See FLANDERS: A. D. 1382.

ROOT AND BRANCH BILL, The. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1641 (MARCH—MAY).

RORKE'S DRIFT, Defense of (1879). See SOUTH AFRICA: A. D. 1877–1879.

ROSAS, OR ROSES: A. D. 1645-1652.—Siege and capture by the French.—Recovery by the Spaniards. See SPAIN: A. D. 1644–1646; and 1648–1652.

A. D. 1808.—Siege and capture by the French. See SPAIN: A. D. 1808–1809 (DECEMBER—MARCH).

ROSBACH, OR ROSSBACH, Battle of. See GERMANY: A. D. 1757 (JULY—DECEMBER).

ROSECRANS, General W. S.: Command in West Virginia. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1861 (JULY—NOVEMBER); and 1861 (AUGUST—DECEMBER: WEST VIRGINIA).....**Command of the Army of the Mississippi.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1862 (JUNE—OCTOBER: TENNESSEE—KENTUCKY).....**Battle of Stone River.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1862–1863 (DECEMBER—JANUARY: TENNESSEE).....**The Tullahoma campaign.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1863 (JUNE—JULY: TENNESSEE).....**Chickamauga.—Chattanooga campaign.—Displacement.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1863 (AUGUST—SEPTEMBER: TENNESSEE) ROSECRANS'S ADVANCE; and (OCTOBER—NOVEMBER: TENNESSEE)..... **Command in Missouri.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1864 (MARCH—OCTOBER: ARKANSAS—MISSOURI).

ROSES, Wars of the. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1455–1471.

ROSETTA STONE.—"The Rosetta Stone is a fragment of a stela discovered in the year 1799 by M. Boussard, a French artillery officer, while digging entrenchments round the town of that name. It contains a copy of a decree made by the priests of Egypt, assembled at Memphis, in honour of Ptolemy Epiphanes. This decree is engraved on the stone in three languages, or rather in three different writings. The first is the hieroglyphic, the grand old writing of the monuments; the second is the demotic character as used by the people; and the third is the Greek. But the text in Greek character is the translation of the two former. Up to this time, hieroglyphs had remained an impenetrable mystery even for science. But a corner of the veil was about to be lifted: in proceeding from the known to the unknown, the sense at all events was at length to be arrived at of that mysterious writing which had so long defied all the efforts of science. Many erudite scholars tried to solve the mystery, and Young, among others, very nearly brought his researches to a satisfactory issue. But it was Champollion's happy lot to succeed in entirely tearing away the veil. Such is the Rosetta Stone, which thus became the instrument of one of the greatest discoveries which do honour to the nineteenth century."—A. Mariette-Bey, *Monuments of Upper Egypt* (*Itinéraire*) *p.* 29.—See, also, HIEROGLYPHICS.

ROSICRUCIANS.—ILLUMINATI.—"About the year 1610, there appeared anonymously a little book, which excited great sensation throughout Germany. It was entitled, The Discovery of the Brotherhood of the Honourable Order of the Rosy Cross, and dedicated to all the scholars and magnates of Europe. It commenced with an imaginary dialogue between the Seven Sages of Greece, and other worthies of antiquity, on the best method of accomplishing a

general reform in those evil times. The suggestion of Seneca is adopted, as most feasible, namely a secret confederacy of wise philanthropists, who shall labour everywhere in unison for this desirable end. The book then announces the actual existence of such an association. One Christian Rosen Kreuz, whose travels in the East had enriched him with the highest treasures of occult lore, is said to have communicated his wisdom, under a vow of secresy, to eight disciples, for whom he erected a mysterious dwelling-place called The Temple of the Holy Ghost. It is stated further, that this long-hidden edifice had been at last discovered, and within it the body of Rosen Kreuz, untouched by corruption, though, since his death, 120 years had passed away. The surviving disciples of the institute call on the learned and devout, who desire to co-operate in their projects of reform, to advertise their names. They themselves indicate neither name nor place of rendezvous. They describe themselves as true Protestants. They expressly assert that they contemplate no political movement in hostility to the reigning powers. Their sole aim is the diminution of the fearful sum of human suffering, the spread of education, the advancement of learning, science, universal enlightenment, and love. Traditions and manuscripts in their possession have given them the power of gold-making, with other potent secrets; but by their wealth they set little store. They have arcana, in comparison with which the secret of the alchemist is a trifle. But all is subordinate, with them, to their one high purpose of benefiting their fellows both in body and soul. . . . I could give you conclusive reasons, if it would not tire you to hear them, for the belief that this far-famed book was written by a young Lutheran divine named Valentine Andreä. He was one of the very few who understood the age, and had the heart to try and mend it. . . . This Andreä writes the Discovery of the Rosicrucian Brotherhood, a jeu-d'esprit with a serious purpose, just as an experiment to see whether something cannot be done by combined effort to remedy the defect and abuses — social, educational, and religious, so lamented by all good men. He thought there were many Andreäs scattered throughout Europe — how powerful would be their united systematic action! . . . Many a laugh, you may be sure, he enjoyed in his parsonage with his few friends who were in the secret, when they found their fable everywhere swallowed greedily as unquestionable fact. On all sides they heard of search instituted to discover the Temple of the Holy Ghost. Printed letters appeared continually, addressed to the imaginary brotherhood, giving generally the initials of the candidate, where the invisibles might hear of him, stating his motives and qualifications for entrance into their number, and sometimes furnishing samples of his cabbalistic acquirements. Still, no answer. Not a trace of the Temple. Profound darkness and silence, after the brilliant flash which had awakened so many hopes. Soon the mirth grew serious. Andreä saw with concern that shrewd heads of the wrong sort began to scent his artifice, while quacks reaped a rogue's harvest from it. . . . A swarm of impostors pretended to belong to the Fraternity, and found a readier sale than ever for their nostrums. Andreä dared not reveal himself. All he could do was to write book after book to expose the folly of those whom his handiwork had so befooled, and still to labour on, by pen and speech, in earnest aid of that reform which his unhappy stratagem had less helped than hindered. . . . Confederacies of pretenders appear to have been organized in various places; but Descartes says he sought in vain for a Rosicrucian lodge in Germany. The name Rosicrucian became by degrees a generic term, embracing every species of occult pretension, — arcana, elixirs, the philosopher's stone, theurgic ritual, symbols, initiations. In general usage the term is associated more especially with that branch of the secret art which has to do with the creatures of the elements. . . . And from this deposit of current mystical tradition sprang, in great measure, the Freemasonry and Rosicrucianism of the 18th century, — that golden age of secret societies. Then flourished associations of every imaginable kind, suited to every taste. . . . Some lodges belonged to Protestant societies, others were the implements of the Jesuits. Some were aristocratic, like the Strict Observance; others democratic, seeking in vain to escape an Argus-eyed police. Some — like the Illuminati under Weishaupt Knigge, and Von Zwackh, numbering (among many knaves) not a few names of rank, probity, and learning — were the professed enemies of mysticism and superstition. Others existed only for the profitable juggle of incantations and fortune-telling. . . . The best perished at the hands of the Jesuits, the worst at the hands of the police."—R. A. Vaughan, *Hours with the Mystics, bk.* 8, *ch.* 9 (*v.* 2).

Also in: F. C. Schlosser, *Hist. of the 18th Century, v.* 4, *pp.* 483–504.—T. Frost, *The Secret Societies of the European Revolution, v.* 1, *ch.* 1.—A. P. Marras, *Secret Fraternities of the Middle Ages, ch.* 8.

ROSLIN, Battle of.— One of the minor battles fought in the Scottish "war of independence," with success to the Scots., A. D. 1302.

ROSSBACH, OR ROSBACH, Battle of. See Germany: A. D. 1757 (July—December).

ROSSBRUNN, Battle of. See Germany: A. D. 1866.

ROSTOCK: The founding of the city. See Hansa Towns.

ROSY CROSS, The Honourable Order of the. See Rosicrucians.

ROTENNU, RUTENNU, OR RETENNU, The.—"The Syrian populations, who, to the north of the Canaanites [17th century B. C.], occupied the provinces called in the Bible by the general name of Aram, as far as the river Euphrates, belonged to the confederation of the Rotennu, or Retennu, extending beyond the river and embracing all Mesopotamia (Naharaina). . . . The Rotennu had no well-defined territory, nor even a decided unity of race. They already possessed powerful cities, such as Nineveh and Babylon, but there were still many nomadic tribes within the ill-defined limits of the confederacy. Their name was taken from the city of Resen, apparently the most ancient, and originally the most important, city of Assyria. The germ of the Rotennu confederation was formed by the Semitic Assyro-Chaldæan people, who were not yet welded into a compact monarchy."—F. Lenormant, *Manual of the Ancient Hist. of the East, bk.* 3, *ch.* 3.

ROTHIÈRE, Battle of La. See France: A. D. 1814 (January—March).

ROTOMAGUS. — Modern Rouen. See BELGÆ.

RÖTTELN: Capture by Duke Bernhard (1638). See GERMANY: A. D. 1634–1639.

ROTTEN BOROUGHS. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1830; and 1830–1832.

ROTTWEIL: Siege and capture by the French (1643). See GERMANY: A. D. 1643–1644.

ROUEN: Origin of the city and name. See BELGÆ.

A. D. 841.—First destructive visit of the Northmen. See NORMANS: A. D. 841.

A. D. 845.—Second capture by the Northmen. See PARIS: A. D. 845.

A. D. 876-911. — Rollo's settlement. See NORMANS: A. D. 876–911.

A. D. 1418-1419. — Siege and capture by Henry V. of England. See FRANCE: A. D. 1417–1422.

A. D. 1431.—The burning of the Maid of Orleans. See FRANCE: A. D. 1429–1431.

A. D. 1449.—Recovery from the English. See FRANCE: A. D. 1431–1453.

A. D. 1562.—Occupied by the Huguenots and retaken by the Catholics. See FRANCE: A. D. 1560–1563.

A. D. 1591-1592. — Siege by Henry IV., raised by the Duke of Parma. See FRANCE: A. D. 1591–1593.

A. D. 1870.—Taken by the Germans. See FRANCE: A. D. 1870–1871.

ROUM, OR ICONIUM, OR NICÆA, The Sultans of. See TURKS (THE SELJUKS): A. D. 1073–1092.

ROUMANI, OR ROMÚNI, The. See DACIA: A. D. 102–106.

ROUMANIA. See BALKAN AND DANUBIAN STATES: 14–18TH CENTURIES.

ROUMELIA, Eastern. See TURKS: A. D. 1878, TREATIES OF SAN STEFANO AND MADRID; and BALKAN AND DANUBIAN STATES: A. D. 1878, to 1878–1886.

ROUND TABLE, Knights of the. See ARTHUR, KING.

ROUND TOWERS OF IRELAND.—"At various periods between the sixth and twelfth centuries (some of them still later, but the greater number, perhaps, in the ninth and tenth centuries), were erected those singular buildings, the round towers, which have been so enveloped in mystery by the arguments and conjectures of modern antiquaries. . . . The real uses of the Irish round towers, both as belfries and as ecclesiastical keeps or castles, have been satisfactorily established by Dr. Petrie, in his important and erudite work on the ecclesiastical architecture of Ireland. . . . These buildings were well contrived to supply the clergy with a place of safety for themselves, the sacred vessels, and other objects of value, during the incursions of the Danes, and other foes; and the upper stories, in which there were four windows, were perfectly well adapted for the ringing of the largest bells then used in Ireland."—M. Haverty, *Hist. of Ireland, p.* 115.

ALSO IN: S. Bryant, *Celtic Ireland, ch.* 7.

ROUNDHEADS. — The Parliamentary or popular party in the great English civil war were called Roundheads because they generally wore their hair cut short, while the Cavaliers of the king's party held to the fashion of flowing locks. According to the Parliamentary clerk Rushworth, the first person who applied the name was one David Hyde, who threatened a mob of citizens which surrounded the Houses of Parliament on the 27th of December, 1641, crying "No Bishops," that he would "cut the throats of these round-headed dogs."—D. Masson, *Life of John Milton, v.* 2, *bk.* 2, *ch.* 6.

ALSO IN: Mrs. Hutchinson, *Memoirs of Col. Hutchinson* (1642).—See, also, ENGLAND: A. D. 1641 (OCTOBER).

ROUSSEAU, and educational reform. See EDUCATION, MODERN: REFORMS, &C.: A. D. 1762.

ROUSSILLON: A. D. 1639.—Situation of the county.—Invasion by the French. See SPAIN: A. D. 1637–1640.

A. D. 1642.—French conquest. See SPAIN: A. D. 1640–1642.

A. D. 1659.—Ceded to France. See FRANCE: A. D. 1659–1661.

ROUTIERS, The. See WHITE HOODS OF FRANCE.

ROXOLANI, The.—A people, counted among the Sarmatians, who occupied anciently the region between the Don and the Dnieper, —afterwards encroaching on Dacian territory. They were among the barbarians who troubled the Roman frontier earliest, and were prominent in the wars which disturbed the reign of Marcus Aurelius. Later, they disappeared in the flood of Gothic and Hunnish invasion, partly by absorption, and partly by extermination.

ROYAL ARCANUM. See INSURANCE.

ROYAL ROAD OF ANCIENT PERSIA, The.—"Herodotus describes the great road of the Persian period from Ephesos by the Cilician Gates to Susa. It was called the 'Royal Road,' because the service of the Great King passed along it; and it was, therefore, the direct path of communication for all government business. . . . It is an accepted fact that in several other cases roads of the Persian Empire were used by the Assyrian kings long before the Persian time, and, in particular, that the eastern part of the 'Royal Road,' from Cilicia to Susa, is much older than the beginning of the Persian power. . . . Herodotus represents it as known to Aristagoras, and therefore, existing during the 6th century, B. C., and the Persians had had no time to organise a great road like this before 500; they only used the previously existing road. Moreover, the Lydian kings seem to have paid some attention to their roads, and perhaps even to have measured them, as we may gather from Herodotus's account of the roads in the Lycus valley, and of the boundary pillar erected by Crœsus at Kydrara."—W. M. Ramsay, *Hist. Geog. of Asia Minor, pt.* 1, *ch.* 2.

ROYAL TOUCH, The. See MEDICAL SCIENCE: 12–17TH CENTURIES.

RUBICON, Cæsar's passage of the. See ROME: B. C. 50–49.

RUCANAS, The. See PERU: THE ABORIGINAL INHABITANTS.

RUDOLPH, King of France, A. D. 923–936. ....Rudolph I., King of Germany — called Emperor (the first of the House of Hapsburg), 1273–1291. ....Rudolph II., Archduke of Austria and King of Hungary, 1576–1606; King of Bohemia and Germanic Emperor, 1576–1612.

RUGBY SCHOOL. See EDUCATION, MODERN: EUROPEAN COUNTRIES.—ENGLAND.

RUGII, The.—A coast tribe in ancient Germany who seem to have occupied the extreme north of Pomerania and who probably gave their name to the Isle of Rugen.—Church and Brodribb, *Geog. Notes to the Germany of Tacitus.*—In the fifth century, after the breaking up of the empire of Attila, the Hun, a people called the Rugii, and supposed to be the same, were occupying a region embraced in modern Austria. There were many Rugians among the barbarian auxiliaries in the Roman army, and some of the annalists place among the number Odoacer, who gave the extinguishing blow to the empire. —T. Hodgkin, *Italy and Her Invaders, bk.* 3, *ch.* 8.

RULE OF ST. BENEDICT. See BENEDICTINE ORDERS.

RUMP, The. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1648 (NOVEMBER—DECEMBER).

RUNJIT SINGH, OR RANJIT SINGH, The conquests of. See SIKHS.

RUNNYMEDE. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1215.

RUPERT, OR ROBERT (of the Palatine), King of Germany, A. D. 1400–1410.

RUPERT'S LAND. See CANADA: A. D. 1869–1873.

RUSCINO.—The ancient name of modern Roussillon.

RUSSELL, Lord John, Ministries of. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1846; 1851–1852; 1865–1868.

RUSSELL, Lord William, Execution of. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1681–1683.

RUSSIA.

A. D. 862.—Scandinavian Origin of the name and the National Organization.—"'In the year 859,' says Nestor [the oldest Russian chronicler, a monk of Kiev, who wrote early in the 12th century] 'came the Varangians from beyond the sea and demanded tribute from the Chud and from the Slavonians, the Meria, the Ves, and the Krivichi; but the Khazars took tribute of the Polians, the Severians and of the Viatichi.' Then he continues: 'In the year 862 they drove the Varangians over the sea, and paid them no tribute, and they began to govern themselves, and there was no justice among them, and clan rose against clan, and there was internal strife between them, and they began to make war upon each other. And they said to each other: Let us seek for a prince who can reign over us and judge what is right. And they went over the sea to the Varangians, to Rus, for so were these Varangians called: they were called Rus as others are called Svie (Swedes), others Nurmane (Northmen, Norwegians), others Angliane (English, or Angles of Sleswick?), others Gote (probably the inhabitants of the island of Gothland). The Chud, the Slavonians, the Krivichi, and the Ves said to Rus: Our land is large and rich, but there is no order in it; come ye and rule and reign over us. And three brothers were chosen with their whole clan, and they took with them all the Rus, and they came. And the eldest, Rurik, settled in Novgorod, and the second, Sineus, near Bielo-ozero, and the third, Truvor, in Izborsk. And the Russian land, Novgorod, was called after these Varangians; they are the Novgorodians of Varangian descent; previously the Novgorodians were Slavonians. But after the lapse of two years Sineus and his brother Truvor died and Rurik assumed the government and divided the towns among his men, to one Polotsk, to another Rostov, to another Bielo-ozero.' Such is Nestor's naive description of the foundation of the Russian state. If it be read without prejudice or sophistical comment, it cannot be doubted that the word Varangians is used here as a common term for the inhabitants of Scandinavia, and that Rus was meant to be the name of a particular Scandinavian tribe; this tribe, headed by Rurik and his brothers, is said to have crossed the sea and founded a state whose capital, for a time, was Novgorod, and this state was the nucleus of the present Russian empire. Next, Nestor tells us that in the same year two of Rurik's men, 'who were not of his family,' Askold and Dir, separated themselves from him with the intention to go to Constantinople. They went down the Dnieper; but when they arrived at Kiev, the capital of the Polians, who at that time were tributary to the Khazars, they preferred to stay there, and founded in that town an independent principality. Twenty years after, in 882, this principality was incorporated by Rurik's successor, Oleg: by a stratagem he made himself master of the town and killed Askold and Dir, and from this time Kiev, 'the mother of all Russian towns,' as it was called, remained the capital of the Russian state and the centre of the Russian name. . . . From the time historical critics first became acquainted with Nestor's account, that is to say from the beginning of the last century, until about fifteen or twenty years ago [written in 1877], scarcely any one ventured to doubt the accuracy of his statement. Plenty of evidence was even gradually produced from other sources to corroborate in the most striking manner the tradition of the Russian chronicles."—V. Thomsen, *Relations between Ancient Russia and Scandinavia, lect.* 1.

ALSO IN: E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, ch.* 55.—R. G. Latham, *The Germany of Tacitus; Epilegomena, sect.* 18.

A. D. 865.—First attack of the Russians on Constantinople. See CONSTANTINOPLE: A. D. 865.

A. D. 865-900.—Early relations with the Byzantine Empire.—"The first Russian naval expedition against Constantinople in 865 would probably have been followed by a series of plundering excursions, like those carried on by the Danes and Normans on the coasts of England and France, had not the Turkish tribe called the Patzinaks rendered themselves masters of the lower course of the Dnieper, and become instruments in the hands of the emperors to arrest the activity of the bold Varangians. The northern rulers of Kief were the same rude warriors that infested England and France, but the Russian people was then in a more advanced state of society than the mass of the population in Britain and Gaul. The majority of the Russians were freemen; the majority of the inhabitants of Britain and Gaul were serfs. The commerce of

the Russians was already so extensive as to influence the conduct of their government, and to modify the military ardour of their Varangian masters. . . . After the defeat in 865, the Russians induced their rulers to send envoys to Constantinople to renew commercial intercourse, and invite Christian missionaries to visit their country; and no inconsiderable portion of the people embraced Christianity, though the Christian religion continued long after better known to the Russian merchants than to the Varangian warriors. The commercial relations of the Russians with Cherson and Constantinople were now carried on directly, and numbers of Russian traders took up their residence in these cities. The first commercial treaty between the Russians of Kief and the Byzantine empire was concluded in the reign of Basil I. The intercourse increased from that time."—G. Finlay, *Hist. of the Byzantine Empire, from* 716 *to* 1057, *bk.* 2, *ch.* 2, *sect.* 1.

A. D. 907-1043.—Wars, commerce and church connection with the Byzantines. See CONSTANTINOPLE: A. D. 907-1043.

10th Century.—The introduction of Christianity. See CHRISTIANITY: 10TH CENTURY.

A. D. 980-1054.—Family divisions and their consequence.—"Under Wladimir I. (980-1015), and under Jaroslaf I. (1019-1054), the power of the grand-duchy of Kiew was respectable. But Jaroslaf having divided it between his sons conduced to enfeeble it. In the 12th century, the supremacy passed from the grand-duchy of Kiew to the grand-duchy of Wladimir, without extricating Russia from division and impotence. The law of primogeniture not existing in Russia, where it was not introduced into the Czarean family until the 14th century, the principalities were incessantly divided."—S. Menzies, *Hist. of Europe, ch.* 36.

A. D. 988.— Acquisition of Cherson. See CHERSON: A. D. 988.

A. D. 1054-1237.—The early Russian territory and its divisions.—"It must not be forgotten that the oldest Russia was formed mainly of lands which afterwards passed under the rule of Poland and Lithuania. . . . The Dnieper, from which Russia was afterwards cut off, was the great central river of the elder Russia; of the Don and the Volga she held only the upper course. The northern frontier barely passed the great lakes of Ladoga and Onega, and the Gulf of Finland itself. It seems not to have reached what was to be the Gulf of Riga, but some of the Russian princes held a certain supremacy over the Finnish and Lettish tribes of that region. In the course of the 11th century, the Russian state, like that of Poland, was divided among princes of the reigning family, acknowledging the superiority of the great prince of Kief. In the next century the chief power passed from Kief to the northern Vladimir on the Kiasma. Thus the former Finnish land of Susdal on the upper tributaries of the Volga became the cradle of the second Russian power. Novgorod the Great, meanwhile, under elective princes, claimed, like its neighbour Pskof, to rank among commonwealths. Its dominion was spread far over the Finnish tribes to the north and east; the White Sea, and, far more precious, the Finnish Gulf, had now a Russian seaboard. It was out of Vladimir and Novgorod that the Russia of the future was to grow. Meanwhile a crowd of principalities, Polotsk, Smolensk, the Severian Novgorod, Tchernigof, and others, arose on the Duna and Dnieper. Far to the east arose the commonwealth of Viatka, and on the frontiers of Poland and Hungary arose the principality of Halicz or Galicia, which afterwards grew for a while into a powerful kingdom. Meanwhile in the lands on the Euxine the old enemies, Patzinaks and Chazars, gave way to the Cumans, known in Russian history as Polovtzi and Parthi. They spread themselves from the Ural river to the borders of Servia and Danubian Bulgaria, cutting off Russia from the Caspian. In the next century Russians and Cumans—momentary allies—fell before the advance of the Mongols, commonly known in European history as Tartars. Known only as ravagers in the lands more to the west, over Russia they become overlords for 250 years. All that escaped absorption by the Lithuanian became tributary to the Mongol. Still the relation was only a tributary one; Russia was never incorporated in the Mongol dominion, as Servia and Bulgaria were incorporated in the Ottoman dominion. But Kief was overthrown; Vladimir became dependent; Novgorod remained the true representative of free Russia in the Baltic lands."—E. A. Freeman, *Hist. Geog. of Europe, ch.* 11, *sect.* 2.

A. D. 1235.—Formation of the grand-duchy of Lithuania, embracing a large area of Russian territory. See LITHUANIA: A. D. 1235.

A. D. 1237-1239.—Mongol conquest. See MONGOLS: A. D. 1229-1294.

A. D. 1237-1480.—Prosperity and greatness of Novgorod as a commercial republic.—Two centuries of Tartar domination.—Growing power of Lithuania and Poland.—Rise of the Duchy of Moscow, the nucleus of the future Russian Empire.—"Alone among the cities the ancient Novgorod has boasted its exemption from plunder [at the hands of the Tartars]. The great city, though fallen since the days of Rurik from being the capital of an Empire, had risen to the dignity of a Republic. It had found wealth in trade; and at successive epochs had introduced the riches of Constantinople to the North, the merchandise of the great Hanse Towns to the South. It had profited by the example, and had emulated the prosperity, of the rich cities of Germany. It had striven also to attain their freedom; and, though still continuing to acknowledge a vague allegiance to the Russian Princes, it had been able, by its wealth and its remoteness from control, to win or to assume privileges, until it had resembled Bremen or Lubeck in the sovereignty of its assemblies, and had surpassed those cities by the assumption of a style declaratory of its independence. It boasted further of a prince, St. Alexander Nevsky, to whom a glorious victory over the Swedes had already given a name, and whose virtues were hereafter to enrol him among the Saints; and it had a defence in the marshes and forests which surrounded it and which had already once deterred the invaders. But even the great city could not continue to defy the Tartar horde, and its submission is at once the last and most conclusive proof of the supremacy of their power. Thenceforth the nation felt the bitterness of servitude. The Tartars did not occupy the country they had conquered; they retired to establish their settlements upon the Volga, where they became known as the Golden Horde: but they ex-

acted the tribute and the homage of the Russian Princes. . . . Five centuries have been unable to obliterate the traces which this period has imprinted upon the national character. The Tartars oppressed and extorted tribute from the Russian princes; the princes in their turn became the oppressors and extortioners of their people. Deceit and lying, the refuge of the weak, became habitual. Increasing crime and increasing punishments combined to brutalise the people. The vice of drunkenness was universal. Trade indeed was not extinguished; and religion prospered so abundantly that of all the many monasteries of Russia there are but few that do not owe their origin to this time. . . . Meanwhile the provinces of the West were falling into the hands of other enemies. The Tartar wave had swept as far as Poland, but it had then recoiled, and had left the countries westward of the Dnieper to their fate. All links of the connection that had bound these regions to the Princes of Vladimir, were now broken. Vitepsk, Polotsk, Smolensk, and even provinces still nearer Moscow, were gradually absorbed by the growing power of Lithuania, which, starting from narrow limits between the Dwina and the Niemen, was destined to overshadow Russia [see LITHUANIA: A. D. 1235]. The provinces of the South for a time maintained a certain unity and independence under the name of the Duchy of Halicz or Kief; but these also, through claims of inheritance or feudal right, became eventually merged in the dominions of their neighbours. Poland obtained Black Russia, which has never since returned to its earlier masters. Lithuania acquired Volhynia and Red Russia, and thus extended her wide empire from the Baltic as far as the Red Sea. Then came the union of these powers by the acceptance in 1383 of the Grand Duke Jagellon as King of Poland; and all hopes for the Russian princes of recovering their possessions seemed lost. The ancient empire of Yaroslaf was thus ended; and its history is parted from that of mediæval Russia by the dark curtain of two centuries in which the Russian people were a race but not a nation. The obscure descendants of Rurik still occupied his throne, and ruled with some appearance of hereditary succession. They even chose this period of their weakness to solace their vanity by the adoption of the style of Sovereigns of All the Russias. But they were the mere vassals of the Golden Horde. . . . It was not until the reign of Dimitry IV., that any sign was shown of reviving independence. Time, by weakening the Tartars, had then brought freedom nearer to the Russians. The Horde, which had been united under Bati, when it had first precipitated itself upon Europe, had become divided by the ambition of rebellious Khans, who had aspired to establish their independent power; and the Russians had at length a prince who was able to profit by the weakness of his enemies. Dimitry, who reigned from 1362 to 1389, is celebrated as having checked the divisions which civil strife and appanages had inflicted upon his country, and as having also gloriously repulsed the Lithuanians from the walls of Moscow, now rising to be his capital. But his greatest deed, and that by which he lives in the remembrance of every Russian, is his victory upon the Don, which gave to him thenceforth the name of Donskoi. The Tartars, indignant at his prominence, had united with the Lithuanians. For the first time the Russians turned against their tyrants, and found upon the field of Khoulikof [1383] that their freedom was still possible. They did not achieve indeed for many years what they now began to hope. Their strength was crippled by renewed attacks of Tartars from the south and of Lithuanians from the west; and they could not dare to brave the revengeful enmity of the Horde. For a hundred years they still paid tribute, and the successors of Dimitry still renewed their homage at the camp upon the Volga. But progress gradually was made. The Grand Prince Vassili Dimitrievitch [1389–1425] was able to extend his rule over a territory that occupied the space of six or seven of the modern governments round Moscow; and though the country, under Vassili Vassilievitch [1425–1462], became enfeebled by a renewal of civil strife, the increasing weakness of the Tartar power continued to prepare the way for the final independence that was accomplished by the close of the 15th century. The reign of Ivan III. became the opening of a new epoch in Russian history. He restored his people, long sunk out of the gaze of Europe, to a place among its nations, and recalled them in some degree from the barbarism of the East to the intercourse and civilization of the West. The Russia of old time was now no more; but the Grand Prince, or Duke of Moscow, as he was called, was still the heir of Rurik and of Yaroslaf, and in the growth of his Duchy their Empire reappeared. . . . Without the fame of a warrior, but with the wisdom of a statesman, with a strong hand and by the help of a long reign, he built up out of the fragments that surrounded him an Empire that exceeded vastly that of his immediate predecessor. . . . The fall of the republic of Novgorod [1478] and the final extinction of the Golden Horde, are the events which are most prominent. Riches had been the bane of the great city. They had fostered insolence, but they had given a distaste for war. The citizens had often rebelled; they had accepted the protection of Lithuania, and had later meditated, and even for a time accomplished, a union with Poland. But they had had no strength to defend the liberty to which they had aspired. . . . When Ivan advanced, determined, as he said, to reign at Novgorod as he reigned at Moscow, they were unable to repel or to endure a siege, and they surrendered themselves into his hand. Once he had pardoned them; now their independence was taken from them. Their assembly was dissolved; their great bell, the emblem of their freedom, was carried to Moscow. The extinction of the Golden Horde was due to time and policy, rather than to any deeds which have brought glory to the Russian people [see MONGOLS: A. D. 1238–1391]. . . . Released in this manner from the most dangerous both of domestic and of foreign foes the power of Ivan rapidly advanced. The broad province of Perm, that had begun to boast a half accomplished independence, had been early forced to acknowledge her subjection. The Khan of Kazan was now made tributary; and the rule of Ivan was extended from the Oural to the Neva. Provinces, as important, though less extensive, were acquired in the south. The Russian princes and cities that had preserved their independence were all, with the one exception of Riazan, compelled to acknowledge the sovereignty of Moscow. . . .

At the same time the Lithuanians were thrust back. Their greatness had gone by; and the territories of Tula, Kalouga, and Orel, now ceasing to own allegiance to a declining power, were incorporated with the rising Empire. That Empire had already reached the Dnieper, and was already scheming to recover the ancient capital of its princes."—C. F. Johnstone, *Historical Abstracts, ch.* 6.

Also in: A. Rambaud, *Hist. of Russia, ch.* 8–14 (*v.* 1).

15th Century.—Effects of the Tartar domination.—Sources of autocracy.—"The invasion of the Mongols, in the beginning of the 13th century, snapped the thread of Russia's destinies. . . . Nature, after preparing the invasion, herself marked its bounds. The Tatars, now masters of the steppes in the southeast, which felt to them very much like home, grew ill at ease as soon as they began to lose themselves in the forests of the north. They did not settle there. These regions were too European to suit their half-nomadic habits, and they cared more for tribute-payers than for subjects. So the 'kniazes' received their principalities back from the hands of the Mongols—as fiefs. They had to submit to the presence near their person of a sort of Tatar 'residents,'—the 'baskâks,' whose duty it was to take the census and to collect the taxes. They were compelled to take the long, long journey to the 'Horde,' often encamped in the heart of Asia, in order to receive their investiture from the successors of Djinghiz, and ended by becoming the vassals of a vassal of the 'Great-Khan.' At this price Russia retained her religion, her dynasties, and—thanks to her clergy and her princes—her nationality. Never yet was nation put through such a school of patience and abject submission. . . . Under this humiliating and impoverishing domination the germs of culture laid in the old principalities withered up. . . . The Tatar domination developed in the Russians faults and faculties of which their intercourse with Byzance had already brought them the germs, and which, tempered by time, have since contributed to develop their diplomatic gifts. . . . The oppression by man, added to the oppression by the climate, deepened certain traits already sketched in by nature in the Great-Russian's soul. Nature inclined him to submission, to endurance, to resignation; history confirmed these inclinations. Hardened by nature, he was steeled by history. One of the chief effects of the Tatar domination and all that makes up Russian history, is the importance given to the national worship. . . . The domination of an enemy who was a stranger to Christianity fortified the sufferers' attachment to their worship. Religion and native land were merged into one faith, took the place of nationality and kept it alive. It was then that the conception sprang up which still links the quality of Russian to the profession of Greek orthodoxy, and makes of the latter the chief pledge of patriotism. . . . Upon Russia's political sovereignty the Tatar domination had two parallel effects: it hastened national unity and it strengthened autocracy. The country which, under the appanage system, was falling to pieces, was bound together by foreign oppression as by a chain of iron. Having constituted himself suzerain of the 'Grand-Kniazes,' whom he appointed and dethroned at will, the Khan conferred on them his authority. The Asiatic tyranny of which they were the delegates empowered them to govern tyrannically. Their despotism over the Russians was derived from their servitude under the Tatars. . . . Every germ of free government, whether aristocratic or democratic, was stifled. Nothing remained but one power, the 'Velíki-Kniaz,' the autocrat,—and such now, after more than 500 years, still is the basis of the state."—A. Leroy-Beaulieu, *The Empire of the Tsars and the Russians, pt.* 1, *bk.* 4, *ch.* 3.

A. D. 1533-1682.—From Ivan the Terrible to Peter the Great.—The Poles at Moscow.—Origin of the dynasty of the Romanoffs.—"Apart from the striking and appalling character of Ivan himself, whom Miçkiewicz, the Polish poet, calls, in his lectures on the Slavonians, 'the most finished tyrant known in history—frivolous and debauched like Nero, stupid and ferocious like Caligula, full of dissimulation like Tiberius or Louis XI.,' the reign of Ivan the Terrible is interesting as marking the beginning of the intercourse between Russia and Western Europe, and especially between Russia and England. The natural approach to Russia from the west was, of course, through Poland; but the Poles impeded systematically, and for political reasons, the introduction of arts and artificers into Russia, and Sigismund wrote a letter to Elizabeth, warning her against the Muscovite power as a danger to civilization, only not formidable for the moment because it was still semi-barbarous. Ivan the Terrible was the third of the independent Tsars; and already under Ivan, sometimes called the 'Great'—to whom indeed belongs the honour of having finally liberated Russia from the Tartar yoke—endeavours had been made to enter into relations with various European nations. Foreigners, too, were encouraged to visit Russia and settle there. The movement of foreigners towards Russia increased with each succeeding reign; and beginning with the first Tsar of Muscovy it became much more marked under the third, that Ivan the Terrible, under whose reign the mariners in the service of the English company of 'merchant adventurers' entered the White Sea, and, in their own language, 'discovered' Russia. Russia was, indeed, until that time, so far as Western Europe was concerned, an unknown land, cut off from Western civilization for political and warlike reasons by the Poles, and for religious reasons by the Catholic Church. On the 18th of March, 1584, Ivan was sitting half dressed, after his bath, 'solacing himself and making merie with pleasant songs, as he used to doe.' He called for his chess-board, had placed the men, and was just setting up the king, when he fell back in a swoon and died. . . . The death of Ivan was followed by strong dislike against the English at Moscow; and the English diplomatist and match-maker, Sir Jerome Bowes, after being ironically informed that 'the English king was dead,' found himself seized and thrown into prison. He was liberated through the representations of another envoy, who pointed out that it would be imprudent to excite Elizabeth's wrath; and though for a time intercourse between Russia and Western Europe was threatened, through the national hatred of foreigners as manifested by the councillors of the Tsar, yet when the weak-minded Feodor fell beneath the influence of his brother-in-law Boris Godounoff, the previous policy, soon

to become traditional, of cultivating relations with Western Europe, was resumed. . . . Nineteen years have yet to pass before the election of the first of the Romanoffs to the throne; for strange as it may seem, the first member of the dynasty of the Romanoffs was chosen and appointed to the imperial rule by an assembly representing the various estates. Meanwhile the order of succession had been broken. Several pretenders to the throne had appeared, one of whom, Demetrius, distinctively known as the 'Imposter,' attained for a time supreme power. Demetrius, married to a Polish lady, Marina Mniszek, was aided by her powerful family to maintain his position in Moscow; for the Mniszeks assembled and sent to the Russian capital a body of 4,000 men. Then Ladislas [son of the king] of Poland interfered, and after a time [1610] Moscow fell beneath the power of the Poles [see POLAND: A. D. 1590–1648]. Soon, however, the national feeling of Russia was aroused. A butcher, or cattle dealer of Nijni Novgorod, named Minin, whose patriotism has made him one of the most popular figures in Russian history, got together the nucleus of a national army, and called upon the patriotic nobleman, Prince Pojarski, to place himself at its head. Pojarski and Minin marched together to Moscow, and their success in clearing the capital of the foreign invaders [1612] is commemorated by a group of statuary which stands in the principal square of Moscow. . . . Among the tombs of the metropolitans buried in . . . [the cathedral of the Assumption at Moscow] are those of Philaret and Hermogenes, who were thrown into prison by the Poles for refusing to consent to the accession of Ladislas, the Polish prince, to the Russian throne. Hermogenes died soon after his arrest. Philaret, at the expulsion of the Poles, was carried away captive by them in their retreat from Moscow (1612), and was kept nine years a prisoner in Poland. On his return to Russia, he found his son, Michael Feodorovitch, elected to the throne. The belief, then, of the Russian people in Michael's patriotism, seems to have been founded on a knowledge of the patriotism of his father. The surname of the metropolitan who had defied the Polish power and had suffered nine years' imprisonment in Poland was Romanoff; Philaret was the name he had adopted on becoming a monk. His baptismal name was Feodor, and hence the patronymic Feodorovitch attached to the name of Michael, the first of the Romanoffs. There is little to say about the reign of Michael Feodorovitch, the circumstances having once been set forth under which he was elected to the vacant throne; and his son and successor, Alexis Michailovitch, is chiefly remembered as father of Peter the Great."—H. S. Edwards, *The Romanoffs, ch.* 1–2.

ALSO IN: W. K. Kelly, *Hist. of Russia, ch.* 13–19 (*v.* 1).—P. Mérimée, *Demetrius the Impostor.*

A. D. 1547.—Assumption of the title, Czar, or Tzar, by the Grand Prince of Moscow.—"In January 1547, Ivan [IV., known as Ivan the Terrible] ordered the Metropolitan Macarius to proceed with his coronation. He assumed at the ceremony not only the title of Grand Prince, but that of Tzar. The first title no longer answered to the new power of the sovereign of Moscow, who counted among his domestics, princes and even Grand Princes. The name of Tzar is that which the books in the Slavonic language, ordinarily read by Ivan, give to the kings of Judæa, Assyria, Egypt, Babylon, and to the emperors of Rome and Constantinople. Now, was not Ivan in some sort the heir of the Tzar Nebuchadnezzar, the Tzar Pharaoh, the Tzar Ahasuerus, and the Tzar David, since Russia was the sixth empire spoken of in the Apocalypse? Through his grandmother Sophia Palæologus, he was connected with the family of the Tzars of Byzantium; through his ancestor Vladimir Monomachus, he belonged to the Porphyrogeniti; and through Constantine the Great, to Cæsar. . . . We may imagine what prestige was added to the dignity of the Russian sovereign by this dazzling title, borrowed from Biblical antiquity, from Roman majesty, from the orthodox sovereigns of Byzantium."—A. Rambaud, *Hist. of Russia, v.* 1, *ch.* 15.—"This title [Czar] . . . is not a corruption of the word 'Cæsar,' as many have supposed [see CÆSAR, THE TITLE], but is an old Oriental word which the Russians acquired through the Slavonic translation of the Bible, and which they bestowed at first on the Greek emperors, and afterwards on the Tartar Khans. In Persia it signifies throne, supreme authority; and we find it in the termination of the names of the kings of Assyria and Babylon, such as Phalassar, Nabonasser, &c.—Karamsin."—W. K. Kelly, *Hist. of Russia, v.* 1, *p.* 125, *foot-note.*—"Von Hammer, in his last note to his 31st book, says, 'The title Czar or Tzar is an ancient title of Asiatic sovereigns. We find an instance of it in the title 'The Schar,' of the sovereign of Gurdistan; and in that of Tzarina . . . of the Scythians.'"—Sir E. S. Creasy, *Hist. of the Ottoman Turks, p.* 213, *foot-note.*

A. D. 1569-1571.—First collision with the Turks.—Their repulse from Astrakhan.—Moscow stormed and sacked by the Crim Tartars.—Peace with the Porte.—At the time (1566) of the accession of Selim II. to the Ottoman throne, the Russians "had been involved in fierce and frequent wars with the Sultan's vassals, the Crim Tartars; but the Porte had taken no part in these contests. But the bold genius of the Vizier Sokolli now attempted the realisation of a project, which, if successful, would have barred the southern progress of Russia, by firmly planting the Ottoman power on the banks of the Don and the Volga, and along the shores of the Caspian Sea. . . . Sokolli proposed to unite the rivers Don and Volga by a canal, and then send a Turkish armament up the sea of Azoph and the Don, thence across by the intended channel to the Volga, and then down the latter river into the Caspian; from the southern shores of which sea the Ottomans might strike at Tabriz and the heart of the Persian power. . . . Azoph already belonged to the Turks, but in order to realise the great project entertained it was necessary to occupy Astrakhan also. Accordingly, 3,000 Janissaries and 20,000 horse were sent [1569] to besiege Astrakhan, and a co-operative force of 30,000 Tartars was ordered to join them, and to aid in making the canal. 5,000 Janissaries and 3,000 pioneers were at the same time sent to Azoph to commence and secure the great work at its western extremity. But the generals of Ivan the Terrible did their duty to their stern master ably in this emergency. The Russian garrison of Astrakhan sallied on its besiegers, and repulsed them with considerable loss. And a Russian army, 15,000 strong, under Prince

Serebinoff, came suddenly on the workmen and Janissaries near Azoph, and put them to headlong flight. It was upon this occasion that the first trophies won from the Turks came into Russian hands. An army of Tartars, which marched to succour the Turks, was also entirely defeated by Ivan's forces; and the Ottomans, dispirited by their losses and reverses, withdrew altogether from the enterprise. . . . Russia was yet far too weak to enter on a war of retaliation with the Turks. She had subdued the Tartar Khanates of Kasan and Astrakhan; but their kinsmen of the Crimea were still formidable enemies to the Russians, even without Turkish aid. It was only two years after the Ottoman expedition to the Don and Volga that the Khan of the Crimea made a victorious inroad into Russia, took Moscow by storm, and sacked the city (1571). The Czar Ivan had, in 1570, sent an ambassador, named Nossolitof, to Constantinople, to complain of the Turkish attack on Astrakhan, and to propose that there should be peace, friendship, and alliance between the two empires. . . . The Russian ambassador was favourably received at the Sublime Porte, and no further hostilities between the Turks and Russians took place for nearly a century."—Sir E. S. Creasy, *Hist. of the Ottoman Turks, ch.* 11.

A. D. 1577-1580.—Conquests by the Poles. See POLAND: A. D. 1574–1590.

A. D. 1578-1579.—Yermac's conquest of Siberia. See SIBERIA.

A. D. 1613-1617.—War with Sweden.—Cession of territory, including the site of St. Petersburg. See SCANDINAVIAN STATES (SWEDEN): A. D. 1611–1629.

A. D. 1652.—Allegiance of the Cossacks of the Ukraine transferred from the King of Poland to the Czar. See POLAND: A. D. 1648–1654.

A. D. 1655-1659.—The great schism, known as the Rascol.—"In the reign of Alexis took place the great revision of the Bible, carried out by the energy of Nicon, the Patriarch, who, finding that the church-books were full of ridiculous blunders caused by ignorant copyists, procured a quantity of the best Greek manuscripts from Mount Athos, and other places. In 1655, and the following year, he summoned two councils of the church, at which the newly translated service-books were promulgated and the old ones called in. In consequence of this change, a great schism took place in the Russian Church, a number of people attaching a superstitious veneration to the old books, errors and all. Thus was formed the large sect of the Staro-obriadtsi or Raskolniks, still existing in Russia, who have suffered great persecutions at many periods of her history."—W. R. Morfill, *The Story of Russia, ch.* 6.—"The most important innovation, which afterwards became the symbol and the war-cry of the religious rebellion, referred to the position of the fingers in making the sign of the cross. The Russians of Nicon's time when they crossed themselves held two fingers together, while the Oriental churches and the Greeks enjoined their adherents to cross themselves with three fingers united into one point. The two-fingered cross of the Muscovites was used in the Orient only for giving the priestly benediction. . . . Patriarch Nicon was anxious to return to ancient traditions. Reserving the two-fingered cross for priestly benedictions only, he re-established the three-fingered Greek cross, or, as his opponents called it, 'the pinch-of-snuff cross,' for the private act of devotion. Then, too, in certain cases, for instance in stamping the round wafers, he introduced the use of the equilateral, four-sided cross. . . . The Russians celebrated the mass on seven wafers, while the Greeks and Orientals used only five. In the processions of the Church the Russians were in the habit of first turning their steps westward—going with the sun; the Greeks marched eastward—against the sun. In all these points Patriarch Nicon conformed to the traditions of the Greek mother-church. In conformity with this rule, moreover, he directed that the hallelujahs should be 'trebled,' or sung thrice, as with the Greeks, the Russians having up till then only 'doubled' it—singing, instead of the third hallelujah, its Russian equivalent, 'God be praised.' Finally, or we should rather say above all, Nicon introduced a fresh spelling of the name of Jesus. The fact is that, probably in consequence of the Russian habit of abbreviating some of the commonest scriptural names, the second letter in the name Jesus had been dropped altogether; it was simply spelt Jsus, without any sign of abbreviation. Patriarch Nicon corrected this orthographical error, replacing the missing letter. Was this all? Yes, this was all. As far as doctrinal matters were concerned, nothing more serious was at stake in the great religious schism of the 17th century, known by the name of the Rascol. And yet it was for these trifles—a letter less in a name, a finger more in a cross, the doubling instead of the trebling of a word—that thousands of people, both men and women, encountered death on the scaffold or at the stake. It was for these things that other scores of thousands underwent the horrible tortures of the knout, the strappado, the rack, or had their bodies mutilated, their tongues cut, their hands chopped off."—Stepniak, *The Russian Peasantry* (*Am. ed.*), *pp.* 237–239.

A. D. 1686-1696.—War of the Holy League against the Turks.—Capture of Azov.—First foothold on the Black Sea acquired. See TURKS: A. D. 1684–1696.

A. D. 1689.—Accession of Peter the Great.

A. D. 1697-1704.—Peter the Great: his travels in pursuit of knowledge; his apprenticeship to the useful arts; his civilizing work in Muscovy.—"Many princes before [Peter the Great] had renounced crowns, wearied out with the intolerable load of public affairs; but no man had ever divested himself of the royal character, in order to learn the art of governing better: this was a stretch of heroism which was reserved for Peter the Great alone. He left Russia in [1697], having reigned as yet but [a few] years, and went to Holland disguised under a common name, as if he had been a menial servant of that same Lefort, whom he sent in quality of ambassador-extraordinary to the States-General. As soon as he arrived at Amsterdam, he enrolled his name among the shipwrights of the admiralty of the Indies, and wrought in the yard like the other mechanics. At his leisure hours he learned such parts of the mathematics as are useful to a prince,—fortification, navigation, and the art of drawing plans. He went into the workmen's shops, and examined all their manufactures: nothing could escape his observation. From thence he passed over into England, where hav-

ing perfected himself in the art of ship-building, he returned to Holland, carefully observing every thing that might turn to the advantage of his country. At last, after two years of travel and labor, to which no man but himself would have willingly submitted, he again made his appearance in Russia, with all the arts of Europe in his train. Artists of every kind followed him in abundance. Then were seen, for the first time, large Russian ships in the Baltic, and on the Black Sea and the ocean. Stately buildings, of a regular architecture, were raised among the Russian huts. He founded colleges, academies, printing-houses, and libraries. The cities were brought under a regular police. The dress and customs of the people were gradually changed, though not without some difficulty; and the Muscovites learned by degrees the true nature of a social state. Even their superstitious rites were abolished; the dignity of the patriarch was suppressed ; and the czar declared himself the head of the Church. This last enterprise, which would have cost a prince less absolute than Peter both his throne and his life, succeeded almost without opposition, and insured to him the success of all his other innovations. After having humbled an ignorant and a barbarous clergy, he ventured to make a trial of instructing them, though, by that means, he ran the risk of rendering them formidable. . . . The czar not only subjected the Church to the State, after the example of the Turkish emperors, but, what was a more masterly stroke of policy, he dissolved a militia of much the same nature with that of the janizaries: and what the sultans had attempted in vain, he accomplished in a short time: he disbanded the Russian janizaries, who were called Strelitz, and who kept the czars in subjection. These troops, more formidable to their masters than to their neighbors, consisted of about 30,000 foot, one half of which remained at Moscow, while the other was stationed upon the frontiers. The pay of a Strelitz was no more than four roubles a year; but this deficiency was amply compensated by privileges and extortions. Peter at first formed a company of foreigners, among whom he enrolled his own name, and did not think it below him to begin the service in the character of a drummer, and to perform the duties of that mean office; so much did the nation stand in need of examples! By degrees he became an officer. He gradually raised new regiments; and, at last, finding himself master of a well-disciplined army, he broke the Strelitz, who durst not disobey. The cavalry were nearly the same with that of Poland, or France, when this last kingdom was no more than an assemblage of fiefs. The Russian gentlemen were mounted at their own expense, and fought without discipline, and sometimes without any other arms than a sabre or a bow, incapable of obeying, and consequently of conquering. Peter the Great taught them to obey, both by the example he set them and by the punishments he inflicted; for he served in the quality of a soldier and subaltern officer, and as czar he severely punished the Boyards, that is, the gentlemen, who pretended that it was the privilege of their order not to serve but by their own consent. He established a regular body to serve the artillery, and took 500 bells from the churches to found cannon. . . . He was himself a good engineer; but his chief excellence lay in his knowledge of naval affairs: he was an able sea-captain, a skilful pilot, a good sailor, an expert shipwright, and his knowledge of these arts was the more meritorious, as he was born with a great dread of the water. In his youth he could not pass over a bridge without trembling. . . . He caused a beautiful harbor to be built at the mouth of the Don, near Azof, in which he proposed to keep a number of galleys; and some time after, thinking that these vessels, so long, light, and flat, would probably succeed in the Baltic, he had upwards of 300 of them built at his favorite city of Petersburg. He showed his subjects the method of building ships with fir only, and taught them the art of navigation. He had even learned surgery, and, in a case of necessity, has been known to tap a dropsical person. He was well versed in mechanics, and instructed the artists. . . . He was always travelling up and down his dominions, as much as his wars would allow him; but he travelled like a legislator and natural philosopher, examining nature everywhere, endeavoring to correct or perfect her; sounding with his own hands the depths of seas and rivers, repairing sluices, visiting docks, causing mines to be searched for, assaying metals, ordering accurate plans to be drawn, in the execution of which he himself assisted. He built, upon a wild and uncultivated spot, the imperial city of Petersburg. . . . He built the harbor of Cronstadt, on the Neva, and Sainte-Croix, on the frontiers of Persia; erected forts in the Ukraine and Siberia; established offices of admiralty at Archangel, Petersburg, Astrakhan, and Azof; founded arsenals, and built and endowed hospitals. All his own houses were mean, and executed in a bad taste; but he spared no expenses in rendering the public buildings grand and magnificent. The sciences, which in other countries have been the slow product of so many ages, were, by his care and industry, imported into Russia in full perfection. He established an academy on the plan of the famous societies of Paris and London. . . . Thus it was that a single man changed the face of the greatest empire in the universe. It is however a shocking reflection, that this reformer of mankind should have been deficient in that first of all virtues, the virtue of humanity. Brutality in his pleasures, ferocity in his manners, and cruelty in his punishments, sullied the lustre of so many virtues. He civilized his subjects, and yet remained himself a barbarian. He would sometimes with his own hands execute sentences of death upon the unhappy criminals; and, in the midst of a revel, would show his dexterity in cutting off heads."—Voltaire, *Hist. of Charles XII., King of Sweden, bk.* 1.

Also in: J. L. Motley, *Peter the Great.*—E. Schuyler, *Peter the Great, v.* 1.—A. Leroy-Beaulieu, *The Empire of the Tsars, pt.* 1, *bk.* 4, *ch.* 4.

A. D. 1699.—The Peace of Carlowitz with the Sultan.—Possession of Azov confirmed. See Hungary: A. D. 1683–1699.

A. D. 1700.—Aggressive league with Poland and Denmark against Charles XII. of Sweden.—Defeat at Narva. See Scandinavian States (Sweden): A. D. 1697–1700.

A. D. 1701-1706.—War with Charles XII. of Sweden in Poland and Livonia. See Scandinavian States (Sweden): A. D. 1701–1707.

A. D. 1703-1718.—The founding of St. Petersburg.—"Immediately after the capture of

Nyenskanz [1703], a council of war was convened to consider the question of defending and utilising the mouth of the Neva, and whether it would be better to strengthen the little fort which had just been taken, or to seek a fit site for a commercial town nearer the sea. The latter course was decided upon. Near its mouth the Neva takes a sharp turn and divides into three or four branches, which by subsequent redivision form a number of islands, large and small. These marshy islands, overgrown with forests and thickets, and liable to be covered with water during the westerly winds, were inhabited by a few Finnish fishermen, who were accustomed to abandon their mud huts at the approach of high water, and seek a refuge on the higher ground beyond. It was on the first of these islands, called by the Finns Yanni-Saari, or Hare Island, where the river was still broad and deep, that Peter laid the foundation of a fortress and a city, named St. Petersburg, after his patron saint. . . . For this work many carpenters and masons were sent from the district of Novgorod, who were aided by the soldiers. Wheelbarrows were unknown (they are still little used in Russia), and in default of better implements the men scraped up the earth with their hands, and carried it to the ramparts on pieces of matting or in their shirts. Peter wrote to Ramodanofsky, asking him to send the next summer at least 2,000 thieves and criminals destined for Siberia, to do the heavy work under the direction of the Novgorod carpenters. At the same time with the construction of the bastions, a church was built in the fortress and dedicated to St. Peter and St. Paul. . . . Just outside of the fortress Peter built for himself a small hut, which he called his palace. It was about fifty-five feet long by twenty wide, built of logs roofed with shingles, and contained only three rooms, lighted by little windows set in leaden frames. In respect for this, his earliest residence in St. Petersburg, Peter subsequently had another building erected outside of it to preserve it from the weather, and in this state it still remains, an object of pilgrimage to the curious and devout. . . . In spite of disease and mortality among the men, in spite of the floods, which even in the first year covered nearly the whole place and drowned some who were too ill to move, the work went on. But in its infancy St. Petersburg was constantly in danger from the Swedes, both by sea and land. . . . St. Petersburg was the apple of Peter's eye. It was his 'paradise,' as he often calls it in his letters. It was always an obstacle, and sometimes the sole obstacle, to the conclusion of peace. Peter was willing to give up all he had conquered in Livonia and Esthonia, and even Narva, but he would not yield the mouth of the Neva. Nevertheless, until the war with Sweden had been practically decided by the battle of Poltava, and the position of St. Petersburg had been thus secured, although it had a certain importance as a commercial port, and as the fortress which commanded the mouth of the Neva, it remained but a village. The walls of the fortress were finally laid with stone, but the houses were built of logs at the best, and for many years, in spite of the marshy soil, the streets remained unpaved. If fate had compelled the surrender of the city, there would not have been much to regret. Gradually the idea came to Peter to make it his capital. In 1714 the Senate was transported thither from Moscow, but wars and foreign enterprises occupied the Tsar's attention, and it was not until 1718 that the colleges or ministries were fully installed there, and St. Petersburg became in fact the capital of the Empire."—E. Schuyler, *Peter the Great, ch.* 46 (*v.* 2).

A. D. 1707-1718.—Invasion by Charles XII. of Sweden.—His ruinous defeat at Pultowa.—His intrigues with the Turks.—Unlucky expedition of the Czar into Moldavia.—Russian conquests in the north. See SCANDINAVIAN STATES (SWEDEN): A. D. 1707–1718.

A. D. 1721.—The Peace of Nystad with Sweden.—Livonia and other conquests of Peter the Great secured.—Finland given up. See SCANDINAVIAN STATES (SWEDEN): A. D. 1719–1721.

A. D. 1725-1739.—The reigns of Catherine I., Peter II., and Anne Ivanovna.—Fruitless war with Turkey.—Depredations in the Crimea.—"The death of Peter found the Russian Court divided into two powerful factions. The reactionary party, filled with Russians of the old school, who had looked upon the reforms of Peter with no favourable eye, such as the Golitsins and the Dolgorukis, were anxious to raise to the throne Peter, the son of Alexis [Peter the Great's son, whom he had caused to be put to death], a mere boy; whereas the party of progress, led by Menshikov, wished that Catherine, the Tsar's widow, should succeed. . . . The party of reform finally triumphed. Catherine was elected the successor of her husband, and the chief authority fell into the hands of Alexander Menshikov. . . . The brief reign of Catherine is distinguished only by two events which added any glory to Russia. The Academy of Sciences was founded in 1726, and Behring, a Dane, was sent on an exploring expedition to Kamchatka. He has left his name indelibly written on the geography of the world. . . . The Empress died on the 17th of May, 1727, a little more than two years after her accession to the throne, aged about 39 years. . . . A ukase of Peter permitted Catherine to choose her successor. She accordingly nominated Peter, the son of the unfortunate Alexis, and, in default of Peter and his issue, Elizabeth and Anne, her daughters. Anne died in 1728, the year after her mother; she had married Karl Friedrich, the Duke of Holstein, . . . and was the mother of the unfortunate Peter III. Menshikov was appointed the guardian of the young Tsar till he had reached the age of 17." In four months Menshikov was in disgrace and the young Tsar had signed a ukase which condemned him to Siberian banishment. He died in 1729, and was followed to the grave a year later by the boy autocrat whose fiat had been his ruin. On the death of Peter II., the will of Catherine, in favor of her daughters, was set aside, and the Council of the Empire conferred the crown on Anne [Anne Ivanovna], the widowed Duchess of Courland, who was a daughter of Ivan, elder brother of Peter the Great. An attempt was made to impose on her a constitution, somewhat resembling the Pacta Conventa of the Poles, but she evaded it. "The Empress threw herself entirely into the hands of German favourites, especially a Courlander of low extraction, named Biren, said to have been the son of a groom. . . . The Empress was a woman of vulgar mind, and the Court was given up to unrefined orgies. . . .

Lith. of J. McFarlane Co. Phila.

EASTERN EUROPE
IN 1715.
SHOWING SOME PRIOR AND SUBSEQUENT CHANGES.
HABSBURG POSSESSIONS
HOHENZOLLERN POSSESSIONS
VENETIAN POSSESSIONS
DANISH AND NORWEGIAN POSSESSIONS
SWEDISH POSSESSIONS
TURKISH EMPIRE
RUSSIA
POLAND
THE EASTERN BOUNDARY OF THE EMPIRE IS SHOWN BY THE HEAVY RED LINE.
LAPLAND
FINLAND
GOV'T. OF ARCHANGEL
GOV'T. OF SIBERIA
GOV'T. OF NOVGOROD
GOV'T. OF MOSCOW
GOV'T. OF KASAN
GOV'T. OF KIEV
GOV'T. OF WORONETZ
GOV'T. OF KOSSACKS
RUSSIA
LITTLE NOGHIS HORDE
ASTRACHAN
DON KOSSACKS
ZAPOROGIAN KOSSACKS
KHANATE OF CRIMEA
CIRCASSIANS
DAGHISTAN
GEORGIA
ARMENIA
TURKISH EMPIRE
PERSIA
GREAT POLAND
LITHUANIA
POLAND
LITTLE POLAND
VOLHYNIA
PODOLIA
UKRAINE
MOLDAVIA
WALLACHIA
BESSARABIA
BULGARIA
SERVIA
HUNGARY
CRIMEA
CRETE
RHODES
CYPRUS
MOREA
Archangel
Dwina
Stockholm
Upsdal
Calmar
Gothland
Oland
Bornholm
Copenhagen
Petersburg (1703)
Ingermanland
Dago
Oesel
Esthland
To Russia
Livland
Novgorod
Pskow
Vologda
Viatka
Volga
Susdal
Vladimir
Nijni Novgorod
Kasan
Moscow
Smolensk
To Russia
Treaty of Andrussow 1667
Kalugan
Riazan
Samara
Ural
Orel
Woronetz
Tschernigoff
Kiev (Kyew)
Poltowa
Don
Dnieper
Volga
Asov
Astrachan
Kaffa
Mikertch
Perekop
Chersonese
Circassians
Lesghistan
Daghistan
Schirwan
Baku
Tiflis
Kars
Erserum
Trebizond
Sinope
Constantinople
Adrianople
Philippopolis
Varna
Nicopolis
Danube
Belgrade
Widin
Wallachia
Bessarabia
Hermannstadt
Krajnstadt
Crossward
Budgiest
(To Austria 1699)
(To Austria 1718)
(To Austria 1718-1739)
To Austria 1718-1739
Theiss
Dniester
Bender
Chocsim
Kamenitz
(To Turkey 1699)
Lemberg
Lwoff
Cracow
Lublin
Warsaw
Brock
Thorn
Dantzig
Prussia
Memel
Kowno
Vilna
Grodno
Vitebsk
Duna
Niemen
Konigsberg
Pillau
Pregel
Silesia
Posen
Gotha
Erfurt
Leipsic
Dresden
Prague
Vienna
Olmutz
Breslau
Frankfort
Hamburg
Lubeck
Bremen
Amsterdam
Utrecht
Rotterdam
Antwerp
Ostend
Brussels
Ghent
Bruges
Calais
Dunkirk
Boulogne
Dieppe
Rouen
Paris
Orleans
Nantes
Bordeaux
Rochelle
Toulouse
Marseilles
Nice
Genoa
Turin
Milan
Mantua
Venice
Trieste
Fiume
Ragusa
Cattaro
Durazzo
Valona
Corfu
Patras
Lepanto
Athens
Modon
Navarino
Coron
Candia
Smyrna
Konia
Brussa
Angora
Halys
Salonica
Prevesa
Parga
Monitza
Aleppo
Antioch
Euphrates
Tripolis
Tigris
Tabriz
Persepolis
Ispahan
Shiraz
Bassora
Gulf of Persia
Mecca
Medina
Red Sea
Arabia
Egypt
Cairo
Alexandria
Nile
Abyssinia
Nubia
Sahara
Barbary
Tripoli
Tunis
Algiers
Oran
Fez
Morocco
Gibraltar
Cadiz
Seville
Granada
Malaga
Carthagena
Valencia
Barcelona
Saragossa
Madrid
Toledo
Portugal
Lisbon
Oporto
Coimbra
Spain
Navarre
Biscay
Bilboa
Santander
Corunna
Ferrol
Vigo
Oviedo
Leon
Burgos
Valladolid
Salamanca
Castile
Andalusia
Estremadura
Murcia
Minorca
Majorca
Sardinia
Corsica
Sicily
Palermo
Messina
Naples
Rome
Ancona
Bologna
Ferrara
Parma
Modena
Florence
Pisa
Leghorn
Piombino
Elba
Sienna
Perugia
Urbino
Ravenna
Rimini
Pesaro
Ancona
Loretto
Civita Vecchia
Gaeta
Capua
Aversa
Salerno
Otranto
Brindisi
Tarentum
Bari
Manfredonia
Foggia
Benevento
Abruzzo
Aquila
Terracina
Velletri
Frascati
Tivoli
Viterbo
Orvieto
Perugia
Assisi
Foligno
Spoleto
Terni
Rieti
Aquila
Sulmona
Isernia
Campobasso
Larino
Termoli
Vasto
Chieti
Pescara
Teramo
Ascoli
Fermo
Macerata
Recanati
Osimo
Jesi
Fabriano
Camerino
Tolentino
Sinigaglia
Fano
Pesaro
Rimini
Cesena
Forli
Faenza
Imola
Bologna
Ferrara
Comacchio
Rovigo
Padua
Vicenza
Verona
Brescia
Bergamo
Como
Lecco
Milan
Pavia
Lodi
Cremona
Mantua
Parma
Piacenza
Modena
Reggio
Carpi
Mirandola
Guastalla
Sabbioneta
Casale
Alessandria
Tortona
Novi
Voghera
Vigevano
Novara
Vercelli
Ivrea
Aosta
Susa
Pinerolo
Turin
Chivasso
Asti
Alba
Cuneo
Saluzzo
Mondovi
Ceva
Savona
Albenga
Oneglia
Ventimiglia
Nice
Monaco
Antibes
Cannes
Frejus
Toulon
Hyeres
Marseilles
Aix
Arles
Tarascon
Avignon
Carpentras
Orange
Montelimar
Valence
Vienne
Lyons
Grenoble
Chambery
Geneva
Lausanne
Berne
Basle
Zurich
Constance
Schaffhausen
Coire
Chur
Bregenz
Innspruck
Trent
Roveredo
Botzen
Brixen
Meran
Sterzing
Lienz
Villach
Klagenfurt
Judenburg
Leoben
Bruck
Mariazell
Gratz
Marburg
Pettau
Radkersburg
Fiume
Carlstadt
Agram
Essek
Peterwardein
Semlin
Belgrade
Widin
Nicopolis
Rustchuk
Silistria
Varna
Shumla
Adrianople
Philippopolis
Tirnova
Sophia
Ismid
Nicomedia
Nice
Scutari
Constantinople
Gallipoli
Rodosto
Enos
Dardanelles
Lemnos
Mytilene
Chios
Scio
Samos
Rhodes
Candia
Cerigo
Zante
Cephalonia
Ithaca
Santa Maura
Prevesa
Parga
Janina
Durazzo
Valona
Scutari
Cattaro
Ragusa
Spalatro
Zara
Sebenico
Trau
Lesina
Curzola
Cattaro
Montenegro
Albania
Thessaly
Macedonia
Epirus
Morea
Corinth
Patras
Lepanto
Navarino
Coron
Modon
Athens
Negropont
Candia
Smyrna
Konia
Brussa
Angora
Halys
Trebizond
Sinope
Constantinople
Adrianople
Philippopolis
Varna
Nicopolis
Danube
Belgrade
Widin
Wallachia
Bessarabia
Hermannstadt
Krajnstadt
Crossward
Budgiest
Theiss
Dniester
Bender
Chocsim
Kamenitz

Her reign was not an important one for Russia either as regards internal or foreign affairs. The right of primogeniture which had been introduced into the Russian law of real property by Peter the Great, was abolished; it was altogether alien to the spirit of Slavonic institutions. A four years' war with Turkey led to no important results."—W. R. Morfill, *The Story of Russia, ch.* 8.—"The Russians could have no difficulty in finding a pretence for the war [with Turkey], because the khan of the Turkish allies and dependents, the Tatars on the coast of the Black Sea and the Sea of Asof, and in the Crimea, could never wholly restrain his wandering hordes from committing depredations and making incursions into the neighbouring pasture-lands of Russia. . . . In 1735 a Russian corps marched into the Crimea, ravaged a part of the country, and killed a great number of Tatars; but having ventured too far without a sufficient stock of provisions, they were obliged to retreat, and sustained so great a loss in men that what had been accomplished bore no proportion to this misfortune. The almost total failure of this first attempt, which had cost the Russians 10,000 men, by no means deterred them from pursuing their designs of conquest. Count Munich marched with a large army from the Ukraine into the Crimea (1736). The Tatars . . . suffered the Russian troops to advance unmolested, thinking themselves safe behind their entrenchments. . . . But entrenchments of that kind were unable to resist the impetuosity of the Russian troops. They were surmounted; the Tatars repulsed; and a great part of the Crimea lay at the mercy of the conquerors. In the month of June they entered the Crimean fortress of Perekop. The Russian troops now retaliated the devastations committed by the Tatars in the Empire; but they found it impossible to remain long. . . . Whatever the army was in want of had to be fetched with extreme difficulty from the Ukraine; so that Munich at length found himself, towards autumn, under the necessity of withdrawing with his troops by the shortest way to the Ukraine. . . . While Munich was in the Crimea, endeavouring to chastise the Tatars for their depredations, Lascy had proceeded with another army against Asof. The attack proved successful; and on the 1st of July the fort of Asof had already submitted to his arms. . . . The Ottomans published a manifesto against Russia, but they were neither able afterwards to protect the Crimea nor Moldavia, for they were soon threatened with an attack from Austria also. By the treaty with Russia, the emperor was bound to furnish 30,000 auxiliaries in case of a war with the Turks; but a party in the Austrian cabinet persuaded the emperor that it would be more advantageous to make war himself. . . . In the year 1737 a new expedition was undertaken from the Ukraine at an immense cost. . . . A new treaty had been concluded with Austria before this campaign, in which the two empires agreed to carry on the war in common, according to a stipulated plan. In order to gain a pretence for the war, Austria had previously acted as if she wished to force her mediation upon the Turks. The first year's campaign was so unfortunate that the Austrians were obliged to give up all idea of prosecuting their operations, and to think of the protection and defence of their own frontiers." But "the Russians were every where victorious, and made the names of their armies a terror both in the east and the west. Lascy undertook a new raid into the Crimea. Munich first threatened Bender, then reduced Otchakof without much difficulty, and left a few troops behind him when he withdrew . . . who were there besieged by a large combined army of Turks and Tatars, supported by a fleet. The Russians not only maintained the fortress, which was, properly speaking, untenable, but they forced the Turks to retire with a loss of 10,000 men. The Russian campaign in 1738 was as fruitless, and cost quite as many men, as the Austrian, but it was at least the means of bringing them some military renown." In 1739, the Russians, under Munich, advanced in the direction of Moldavia, violating Polish territory. "The Turkish and Tatar army which was opposed to the Russians was beaten and routed [at Stavoutchani] on the first attack. . . . Immediately afterwards the whole garrison, struck with a panic, forsook the fortress of Khotzim, which had never been once attacked, and it was taken possession of by the Russians, who were astonished at the ease of the conquest. Jassy was also taken, and Munich even wished to attack Bender, when the news of the peace of Belgrade . . . made him infuriate, because he saw clearly enough that Russia alone was not equal to carry on the war. . . . By the peace of Belgrade, Austria not only suffered shame and disgrace, but lost all the possessions which had been gained by Eugene in the last war, her best military frontier, and her most considerable fortresses. . . . By virtue of this treaty, Austria restored to Turkey Belgrade, Shabacz, the whole of Servia, that portion of Bosnia which had been acquired in the last war, and Austrian Vallachia. Russia was also obliged to evacuate Khotzim and Otchakof; the fortifications of the latter were, however, blown up; as well as those of Perekop; Russia retained Asof, and a boundary line was determined, which offered the Russians the most favourable opportunities for extending their vast empire southward, at the cost of the Tatars and Turks."—W. K. Kelly, *Hist. of Russia, ch.* 33 (*v.* 1).

A. D. 1726-1740.—The question of the Austrian Succession.—Guarantee of the Pragmatic Sanction. See AUSTRIA: A. D. 1718–1738; and 1740.

A. D. 1732-1733.—Interference in the election of king of Poland. See POLAND: A. D. 1732–1733.

A. D. 1740-1762.—Two regencies and two revolutions.—The reign of Empress Elizabeth. —The Empress Anne died in 1740. Her deceased sister, Catherine, had left a daughter, Anna, married to Anthony Ulrich, Prince of Brunswick, and this daughter had an infant son, Ivan. By the will of the Empress the child Ivan was named as her successor, and Biren was appointed Regent. He enjoyed the regency but a short time, when he was overcome by a palace conspiracy and sent in banishment to Siberia. The mother of the infant Czar was now made Regent; but her rule was brief. Another revolution, in the latter part of 1741, consigned her, with her son and husband, to a prison, and raised the Princess Elizabeth, second daughter of Peter the Great, to the Russian throne. "The Empress Anna might have ruled without control, and probably have transmitted the throne to her son Ivan, had Elizabeth been left to the quiet enjoy-

ment of her sensual propensities. Elizabeth indulged without concealment or restraint in amours with subalterns, and even privates of the guard whose barracks lay near her residence; she was addicted, like them, to strong drink, and had entirely gained their favour by her good humour and joviality. Her indolence made her utterly averse to business, and she would never have thought of encumbering herself with the cares of government had she not been restricted in her amusements, reproved for her behaviour, and, what was worst of all, threatened with a compulsory marriage with the ugly and disagreeable Anthony Ulrich, of Brunswick Bevern, brother of the Regent's husband. At the instigation, and with the money, of the French ambassador, La Chétardie, a revolution was effected. . . . Elizabeth, in the manifest which she published on the day of her accession, declared that the throne belonged to her by right of birth, in face of the celebrated ukase issued by her father in 1722, which empowered the reigning sovereign to name his successor. . . . On communicating her accession to the Swedish Government [which had lately declared war and invaded Finland with no success], she expressed her desire for peace, and her wish to restore matters to the footing on which they had been placed by the Treaty of Nystadt. The Swedes, who took credit for having assisted the revolution which raised her to the throne, demanded from the gratitude of the Empress the restitution of all Finnland, with the town of Wiborg and part of Carelia; but Elizabeth, with whom it was a point of honour to cede none of the conquests of her father, would consent to nothing further than the re-establishment of the Peace of Nystadt. On the renewal of the war the Swedes were again unsuccessful in every rencounter, as they had been before."— T. H. Dyer, *Hist. of Modern Europe, bk.* 6, *ch.* 3 (*v.* 3).—"This war had no result except to show the weakness of the Sweden of Charles XII. against regenerate Russia. The Scandinavian armies proved themselves very unworthy of their former reputation. Elizabeth's generals, Lascy and Keith, subdued all the forts in Finland. At Helsingfors 17,000 Swedes laid down their arms before a hardly more numerous Russian force. By the treaty of Abo [August 17, 1743], the Empress acquired South Finland as far as the river Kiümen, and caused Adolphus Frederic, Administrator of the Duchy of Holstein, and one of her allies, to be elected Prince Royal of Sweden, in place of the Prince Royal of Denmark. . . . In her internal policy . . . Elizabeth continued the traditions of the great Emperor. She developed the material prosperity of the country, reformed the legislation, and created new centres of population; she gave an energetic impulse to science and the national literature; she prepared the way for the alliance of France and Russia, emancipated from the German yoke; while in foreign affairs she put a stop to the threatening advance of Prussia." Elizabeth died in January, 1762.— A. Rambaud, *Hist. of Russia, v.* 2, *ch.* 6.

A. D. 1743.—Acquisition of part of Finland from Sweden. See SCANDINAVIAN STATES (SWEDEN): A. D. 1720-1792.

A. D. 1755. — Intrigue with Austria and Saxony against Frederick the Great.—Causes of the Seven Years War. See GERMANY: A. D. 1755-1756.

A. D. 1758.—Invasion of Prussia.— Defeat at Zorndorf.—Retreat. See GERMANY: A. D. 1758.

A. D. 1759.—Renewed invasion of Prussia. — Victory at Kunersdorf. See GERMANY: A. D. 1759 (JULY—NOVEMBER).

A. D. 1761-1762.—Brief reign of Peter III. — His peace with Frederick the Great.—His deposition and death.—His queen, Catherine II., on the throne.—"Charles Peter Ulric, duke of Holstein Gottorp, whom Elizabeth had nominated her successor, who had embraced the Greek religion, and who, at his baptism, had received the name of Peter Fedorovitch, had arrived at St. Petersburg immediately after her accession: he was then in his fourteenth year. The education of this unfortunate prince was neglected. . . . Military exercises were the only occupation for which he had any relish, and in them he was indulged. . . . His potations, which were frequent and long, were encouraged by his companions; and, in a few years, he became a complete bacchanalian." In 1744 the young prince was married to "Sophia Augusta, daughter of the prince of Anhalt Zerbst, who, on her conversion to the Greek faith,— a necessary preliminary to her marriage,— had received the baptismal name of Catherine. This union was entitled to the more attention, as in its consequences it powerfully affected, not only the whole of Russia, but the whole of Europe. Shortly before its completion, Peter was seized with the small-pox, which left hideous traces on his countenance. The sight of him is said so far to have affected Catherine that she fainted away. But though she was only in her sixteenth year, ambition had already over her more influence than the tender passion, and she smothered her repugnance. Unfortunately, the personal qualities of the husband were not of a kind to remove the ill impression: if he bore her any affection, which appears doubtful, his manners were rude, even vulgar. . . . What was still worse, she soon learned to despise his understanding; and it required little penetration to foresee that, whatever might be his title after Elizabeth's death, the power must rest with Catherine. Hence the courtiers in general were more assiduous in their attentions to her than to him,— a circumstance which did not much dispose him for the better. Finding no charms in his new domestic circle, he naturally turned to his boon companions; his orgies became frequent; and Catherine was completely neglected. Hence her indifference was exchanged into absolute dislike. . . . Without moral principles; little deterred by the fear of worldly censure, in a court where the empress herself was any thing but a model of chastity; and burning with hatred towards her husband,— she soon dishonoured his bed." Elizabeth died on the 29th of December, 1761, and Peter III. succeeded to the throne without opposition. The plotting against him on behalf of his wife, had long been active, but no plans were ripe for execution. He was suffered to reign for a year and a half; but the power which he received at the beginning slipped quickly away from him. He was humane in disposition, and adopted some excellent measures. He suppressed the secret chancery— an inquisitorial court said to be as abominable as the Spanish inquisition. He emancipated the nobles from the servility to the crown which Peter the Great

had imposed on them. He improved the discipline of the army, and gave encouragement to trade. But the good will which these measures might have won for him was more than cancelled by his undisguised contempt for Russia and the Russians, and especially for their religion, and by his excessive admiration for Frederick the Great, of Prussia, with whom his predecessor had been at war [but with whom he entered into alliance. — See GERMANY: A. D. 1761–1762]. The clergy and the army were both alienated from him, and were easily persuaded to support the revolution which Catherine and her favorites planned for his overthrow. Their scheme was carried out on the morning of the 9th of July, 1762, when Peter was in the midst of one of his orgies at Oranienbaum, some miles from the capital. Catherine went to the barracks of the troops, and regiment after regiment declared for her. "Accompanied by about 2,000 soldiers, with five times that number of citizens, who loudly proclaimed her sovereign of Russia, she went to the church of Our Lady of Kasan. Here every thing was prepared for her reception: the archbishop of Novogorod, with a host of ecclesiastics, awaited her at the altar; she swore to observe the laws and religion of the empire; the crown was solemnly placed on her head; she was proclaimed sole monarch of Russia, and the grand-duke Paul her successor." The dethroned czar, when the news of these events reached him, doubted and hesitated until he lost even the opportunity to take to flight. On the day following Catherine's coronation he signed an act of abdication. Within a week he was dead. According to accounts commonly credited, he was poisoned, and then strangled, because the poison did its deadly work too slowly. "Whether Catherine commanded this deed of blood, has been much disputed. There can be little doubt that she did. None of the conspirators would have ventured to such an extremity unless distinctly authorised by her." Two years later Catherine added another murder to her crimes by directing the assassination of Ivan, who had been dethroned as an infant by Elizabeth in 1741, and who had grown to manhood in hopeless imprisonment. — *Hist. of Russia* (*Lardner's Cabinet Cyclop.*), *v.* 2, *ch.* 10.

ALSO IN: *Hist. of the Reign of Peter III. and Catherine II.*, *v.* 1.—A. Rabbe and J. Duncan, *Hist. of Russia*, *v.* 1, *pp.* 203–221.

A. D. 1762-1796.—Character and reign of Catherine II.—Partition of Poland.—Wars with the Turks.—Acquisition of the Crimea and part of the Caucasus.—Extension of boundaries to the Dnieper.—"Thus was inaugurated the reign of Catherine II., a woman whose capacities were early felt to be great, but were great for evil as well as for good. . . . She was without scruple in the gratification of her passions, and without delicacy in their concealment; and a succession of lovers, installed ostentatiously in her palace, proclaimed to the world the shamelessness of their mistress. Yet she was great undoubtedly as a sovereign. With a clear and cultivated intellect, with high aims and breadth of views, and fearless because despising the opinions of others, she could plan and she could achieve her country's greatness; and in the extended dominions and improved civilization which she bequeathed to her successor is found a true claim to the gratitude of her subjects. The foreign transactions of the reign begin with the history of Poland. With Frederick of Prussia, Catherine may be said to have shared both the scheme of partition and the spoils that followed [see POLAND: A. D. 1763–1773]. If it is doubtful which originated the transaction, there is at least no doubt but that Russian policy had prepared the way for such a measure. . . . The war with Turkey [see TURKS: A. D. 1768–1774] was closed with equal profit and yet greater glory to the Russian Empire. The Russian armies had fought and conquered upon the soil of Moldavia, and had invaded and occupied the Crimea. At the same time the Russian fleets, no longer confining themselves to the Baltic or Black Seas, had sailed round Europe, and had appeared in the Archipelago. An insurrection of the Greeks had aided their design; and for a time the Bosphorus and Constantinople had been threatened. The great Empress of the North had dazzled Europe by the vastness of her power and designs; and Turkey, exhausted and unequal to further contest, was constrained to purchase peace. The possession of Azof, Kertch, Yenikale, and Kinburn, the free navigation of the Euxine and the Mediterranean, were the immediate gains of Russia. A stipulation for the better treatment of the Principalities, and for the rights of remonstrance, both in their behalf, and in that of the Greek church at Constantinople, gave the opening for future advantages. Another clause assured the independence of the Khan of the Crimea, and of the Tartars inhabiting the northern shores of the Black Sea. Under the name of liberty, these tribes were now, like Poland, deprived of every strength except their own; and the way was prepared for their annexation by Russia. The Peace of Kainardji, as this settlement was called, was signed in 1774. Within ten years dissensions had arisen within the Crimea, and both Turks and Russians had appeared upon the scene. The forces of Catherine passed the isthmus as allies of the reigning Khan; but they remained to receive his abdication, and to become the masters of his country [see TURKS: A. D. 1776–1792]. At the same time the Kuban was entered and subdued by Souvarof, and thus already the Caucasus was reached. Catherine was now at the height of her power. In a triumphant progress she visited her new dominions, and gave the august name of Sebastopol to a new city which was already destined to be the scourge of the Turkish Empire. She believed herself to be upon the road to Constantinople; and, in the interviews which she held with the Emperor Joseph II., she began to scheme for the partition of Turkey, as she had done for that of Poland. . . . The Empress now found herself assailed in two distinct quarters. Gustavus III. of Sweden, allying with the Sultan, invaded Finland; and in her palace at St. Petersburg the Empress heard the Swedish guns [see SCANDINAVIAN STATES (SWEDEN): A. D. 1720–1792]. She was relieved, however, on the north by the dissension in the Swedish army, which compelled the King to an inglorious retreat; and she became able to give an undivided attention to the affairs of the south. While an Austrian army, which supported her, was threatening the north-west of Turkey, her own forces conquered in the north-east. Under Souvarof the town of Oczakof was taken, and the battle of Rimnik was won. Ismail, that gave the key

of the Danube, next fell, and in the horrors of its fall drew forth a cry from Europe. The triumph of Catherine was assured; but already the clouds of revolution had risen in the west; Austria, too busy with the affairs of the Netherlands, had withdrawn from the fight; and the Empress herself, disquieted, and satisfied for the time with her successes, concluded the Peace of Jassy, which extended her frontiers to the Dniester, and gave her the coast on which so soon arose the rich city of Odessa. The acquisitions of Catherine upon the south were completed. Those upon the west had still to receive important additions. Poland, already once partitioned was again to yield new provinces to Russia [see POLAND: A. D. 1791–1792, and 1793–1796]. The internal government of the Empire was meant undoubtedly to rival these foreign successes, but unhappily fell short of them. . . . The long meditated secularization of the estates of the clergy was at last accomplished; the freedom of the serfs was now first urged; and, as a unique experiment in Russian history, the convoking of a kind of States General was made to discuss the project. But both project and parliament came to nothing. . . . There was much that was unreal in everything, and Europe, as well as the great Empress herself, was deceived. And so it came to pass that at the close of the reign there was the spectacle of much that had been begun but little finished. Before the death of Catherine [1796], in fact, her greatness may be said to have passed away."—C. F. Johnstone, *Historical Abstracts, ch.* 6.—"The activity of Catherine was prodigious, and her autocratic instincts extremely strong, and these impulses, affected by the French doctrines, which we must not forget set up despotism, if enlightened, as the perfection of wisdom, made her government attempt to accomplish all things and to meddle in every department of the national life. She tried to force civilisation into premature growths; established modern institutions of many kinds in a backward and half-barbaric empire; arranged industrial and economic projects and works in the minutest details; and rigidly prescribed even court dress and fashions. Ségur thus describes this omnipresent and ubiquitous interference:—'It is sought to create at the same time a third estate, to attract foreign commerce, to establish all kinds of manufactures, to extend agriculture, to increase paper money, to raise the exchanges, to reduce the interest of money, to found cities, to people deserts, to cover the Black Sea with a new navy, to conquer one neighbour and circumvent another, and finally to extend Russian influence all over Europe.' These liberal reforms and grand aspirations came, however, for the most part to nothing; and Catherine's internal government grew by degrees into a grievous, cruel and prying despotism. . . . The antithesis of the liberalism in words and of the tyranny in deeds in Catherine's reign may be attributed to four main causes. She gradually found out that reform and progress were impossible in the Russian Empire—half Asiatic, backward and corrupt—and she swung back to the old tyranny of the past. The great rising of the serfs under Pugacheff, too—a servile outbreak of the worst kind—changed to a great extent the type of her government, and gave it a harsh and cruel complexion:—'The domestic policy of Catherine bore, until the end, the traces of those terrible years, and showed, as it were, the bloody cicatrices of the blows given and received in a death struggle.' . . . The foreign policy of Catherine was more successful than her government and administration at home, and the reasons are sufficiently plain. She found grand opportunities to extend her power in the long quarrels between France and England, in the alliance she maintained with Frederick the Great—an alliance she clung to, though she felt the burden—in the instability and weakness of the Austrian councils, in the confusion and strife of the French Revolution, above all in the decay of Islam; and Russia justly hailed her as a great conqueror. . . . The Muscovite race would not see her misdeeds in the march of conquest she opened for it; and her reputation has steadily increased in its eyes. 'The spirit of the people passes, in its fulness, into her. It was this that enabled her to make a complete conquest of her empire, and by this we do not mean the power which she wrested from the weakness, the cowardice, and the folly of Peter III.; but the position which this German woman attained at the close of her life, and especially after her death, in the history, and the national life, and development of a foreign and hostile race. For it may be said that it is since her death, above all, that she has become what she appears now—the sublime figure, colossal alike and splendid, majestic and attractive, before which incline, with an equal impulse of gratitude, the humble Moujik and the man of letters, who shakes the dust of reminiscences and legends already a century old.' In one particular, Catherine gave proof of being far in advance of the ideas of her day, and of extraordinary craft and adroitness. She anticipated the growing power of opinion in Europe, and skilfully turned it to her side by the patronage of the philosophers of France. In Napoleon's phrase, she did not spike the battery, she seized it and directed its fire; she had Voltaire, Diderot, and D'Alembert, admiring mouthpieces, to apologise for, nay to extol, her government. This great force had prodigious influence in throwing a glamour over the evil deeds of her reign, and in deceiving the world as to parts of her conduct:—'All this forms part of a system—a system due to the wonderful intuition of a woman, born in a petty German court, and placed on the most despotic throne of Europe; due, too—and so better—to her clear apprehension of the great power of the modern world—public opinion. It is, we do not hesitate to believe and affirm, because Catherine discovered this force, and resolved to make use of it, that she was able to play the part she played in history. Half of her reputation in Europe was caused by the admiration of Voltaire, solicited, won, managed by her with infinite art, nay, paid for when necessary.'" —*The Empress Catherine II.* (*Edinburgh Rev., July*, 1893).—"In 1781 Catherine had already sent to Grimm the following résumé of the history of her reign, set forth by her new secretary and factotum, Besborodko, in the fantastic form of an inventory:—Governments instituted according to the new form, 29; Towns built, 144; Treaties made, 30; Victories won, 78; Notable edicts, decreeing laws, 88; Edicts on behalf of the people, 123; Total, 492. Four hundred and ninety-two active measures! This astonishing piece of book-keeping, which betrays so naïvely all that there was of romantic, extravagant,

childish, and very feminine, in the extraordinary genius that swayed Russia, and in some sort Europe, during thirty-four years, will no doubt make the reader smile. It corresponds, however, truly enough, to a sum-total of great things accomplished under her direct inspiration. . . . In the management of men . . . she is simply marvellous. She employs all the resources of a trained diplomatist, of a subtle psychologist, and of a woman who knows the art of fascination; she employs them together or apart, she handles them with unequalled 'maestria.' If it is true that she sometimes takes her lovers for generals and statesmen, it is no less true that she treats on occasion her generals and statesmen as lovers. When the sovereign can do nothing, the Circe intervenes. If it avails nothing to command, to threaten, or to punish, she becomes coaxing and wheedling. Towards the soldiers that she sends to death, bidding them only win for her victory, she has delicate attentions, flattering forethought, adorable little ways. . . . Should fortune smile upon the efforts she has thus provoked and stimulated, she is profusely grateful: honours, pensions, gifts of money, of peasants, of land, rain upon the artisans of her glory. But she does not abandon those who have had the misfortune to be unlucky. . . . Catherine's art of ruling was not, however, without its shortcomings, some of which were due to the mere fact of her sex, whose dependences and weaknesses she was powerless to overcome. 'Ah!' she cried one day, 'if heaven had only granted me breeches instead of petticoats, I could do anything. It is with eyes and arms that one rules, and a woman has only ears.' The petticoats were not solely responsible for her difficulties. We have already referred to a defect which bore heavily upon the conduct of affairs during her reign: this great leader of men, who knew so well how to make use of them, did not know how to choose them. . . . It seems that her vision of men in general was disturbed, in this respect, by the breath of passion which influenced all her life. The general, the statesman, of whom she had need, she seemed to see only through the male whom she liked or disliked. . . . These mistakes of judgment were frequent. But Catherine did more than this, and worse. With the obstinacy which characterised her, and the infatuation that her successes gave her, she came little by little to translate this capital defect into a 'parti pris,' to formulate it as a system; one man was worth another, in her eyes, so long as he was docile and prompt to obey. . . . And her idea that one man is worth as much as another causes her, for a mere nothing, for a word that offends her, for a cast of countenance that she finds unpleasing, or even without motive, for the pleasure of change and the delight of having to do with some one new, as she avows naïvely in a letter to Grimm, to set aside, disgraced or merely cashiered, one or another of her most devoted servants."—R. Waliszewski, *Romance of an Empress, v.* 2, *bk.* 2, *ch.* 1.

Also in: W. Tooke, *Life of Catherine II.*—*Memoirs of Catherine II., by herself.*—Princess Daschkaw, *Memoirs.*—S. Menzies, *Royal Favourites.*—F. C. Schlosser, *Hist. of the 18th Century, v.* 4–7.

A. D. 1786.—Establishment of the Jewish Pale. See Jews: A. D. 1727–1880.

A. D. 1791-1793.—Joined in the Coalitions against Revolutionary France. See France: A. D. 1790–1791; 1791 (July—September); 1793 (March—September).

A. D. 1796.—Accession of Paul.

A. D. 1798-1799.—The war of the Second Coalition against Revolutionary France. See France: A. D. 1798–1799 (August—April).

A. D. 1799.—Suwarrow's victorious campaign in Italy and failure in Switzerland.—Anglo-Russian invasion of Holland.—Its disastrous ending. See France: A. D. 1799 (April — September); (August — December); and (September—October).

A. D. 1800.—Desertion of the Coalition by the Czar.—His alliance with Napoleon. See France: A. D. 1800–1801 (June—February).

A. D. 1800-1801. — War with England. — The Northern Maritime League and its sudden overthrow at Copenhagen by the British fleet.—Peace with England. See France: A. D. 1801–1802.

A. D. 1801.—Paul's despotism and assassination.—Accession of Alexander I.—The Emperor Paul's "choice of his Ministers was always directed by one dominant idea — that of surrounding himself with servants on whom he could entirely rely; for from the moment of his accession he foresaw and dreaded a Palace revolution. . . . He erred in the selection, and especially in the extent, of the means which he employed to save his life and his power; they only precipitated his deplorable end. Among the men whom he suspected, he persecuted some with implacable rigour, while he retained others at their posts and endeavoured to secure their fidelity by presents; this, however, only made them ungrateful. Never was there a sovereign more terrible in his severity, or more liberal when he was in a generous mood. But there was no certainty in his favour. A single word uttered intentionally or by accident in a conversation, the shadow of a suspicion, sufficed to make him persecute those whom he had protected. The greatest favourites of to-day feared to be driven from the Court on the morrow, and banished to a distant province. Yet the Emperor wished to be just. . . . All who belonged to the Court or came before the Emperor were thus in a state of continual fear." This fear, and the hatred which it inspired, produced in due time a conspiracy, headed by Counts Panin and Pahlen, of the Emperor's Council. Purporting to have for its object only the deposition of the Czar, the conspiracy was known and acquiesced in by the heir to the throne, the Grand-Duke Alexander, who had been persuaded to look upon it as a necessary measure for rescuing Russia from a demented ruler. "Paul was precipitating his country into incalculable disasters, and into a complete disorganisation and deterioration of the Government machine. . . . Although everybody sympathised with the conspiracy, nothing was done until Alexander had given his consent to his father's deposition." Then it was hurried to its accomplishment. The conspirators, including a large number of military and civil officials, supped together, on the evening of March 3, 1801. At midnight, most of them being then intoxicated, they went in a body to the palace, made their way to the Emperor's bed-chamber — resisted by only one young valet — and found him, in his night-clothes, hiding in the folds of a curtain. "They dragged him out in his shirt, more dead than alive; the terror he had inspired was now

repaid to him with usury. . . . He was placed on a chair before a desk. The long, thin, pale, and angular form of General Bennigsen [a Hanoverian officer, just admitted to the conspiracy, but who had taken the lead when others showed signs of faltering], with his hat on his head and a drawn sword in his hand, must have seemed to him a terrible spectre. 'Sire,' said the General, 'you are my prisoner and have ceased to reign; you will now at once write and sign a deed of abdication in favour of the Grand-Duke Alexander.' Paul was still unable to speak, and a pen was put in his hand. Trembling and almost unconscious, he was about to obey, when more cries were heard. General Bennigsen then left the room, as he has often assured me, to ascertain what these cries meant, and to take steps for securing the safety of the palace and of the Imperial family. He had only just gone out when a terrible scene began. The unfortunate Paul remained alone with men who were maddened by a furious hatred of him. . . . One of the conspirators took off his official scarf and tied it round the Emperor's throat. Paul struggled. . . . But the conspirators seized the hand with which he was striving to prolong his life, and furiously tugged at both ends of the scarf. The unhappy emperor had already breathed his last, and yet they tightened the knot and dragged along the dead body, striking it with their hands and feet." When Alexander learned that an assassination instead of a forced abdication had vacated the throne for him, he "was prostrated with grief and despair. . . . The idea of having caused the death of his father filled him with horror, and he felt that his reputation had received a stain which could never be effaced. . . . During the first years of his reign, Alexander's position with regard to his father's murderers was an extremely difficult and painful one. For a few months he believed himself to be at their mercy, but it was chiefly his conscience and a feeling of natural equity which prevented him from giving up to justice the most guilty of the conspirators. . . . The assassins all perished miserably."— Prince Adam Czartoryski, *Memoirs, v.* 1, *ch.* 9 *and* 11.

A. D. 1805.—The Third Coalition against France. See FRANCE: A. D. 1805 (JANUARY—APRIL).

A. D. 1805.—The crushing of the Coalition at Austerlitz. See FRANCE: A. D. 1805 (MARCH—DECEMBER).

A. D. 1806-1807.—War with Napoleon in aid of Prussia.—Battle of Eylau.—Treaty of Bartenstein with Prussia.—Decisive defeat at Friedland. See GERMANY: A. D. 1806 (OCTOBER—DECEMBER); 1806–1807; and 1807 (FEBRUARY—JUNE).

A. D. 1807.—Ineffective operations of England as an ally against Turkey.—Treaty of Tilsit.—Secret understandings of Napoleon with the Czar. See TURKS: A. D. 1806–1807; and GERMANY: A. D. 1807 (JUNE—JULY).

A. D. 1807-1810.—Northern fruits of the Peace of Tilsit.—English seizure of the Danish fleet.—War with England and Sweden.—Conquest of Finland.—Peculiar annexation of the Grand Duchy to the Empire. See SCANDINAVIAN STATES: A. D. 1807–1810.

A. D. 1808.—Imperial conference and Treaty of Erfurt. See FRANCE: A. D. 1808 (SEPTEMBER—OCTOBER).

A. D. 1809.—Cession of Eastern Galicia by the Emperor of Austria. See GERMANY: A. D. 1809 (JULY—SEPTEMBER).

A. D. 1809-1812.—War with Turkey.—Treaty of Bucharest.—Acquisition of Bessarabia. See TURKS: A. D. 1789–1812.

A. D. 1810.—Grievances against France.—Desertion of the Continental System.—Resumption of commerce with Great Britain.—Rupture with Napoleon. See FRANCE: A. D. 1810–1812.

A. D. 1812 (June—September).—Napoleon's invasion.—Battles of Smolensk and Borodino.—The French advance to Moscow.—"With the military resources of France, which then counted 130 departments, with the contingents of her Italian kingdoms, of the Confederation of the Rhine, of the Grand Duchy of Warsaw, and with the auxiliary forces of Prussia and Austria, Napoleon could bring a formidable army into the field. On the first of June the Grand Army amounted to 678,000 men, 356,000 of whom were French, and 322,000 foreigners. It included not only Belgians, Dutchmen, Hanoverians, Hanseats, Piedmontese, and Romans, then confounded under the name of Frenchmen, but also the Italian army, the Neapolitan army, the Spanish regiments, natives of Germany. . . . Besides Napoleon's marshals, it had at its head Eugène, Viceroy of Italy; Murat, King of Naples; Jerome, King of Westphalia; the princes royal and heirs of nearly all the houses in Europe. The Poles alone in this war, which recalled to them that of 1612, mustered 60,000 men under their standards. Other Slavs from the Illyrian provinces, Carinthians, Dalmatians, and Croats, were led to assault the great Slav empire. It was indeed the 'army of twenty nations,' as it is still called by the Russian people. Napoleon transported all these races from the West to the East by a movement similar to that of the great invasions, and swept them like a human avalanche against Russia. When the Grand Army prepared to cross the Niemen, it was arranged thus:—To the left, before Tilsit, Macdonald with 10,000 French and 20,000 Prussians under General York of Wartenburg; before Kovno, Napoleon with the corps of Davoust, Oudinot, Ney, the Guard commanded by Bessières, the immense reserve cavalry under Murat—in all a total of 180,000 men; before Pilony, Eugène with 50,000 Italians and Bavarians; before Grodno, Jerome Bonaparte, with 60,000 Poles, Westphalians and Saxons, &c. We must add to these the 30,000 Austrians of Schwartzenberg, who were to fight in Gallicia as mildly against the Russians as the Russians had against the Austrians in 1809. Victor guarded the Vistula and the Oder with 30,000 men, Augereau the Elbe with 50,000. Without reckoning the divisions of Macdonald, Schwartzenberg, Victor, and Augereau, it was with about 290,000 men, half of whom were French, that Napoleon marched to cross the Niemen and threaten the centre of Russia. Alexander had collected on the Niemen 90,000 men, commanded by Bagration; on the Bug, tributary to the Vistula, 60,000 men, commanded by Barclay de Tolly; those were what were called the Northern army and the army of the South. On the extreme right, Wittgenstein with 30,000 men was to oppose Macdonald almost throughout the campaign; on the extreme left, to occupy the Austrian Schwartzenberg as harmlessly as possible,

Tormassof was placed with 40,000. Later this latter army, reinforced by 50,000 men from the Danube, became formidable, and was destined, under Admiral Tchitchagof, seriously to embarrass the retreat of the French. In the rear of all these forces was a reserve of 80,000 men — Cossacks and militia. . . . In reality, to the 290,000 men Napoleon had mustered under his hand, the Emperor of Russia could only oppose the 150,000 of Bagration and Barclay de Tolly. . . . At the opening of the campaign the head-quarters of Alexander were at Wilna. . . . They deliberated and argued much. To attack Napoleon was to furnish him with the opportunity he wished; to retire into the interior, as Barclay had advised in 1807, seemed hard and humiliating. A middle course was sought by adopting the scheme of Pfühl — to establish an intrenched camp at Drissa, on the Dwina, and to make it a Russian Torres Vedras. The events in the Peninsula filled all minds. Pfühl desired to act like Wellington at Torres Vedras." But his intrenched camp was badly placed; it was easily turned, and was speedily abandoned when Napoleon advanced beyond the Niemen, which he did on the 24th of June. The Russian armies fell back. "Napoleon made his entry into Wilna, the ancient capital of the Lithuanian Gedimin. He had said in his second proclamation, 'The second Polish war has begun!' The Diet of Warsaw had pronounced the re-establishment of the kingdom of Poland, and sent a deputation to Wilna to demand the adhesion of Lithuania, and to obtain the protection of the Emperor. . . . Napoleon, whether to please Austria, whether to preserve the possibility of peace with Russia, or whether he was afraid to make Poland too strong, only took half measures. He gave Lithuania an administration distinct from that of Poland. . . . A last attempt to negotiate a peace had failed. . . . Napoleon had proposed two unacceptable conditions — the abandonment of Lithuania, and the declaration of war against Great Britain. If Napoleon, instead of plunging into Russia, had contented himself with organising and defending the ancient principality of Lithuania, no power on earth could have prevented the re-establishment of the Polish-Lithuanian State within its former limits. The destinies of France and Europe would have been changed. . . . Napoleon feared to penetrate into the interior; he would have liked to gain some brilliant success not far from the Lithuanian frontier, and seize one of the two Russian armies. The vast spaces, the bad roads, the misunderstandings, the growing disorganisation of the army, caused all his movements to fail. Barclay de Tolly, after having given battle at Ostrovno and Vitepsk, fell back on Smolensk; Bagration fought at Mohilef and Orcha, and in order to rejoin Barclay retreated to Smolensk. There the two Russian generals held council. Their troops were exasperated by this continual retreat, and Barclay, a good tactician, with a clear and methodical mind, did not agree with Bagration, impetuous, like a true pupil of Souvorof. The one held firmly for a retreat, in which the Russian army would become stronger and stronger, and the French army weaker and weaker, as they advanced into the interior; the other wished to act on the offensive, full of risk as it was. The army was on the side of Bagration, and Barclay, a German of the Baltic provinces, was suspected and all but insulted. He consented to take the initiative against Murat, who had arrived at Krasnoé, and a bloody battle was fought (August 14). On the 16th, 17th, and 18th of August, another desperate fight took place at Smolensk, which was burnt, and 20,000 men perished. Barclay still retired, drawing with him Bagration. In his retreat Bagration fought Ney at Valoutina; it was a lesser Eylau: 15,000 men of both armies remained on the field of battle. Napoleon felt that he was being enticed into the interior of Russia. The Russians still retreated, laying waste all behind them. . . . The Grand Army melted before their very eyes. From the Niemen to Wilna, without ever having seen the enemy, it had lost 50,000 men from sickness, desertion and marauding; from Wilna to Mohilef nearly 100,000. . . . In the Russian army, the discontent grew with the retreating movement; . . . they began to murmur as much against Bagration as against Barclay. It was then that Alexander united the two armies under the supreme command of Koutouzof. . . . Koutouzof halted at Borodino. He had then 72,000 infantry, 18,000 regular cavalry, 7,000 Cossacks, 10,000 opoltchénié or militiamen, and 640 guns served by 14,000 artillerymen or pioneers; in all, 121,000 men. Napoleon had only been able to concentrate 86,000 infantry, 28,000 cavalry, and 587 guns, served by 16,000 pioneers or artillerymen. . . . On the 5th of September the French took the redoubt of Chevardino; the 7th was the day of the great battle: this was known as the battle of Borodino among the Russians, as that of the Moskowa in the bulletins of Napoleon, though the Moskowa flows at some distance from the field of carnage. . . . The battle began by a frightful cannonade of 1,200 guns, which was heard 30 leagues round. Then the French, with an irresistible charge, took Borodino on one side and the redoubts on the other; Ney and Murat crossed the ravine of Semenevskoé, and cut the Russian army nearly in two. At ten o'clock the battle seemed won, but Napoleon refused to carry out his first success by employing the reserve, and the Russian generals had time to bring up new troops in line. They recaptured the great redoubt, and Platof, the Cossack, made an incursion on the rear of the Italian army; an obstinate fight took place at the outworks. At last Napoleon made his reserve troops advance; again Murat's cavalry swept the ravine; Caulaincourt's cuirassiers assaulted the great redoubt from behind, and flung themselves on it like a tempest, while Eugène of Italy scaled the ramparts. Again the Russians had lost their outworks. Then Koutouzof gave the signal to retreat. . . . The French had lost 30,000 men, the Russians 40,000. . . . Koutouzof retired in good order, announcing to Alexander that they had made a steady resistance, but were retreating to protect Moscow." But after a council of war, he decided to leave Moscow to its fate, and the retreating Russian army passed through and beyond the city, and the French entered it at their heels.—A. Rambaud, *Hist. of Russia, v.* 2, *ch.* 12.—"The facts prove beyond doubt that Napoleon did not foresee the danger of an advance upon Moscow, and that Alexander I. and the Russian generals never dreamed of trying to draw him into the heart of the country. Napoleon was led on, not by any plan, — a plan had never been thought of, — but by the intrigues,

quarrels, and ambition of men who unconsciously played a part in this terrible war and never foresaw that the result would be the safety of Russia. . . . Amid these quarrels and intrigues, we are trying to meet the French, although ignorant of their whereabouts. The French encounter Neverovski's division, and approach the walls of Smolensk. It is impossible not to give battle at Smolensk. We must maintain our communications. The battle takes place, and thousands of men on both sides are killed. Contrary to the wishes of the tsar and the people, our generals abandon Smolensk. The inhabitants of Smolensk, betrayed by their governor, set fire to the city, and, with this example to other Russian towns, they take refuge in Moscow, deploring their losses and sowing on every side the seeds of hate against the enemy. Napoleon advances and we retreat, and the result is that we take exactly the measures necessary to conquer the French."—Count L. Tolstoi, *The Physiology of War: Napoleon and the Russian Campaign, ch.* 1.

Also in: C. Joyneville, *Life and Times of Alexander I., v.* 2, *ch.* 4.—Baron Jomini, *Life of Napoleon, ch.* 18 (*v.* 3).—Count P. de Segur, *Hist. of the Expedition to Russia, bk.* 1–8 (*v.* 1–2).

A. D. 1812 (September).—The French in Moscow.—The burning of the city.—"With rapid steps the French army advanced towards the heights whence they hoped to perceive at length the great city of Moscow; and, if the Russians were filled with the utmost sadness, the hearts of the French were equally inspired with feelings of joy and triumph, and the most brilliant illusions. Reduced from 420,000 (which was its number at the passage of the Niemen) to 100,000, and utterly exhausted, our army forgot all its troubles on its approach to the brilliant capital of Muscovy. . . . Imagination . . . was strongly excited within them at the idea of entering Moscow, after having entered all the other capitals of Europe with the exception of London, protected by the sea. Whilst Prince Eugene advanced on the left of the army, and Prince Poniatowski on its right, the bulk of the army, with Murat at its head, Davout and Ney in the centre, and the Guard in the rear, followed the great Smolensk road. Napoleon was in the midst of his troops, who, as they gazed upon him and drew near to Moscow, forgot the days of discontent, and uttered loud shouts in honour of his glory and their own. The proposal submitted by Miloradovitch was readily accepted, for the French had no desire to destroy Moscow, and it was agreed that not a shot should be fired during the evacuation, on condition that the Russian army should continue to defile across the city without a moment's halt. . . . The Russian rear-guard defiled rapidly to yield the ground to our advanced guard, and the King of Naples, followed by his staff and a detachment of cavalry, plunged into the streets of Moscow, and, traversing by turns the humblest quarters and the wealthiest, perceived everywhere the most profound solitude, and seemed to have entered a city of the dead. . . . The information which was now obtained — that the whole population of the city had fled — saddened the exultation of the commanders of our advanced guard, who had flattered themselves that they would have had the pleasure of surprising the inhabitants by their kindness. . . . On the morning of the 15th September, Napoleon entered Moscow, at the head of his invincible legions, but passed through a deserted city, and his soldiers were now, for the first time on entering a capital, the sole witnesses of their own glory. Their feelings on the occasion were sad ones. As soon as Napoleon had reached the Kremlin, he hastened to ascend the lofty tower of the great Ivan, and to survey from its elevation the magnificent city he had conquered. . . . A sullen silence, broken only by the tramp of the cavalry, had replaced that populous life which during the very previous evening had rendered the city one of the most animated in the world. The army was distributed through the various quarters of Moscow, Prince Eugene occupying the northwest quarter, Marshal Davout the southwest, and Prince Poniatowski the southeast. Marshal Ney, who had traversed Moscow from west to east, established his troops in the district comprised between the Riazan and Wladimir roads; and the Guard was naturally posted at the Kremlin and in its environs. The houses were full of provisions of every kind, and the first necessities of the troops were readily satisfied. The superior officers were received at the gates of palaces by numerous servants in livery, eager in offering a brilliant hospitality; for the owners of these palaces, perfectly unaware that Moscow was about to perish, had taken great pains, although they fully shared the national hatred against the French, to procure protectors for their rich dwellings by receiving into them French officers. . . . From their splendid lodgings, the officers of the French army wandered with equal delight through the midst of the city, which resembled a Tartar camp sown with Italian palaces. They contemplated with wonder the numerous towns of which the capital is composed, and which are placed in concentric circles, the one within the other. . . . A few days before, Moscow had contained a population of 300,000 souls, of whom scarcely a sixth part now remained, and of these the greater number were concealed in their houses or prostrated at the foot of the altars. The streets were deserts, and only echoed with the footsteps of our soldiers. . . . But although the solitude of the city was a source of great vexation to them, they had no suspicion of any approaching catastrophe, for the Russian army, which alone had hitherto devastated their country, had departed, and there appeared to be no fear of fire. The French army hoped, therefore, to enjoy comfort in Moscow, to obtain, probably, peace by means of its possession, and at least good winter-cantonments in case the war should be prolonged. But, on the afternoon they had entered, columns of flame arose from a vast building containing . . . quantities of spirits, and just as our soldiers had almost succeeded in mastering the fire in this spot, a violent conflagration suddenly burst forth in a collection of buildings called the Bazaar, situated to the northeast of the Kremlin, and containing the richest magazines, abounding in stores of the exquisite tissues of India and Persia, the rarities of Europe, colonial produce, and precious wines. The troops of the Guard immediately hastened up and attempted to subdue the flames; but their energetic efforts were unfortunately unsuccessful, and the immense riches of the establishment fell a prey to the fire, with the exception of some portions which our men were able to snatch from the devouring element. This fresh

accident was again attributed to natural causes, and considered as easily explicable in the tumult of an evacuation. During the night of the 15th of September, however, a sudden change came over the scene; for then as though every species of misfortune were to fall at the same moment on the ancient Muscovite capital, the equinoctial gales suddenly arose with the extreme violence usual to the season and in countries where wide-spread plains offer no resistance to the storm. This wind, blowing first from the east, carried the fire to the west into the streets comprised between the Iwer and Smolensk routes, which were the most beautiful and the richest in all Moscow. Within some hours the fire, spreading with frightful rapidity, and throwing out long arrows of flame, spread to the other westward quarters. And soon rockets were observed in the air, and wretches were seized in the act of spreading the conflagration. Interrogated under threat of instant death, they revealed the frightful secret,—the order given by Count Rostopschin for the burning of the city of Moscow as though it had been a simple village on the Moscow route. This information filled the whole army with consternation. Napoleon ordered that military commissions should be formed in each quarter of the city for the purpose of judging, shooting, and hanging incendiaries taken in the act, and that all the available troops should be employed in extinguishing the flames. Immediate recourse was had to the pumps, but it was found they had been removed; and this latter circumstance would have proved, if indeed any doubt on the matter had remained, the terrible determination with which Moscow had been given to the flames. In the mean time, the wind, increasing in violence every moment, rendered the efforts of the whole army ineffectual, and, suddenly changing, with the abruptness peculiar to equinoctial gales, from the east to the northwest, it carried the torrent of flame into quarters which the hands of the incendiaries had not yet been able to fire. After having blown during some hours from the northwest, the wind once more changed its direction, and blew from the southwest, as though it had a cruel pleasure in spreading ruin and death over the unhappy city, or, rather, over our army. By this change of the wind to the southwest the Kremlin was placed in extreme peril. More than 400 ammunition wagons were in the court of the Kremlin, and the arsenal contained some 400,000 pounds of powder. There was imminent danger, therefore, that Napoleon with his Guard, and the palace of the Czars, might be blown up into the air. . . . Napoleon, therefore, followed by some of his lieutenants, descended from the Kremlin to the quay of the Moskowa, where he found his horses ready for him, and had much difficulty in threading the streets, which, towards the northwest (in which direction he proceeded), were already in flames. The terrified army set out from Moscow. The divisions of Prince Eugene and Marshal Ney fell back upon the Zwenigarod and St. Petersburg roads, those of Marshal Davout fell back upon the Smolensk route, and, with the exception of the Guard, which was left around the Kremlin to dispute its possession with the flames, our troops drew back in horror from before the fire, which, after flaming up to heaven, darted back towards them as though it wished to devour them. The few inhabitants who had remained in Moscow, and had hitherto lain concealed in their dwellings, now fled, carrying away such of their possessions as they valued most highly, uttering lamentable cries of distress, and, in many instances, falling victims to the brigands whom Rostopochin had let loose, and who now exulted in the midst of the conflagration, as the genius of evil in the midst of chaos. Napoleon took up his quarters at the Château of Petrowskoié, a league's distance from Moscow on the St. Petersburg route, in the centre of the cantonments of the troops under Prince Eugene, awaiting there the subsidence of the conflagration, which had now reached such a height that it was beyond human power either to increase or extinguish it. As a final misfortune the wind changed on the following day from southwest to direct west, and then the torrents of flame were carried towards the eastern quarters of the city, the streets Messnitskaia and Bassmanaia, and the summer palace. As the conflagration reached its terrible height, frightful crashes were heard every moment,—roofs crushing inward, and stately façades crumbling headlong into the streets as their supports became consumed in the flames. The sky was scarcely visible through the thick cloud of smoke which overshadowed it, and the sun was only apparent as a blood-red globe. For three successive days—the 16th, the 17th, and the 18th of September—this terrific scene continued, and in unabated intensity. At length, after having devoured four-fifths of the city, the fire ceased, gradually quenched by the rain, which, as is usually the case, succeeded the violence of the equinoctial gales. As the flames subsided, only the spectre, as it were, of what had once been a magnificent city was visible; and, indeed, the Kremlin, and about a fifth part of the city, were alone saved,—their preservation being chiefly due to the exertions of the Imperial Guard. As the inhabitants of Moscow themselves entered the ruins, seeking what property still remained in them undestroyed, it was scarcely possible to prevent our soldiers from acting in the same manner. . . . Of this horrible scene the chiefest horror of all remains to be told: the Russians had left 15,000 wounded in Moscow, and, incapable of escaping, they had perished, victims of Rostopschin's barbarous patriotism."—A. Thiers, *Hist. of the Consulate and the Empire, bk.* 44 (*v.* 4).

Also in: Gen. Count M. Dumas, *Memoirs, ch.* 15 (*v.* 2).—J. Philippart, *Northern Campaigns,* 1812–1813, *v.* 1, *pp.* 81–115.

A. D. 1812 (October—December).—The retreat from Moscow.—Its horrors.—"Napoleon waited in vain for propositions from the Czar; his own were scornfully rejected. Meanwhile the Russians were reorganizing their armies, and winter set in. On the 13th of October, the first frost gave warning that it was time to think of the retreat, which the enemy, already on the French flank, was threatening to cut off. Leaving Mortier with 10,000 men in the Kremlin, the army quitted Moscow on the 19th of October, thirty-five days after it had entered the city. It still numbered 80,000 fighting men and 600 cannons, but was encumbered with camp-followers and vehicles. At Malo-Jaroslavetz a violent struggle took place on the 24th. The town was captured and recaptured seven times. It was finally left in the hands of the French. Here, however, the route changed. The road became

increasingly difficult, the cold grew intense, the ground was covered with snow, and the confusion in the quartermaster's department was terrible. When the army reached Smolensk, there were only 50,000 men in the ranks (November 9). Napoleon had taken minute precautions to provide supplies and reinforcements all along his line of retreat; but the heedlessness of his subalterns, and the difficulty of being obeyed at such distances and in such a country, rendered his foresight useless. At Smolensk, where he hoped to find provisions and supplies, everything had been squandered. Meanwhile there was not a moment to lose; Wittgenstein, with the army of the North, was coming up on the French right. Tchitchagof was occupying Minsk behind the Beresina, with the army which had just come from the banks of the Danube. Kutusof was near at hand. The three Russian armies proposed to unite and bar the Beresina, which the French were obliged to cross. The French began their march, but the cold became suddenly intense; all verdure had disappeared, and there being no food for the horses, they died by the thousand. The cavalry was forced to dismount; it became necessary to destroy or abandon a large portion of the cannon and ammunition. The enemy surrounded the French columns with a cloud of Cossacks, who captured all stragglers. On the following days the temperature moderated. Then arose another obstacle,—the mud, which prevented the advance; and the famine was constant. Moreover, the retreat was one continuous battle. Ney, 'the bravest of the brave,' accomplished prodigies of valor. At Krasnoi the Emperor himself was obliged to charge at the head of his guard. When the Beresina was reached, the army was reduced to 40,000 fighting men, of whom one-third were Poles. The Russians had burned the bridge of Borisof, and Tchitchagof, on the other shore, barred the passage. Fortunately a ford was found. The river was filled with enormous blocks of ice; General Eblé and his pontoniers, plunged in the water up to their shoulders, built and rebuilt bridges across it. Almost all the pontoniers perished of cold or were drowned. Then, while on the right of the river Ney and Oudinot held back the army of Tchitchagof, and Victor on the left that of Wittgenstein, the guard, with Napoleon, passed over. Victor, after having killed or wounded 10,000 of Wittgenstein's Russians, passed over during the night. When, in the morning, the rear-guard began to cross the bridges, a crowd of fugitives rushed upon them. They were soon filled with a confused mass of cavalry, infantry, caissons, and fugitives. The Russians came up and poured a shower of shells upon the helpless crowd. This frightful scene has ever since been famous as the passage of the Beresina. The governor of Minsk had 24,000 dead bodies picked up and burned. Napoleon conducted the retreat towards Wilna, where the French had large magazines. At Smorgoni he left the army, to repair in all haste to Paris, in order to prevent the disastrous effects of the last events, and to form another army. The army which he had left struggled on under Murat. The cold grew still more intense, and 20,000 men perished in three days. Ney held the enemy a long time in check with desperate valor; he was the last to recross the Niemen (December 20). There the retreat ended, and with it this fatal campaign. Beyond that river the French left 300,000 soldiers, either dead or in captivity."—Victor Duruy, *Hist. of France, ch.* 66.—"Thousands of horses soon lay groaning on the route, with great pieces of flesh cut off their necks and most fleshy parts by the passing soldiery for food; whilst thousands of naked wretches were wandering like spectres, who seemed to have no sight or sense, and who only kept reeling on till frost, famine, or the Cossack lance put an end to their power of motion. In that wretched state no nourishment could have saved them. There were continual instances, even amongst the Russians, of their lying down, dozing, and dying within a quarter of an hour after a little bread had been supplied. All prisoners, however, were immediately and invariably stripped stark naked and marched in columns in that state, or turned adrift to be the sport and the victims of the peasantry, who would not always let them, as they sought to do, point and hold the muzzles of the guns against their own heads or hearts to terminate their suffering in the most certain and expeditious manner; for the peasantry thought that this mitigation of torture 'would be an offence against the avenging God of Russia, and deprive them of His further protection.' A remarkable instance of this cruel spirit of retaliation was exhibited on the pursuit to Wiazma. Milaradowitch, Beningsen, Korf, and the English General, with various others, were proceeding on the high-road, about a mile from the town, where they found a crowd of peasant-women, with sticks in their hands, hopping round a felled pine-tree, on each side of which lay about sixty naked prisoners, prostrate, but with their heads on the tree, which those furies were striking in accompaniment to a national air or song which they were yelling in concert; while several hundred armed peasants were quietly looking on as guardians of the direful orgies. When the cavalcade approached, the sufferers uttered piercing shrieks, and kept incessantly crying 'La mort, la mort, la mort!' Near Dorogobouche a young and handsome Frenchwoman lay naked, writhing in the snow, which was ensanguined all around her. On hearing the sound of voices she raised her head, from which extremely long black, shining hair flowed over the whole person. Tossing her arms about with wildest expression of agony, she kept frantically crying, 'Rendez moi mon enfant'—Restore me my babe. When soothed sufficiently to explain her story, she related, 'That on sinking from weakness, a child newly born had been snatched away from her; that she had been stripped by her associates, and then stabbed to prevent her falling alive into the hands of their pursuers.'. . . The slaughter of the prisoners with every imaginable previous mode of torture by the peasantry still continuing, the English General sent off a despatch to the Emperor Alexander 'to represent the horrors of these outrages and propose a check.' The Emperor by an express courier instantly transmitted an order 'to prohibit the parties under the severest menaces of his displeasure and punishment;' at the same time he directed 'a ducat in gold to be paid for any prisoner delivered up by peasant or soldier to any civil authority for safe custody.' The order was beneficial as well as creditable, but still the conductors were offered a higher price for their charge, and frequently were prevailed on to surrender their trust, for

they doubted the justifiable validity of the order. Famine also ruthlessly decimated the enemy's ranks. Groups were frequently overtaken, gathered round the burning or burnt embers of buildings which had afforded cover for some wounded or frozen; many in these groups were employed in peeling off with their fingers and making a repast of the charred flesh of their comrades' remains. The English General having asked a grenadier of most martial expression, so occupied, 'if this food was not loathsome to him?' 'Yes,' he said, 'it was; but he did not eat it to preserve life — that he had sought in vain to lose — only to lull gnawing agonies.' On giving the grenadier a piece of food, which happened to be at command, he seized it with voracity, as if he would devour it whole; but suddenly checking himself, he appeared suffocating with emotion: looking at the bread, then at the donor, tears rolled down his cheeks; endeavouring to rise, and making an effort as if he would catch at the hand which administered to his want, he fell back and had expired before he could be reached. Innumerable dogs crouched on the bodies of their former masters, looking in their faces, and howling their hunger and their loss; whilst others were tearing the still living flesh from the feet, hands, and limbs of moaning wretches who could not defend themselves, and whose torment was still greater, as in many cases their consciousness and senses remained unimpaired. The clinging of the dogs to their masters' corpses was most remarkable and interesting. At the commencement of the retreat, at a village near Selino, a detachment of fifty of the enemy had been surprised. The peasants resolved to bury them alive in a pit: a drummer boy bravely led the devoted party and sprang into the grave. A dog belonging to one of the victims could not be secured; every day, however, the dog went to the neighbouring camp, and came back with a bit of food in his mouth to sit and moan over the newly-turned earth. It was a fortnight before he could be killed by the peasants, afraid of discovery. The peasants showed the English General the spot and related the occurrence with exultation, as if they had performed a meritorious deed. The shots of the peasantry at stragglers or prisoners rang continuously through the woods; and altogether it was a complication of misery, of cruelty, of desolation, and of disorder, that can never have been exceeded in the history of mankind. Many incidents and crimes are indeed too horrible or disgusting for relation."— General Sir R. Wilson, *Narrative of Events during the Invasion of Russia, pp.* 255–261.— The same, *Private Journal, v.* 1, *pp.* 202–257.— When Napoleon abandoned the army, at Smorghoni, on the 6th of December, the King of Naples was left in command. "They marched with so much disorder and precipitation that it was only when they arrived at Wilna that the soldiers were informed of a departure as discouraging as it was unexpected. 'What!' said they among themselves, 'is it thus that he abandons those of whom he calls himself the father? Where then is that genius, who, in the height of prosperity, exhorted us to bear our sufferings patiently? He who lavished our blood, is he afraid to die with us? Will he treat us like the army of Egypt, to whom, after having served him faithfully, he became indifferent, when, by a shameful flight, he found himself free from danger?' Such was the conversation of the soldiers, which they accompanied by the most violent execrations. Never was indignation more just, for never were a class of men so worthy of pity. The presence of the emperor had kept the chiefs to their duty, but when they heard of his departure, the greater part of them followed his example, and shamefully abandoned the remains of the regiments with which they had been intrusted. . . . The road which we followed presented, at every step, brave officers, covered with rags, supported by branches of pine, their hair and beards stiffened by the ice. These warriors, who, a short time before, were the terror of our enemies, and the conquerors of Europe, having now lost their fine appearance, crawled slowly along, and could scarcely obtain a look of pity from the soldiers whom they had formerly commanded. Their situation became still more dreadful, because all who had not strength to march were abandoned, and every one who was abandoned by his comrades, in an hour afterwards inevitably perished. The next day every bivouac presented the image of a field of battle. . . . The soldiers burnt whole houses to avoid being frozen. We saw round the fires the half-consumed bodies of many unfortunate men, who, having advanced too near, in order to warm themselves, and being too weak to recede, had become a prey to the flames. Some miserable beings, blackened with smoke, and besmeared with the blood of the horses which they had devoured, wandered like ghosts round the burning houses. They gazed on the dead bodies of their companions, and, too feeble to support themselves, fell down, and died like them. . . . The route was covered with soldiers who no longer retained the human form, and whom the enemy disdained to make prisoners. Every day these miserable men made us witnesses of scenes too dreadful to relate. Some had lost their hearing, others their speech, and many, by excessive cold and hunger, were reduced to a state of frantic stupidity, in which they roasted the dead bodies of their comrades for food, or even gnawed their own hands and arms. Some were so weak that, unable to lift a piece of wood, or roll a stone towards the fires which they had kindled, they sat upon the dead bodies of their comrades, and, with a haggard countenance, steadfastly gazed upon the burning coals. No sooner was the fire extinguished, than these living spectres, unable to rise, fell by the side of those on whom they had sat. We saw many who were absolutely insane. To warm their frozen feet, they plunged them naked into the middle of the fire. Some, with a convulsive laugh, threw themselves into the flames, and perished in the most horrid convulsions, and uttering the most piercing cries; while others, equally insane, immediately followed them, and experienced the same fate."— E. Labaume, *Circumstantial Narrative of the Campaign in Russia, pt.* 2, *bk.* 5.

Also in: Count P. de Segur, *Hist. of the Expedition to Russia, bk.* 9–12 (*v.* 2).—C. Joyneville, *Life and Times of Alexander I., v.* 2, *ch.* 5.— Earl Stanhope, *The French Retreat from Moscow* (*Hist. Essays; and, also, Quart. Rev., Oct.* 1867 —*v.* 123).—Baron de Marbot, *Memoirs, v.* 2, *ch.* 28–32.

A. D. 1812-1813.—Treaty of Kalisch with Prussia.—The War of Liberation in Germany.—Alliance of Austria.—The driving of the

French beyond the Rhine. See GERMANY: A. D. 1812–1813, to 1814.

A. D. 1814 (January—April).—The Allies in France and in possession of Paris.—Fall of Napoleon. See FRANCE: A. D. 1814 (JANUARY—MARCH), and (MARCH—APRIL).

A. D. 1814 (May).—The Treaty of Paris.—Evacuation of France. See FRANCE: A. D. 1814 (APRIL—JUNE).

A. D. 1814-1815.—The Congress of Vienna.—Acquisitions in Poland.—Surrender of Eastern Galicia. See VIENNA, THE CONGRESS OF.

A. D. 1815.—Napoleon's return from Elba.—The Quadruple Alliance.—The Waterloo campaign and its results. See FRANCE: A. D. 1814–1815, to 1815 (JUNE—AUGUST).

A. D. 1815.—The Allies again in France.—Second Treaty of Paris. See FRANCE: A. D. 1815 (JULY—NOVEMBER).

A. D. 1815.—The Holy Alliance. See HOLY ALLIANCE.

A. D. 1817.—Expulsion of Jesuits. See JESUITS: A. D. 1769–1871.

A. D. 1820-1822.—The Congresses of Troppau, Laybach and Verona. See VERONA, THE CONGRESS OF.

A. D. 1825.—Accession of Nicholas.

A. D. 1827-1829.—Intervention on behalf of Greece.—Battle of Navarino. See GREECE: A. D. 1821–1829.

A. D. 1830-1832.—Polish revolt and its suppression.—Barbarous treatment of the insurgents. See POLAND: A. D. 1830–1832.

A. D. 1831-1846.—Joint occupation of Cracow.—Extinction of the republic.—Its annexation to Austria. See AUSTRIA: A. D. 1815–1846.

A. D. 1833-1840.—The Turko-Egyptian question and its settlement. See TURKS: A. D. 1831–1840.

A. D. 1839-1859.—Subjugation of the Caucasus. See CAUCASUS.

A. D. 1849.—Aid rendered to Austria against the Hungarian patriots. See AUSTRIA: A. D. 1848–1849.

A. D. 1853-1854.—Causes of the Crimean War with Turkey, England and France.—"The immediate cause of the war which broke out in 1853 was a dispute which had arisen between France and Russia upon the custody of the Holy Places in Jerusalem. The real cause was the intention of Russia to hasten the dismemberment of the Turkish Empire. Nicholas, in a memorable conversation, actually suggested to the British ambassador at St. Petersburg that England should receive Egypt and Crete as her own portion of the spoil. This conversation, which took place in January 1853, was at once reported to the British Government. It undoubtedly prepared the way for future trouble. . . . It had the effect of rendering the British Ministry suspicious of his intentions, at a moment when a good understanding with this country was of the first importance to the Czar of Russia. There can, then, be very little doubt that Nicholas committed a grave error in suggesting a partition, which may have seemed reasonable enough to Continental statesmen, but which was regarded with horror by England. Almost at the same moment he affronted France by declining to call Napoleon 'Monsieur mon frère.' . . . Nicholas had the singular indiscretion to render a British ministry suspicious of him, and a French emperor angry with him, in the same month. Napoleon could easily avenge the affront. . . . The Greek and Latin Churches both claimed the right of protecting the Holy Places of Palestine. Both appealed to a Mahometan arrangement in support of their claim: each declined to admit the pretensions of the other. The Latin Church in Palestine was under the protection of France; the Greek Church was under the protection of Russia; and France and Russia had constantly supported, one against the other, these rival claims. In the beginning of 1853 France renewed the controversy. She even threatened to settle the question by force. The man whom Nicholas would not call 'mon frère' was stirring a controversy thick with trouble for the Czar of Russia. It happened, moreover, that the controversy was one which, from its very nature, was certain to spread. Nearly eighty years before, by the Treaty of Kainardji, the Porte had undertaken to afford a constant protection to its Christian subjects, and to place a new Greek Church at Constantinople, which it undertook to erect, 'and the ministers who officiated at it under the specific protection of the Russian Empire.' The exact meaning of this famous article had always been disputed. In Western Europe it had been usually held that it applied only to the new Greek Church at Constantinople, and the ministers who officiated at it. But Russian statesmen had always contended that its meaning was much wider; and British statesmen of repute had supported the contention. The general undertaking which the Porte had given to Russia to afford a constant protection to its Christian subjects gave Russia—so they argued—the right to interfere when such protection was not afforded. In such a country as Turkey, where chronic misgovernment prevailed, opportunity was never wanting for complaining that the Christians were inadequately protected. The dispute about the Holy Places was soon superseded by a general demand of Russia for the adequate protection of the Christian subjects of the Porte. In the summer of 1853 the demand took the shape of an ultimatum; and, when the Turkish ministers declined to comply with the Russian demand, a Russian army crossed the Pruth and occupied the Principalities. In six months a miserable quarrel about the custody of the Holy Places had assumed dimensions which were clearly threatening war. At the advice of England the Porte abstained from treating the occupation of the Principalities as an act of war; and diplomacy consequently secured an interval for arranging peace. The Austrian Government framed a note, which is known as the Vienna Note, as a basis of a settlement. England and the neutral powers assented to the note; Russia accepted it; and it was then presented to the Porte. But Turkey, with the obstinacy which has always characterised its statesmen, declined to accept it. War might even then have been prevented if the British Government had boldly insisted on its acceptance, and had told Turkey that if she modified the conditions she need not count on England's assistance. One of the leading members of Lord Aberdeen's Ministry wished to do this, and declared to the last hour of his life that this course should have been taken. But the course was not taken. Turkey was permitted, or, according to Baron Stockmar, en-

couraged to modify the Vienna Note; the modifications were rejected by Russia; and the Porte, on the 26th of September, delivered an ultimatum, and on the 4th of October 1853 declared war. These events excited a very widespread indignation in this country. The people, indeed, were only imperfectly acquainted with the causes which had produced the quarrel; many of them were unaware that the complication had been originally introduced by the act of France; others of them failed to reflect that the refusal of the Porte to accept a note which the four Great Powers—of which England was one—had agreed upon was the immediate cause of hostilities. Those who were better informed thought that the note was a mistake, and that the Turk had exercised a wise discretion in rejecting it; while the whole nation instinctively felt that Russia, throughout the negotiations, had acted with unnecessary harshness. In October 1853, therefore, the country was almost unanimously in favour of supporting the Turk. The events of the next few weeks turned this feeling into enthusiasm. The Turkish army, under Omar Pasha, proved its mettle by winning one or two victories over the Russian troops. The Turkish fleet at Sinope was suddenly attacked and destroyed. Its destruction was, undoubtedly, an act of war: it was distorted into an act of treachery; a rupture between England and Russia became thenceforward inevitable; and in March 1854 England and France declared war."—S. Walpole, *Foreign Relations, ch.* 3.

Also in: A. W. Kinglake, *The Invasion of the Crimea, v.* 1.—J. Morley, *Life of Richard Cobden, v.* 2, *ch.* 6.

A. D. 1854 (September).—The Crimean War: Landing of the Allies.—Battle of the Alma.—Sufferings of the invading army.—"England, then, and France entered the war as allies. Lord Raglan, formerly Lord Fitzroy Somerset, an old pupil of the Great Duke in the Peninsular War, and who had lost his right arm serving under Wellington at Waterloo, was appointed to command the English forces. Marshal St. Arnaud, a bold, brilliant soldier of fortune, was intrusted by the Emperor of the French with the leadership of the soldiers of France. The allied forces went out to the East and assembled at Varna, on the Black Sea shore, from which they were to make their descent on the Crimea. The war, meantime, had gone badly for the Emperor of Russia in his attempt to crush the Turks. The Turks had found in Omar Pasha a commander of remarkable ability and energy; and they had in one or two instances received the unexpected aid and counsel of clever and successful Englishmen. . . . The invasion of the Danubian provinces was already, to all intents, a failure. Mr. Kinglake and other writers have argued that but for the ambition of the Emperor of the French and the excited temper of the English people the war might well have ended then and there. The Emperor of Russia had found, it is contended, that he could not maintain an invasion of European Turkey; his fleet was confined to its ports in the Black Sea, and there was nothing for him but to make peace. But we confess we do not see with what propriety or wisdom the allies, having entered on the enterprise at all, could have abandoned it at such a moment, and allowed the Czar to escape thus merely scotched. . . . The allies went on. They sailed from Varna for the Crimea. . . . There is much discussion as to the original author of the project for the invasion of the Crimea. The Emperor Napoleon has had it ascribed to him; so has Lord Palmerston; so has the Duke of Newcastle; so, according to Mr. Kinglake, has the 'Times' newspaper. It does not much concern us to know in whom the idea originated, but it is of some importance to know that it was essentially a civilian's and not a soldier's idea. It took possession almost simultaneously, as far as we can observe, of the minds of several statesmen, and it had a sudden fascination for the public. The Emperor Nicholas had raised and sheltered his Black Sea fleet at Sebastopol. That fleet had sallied forth from Sebastopol to commit what was called the massacre of Sinope. Sebastopol was the great arsenal of Russia. It was the point from which Turkey was threatened; from which, it was universally believed, the embodied ambition of Russia was one day to make its most formidable effort of aggression. Within the fence of its vast seaforts the fleet of the Black Sea lay screened. From the moment when the vessels of England and France entered the Euxine the Russian fleet had withdrawn behind the curtain of these defences, and was seen upon the open waves no more. If, therefore, Sebastopol could be taken or destroyed, it would seem as if the whole material fabric, put together at such cost and labor for the execution of the schemes of Russia, would be shattered at a blow. . . . The invasion of the Crimea, however, was not a soldier's project. It was not welcomed by the English or the French commander. It was undertaken by Lord Raglan out of deference to the recommendations of the Government; and by Marshal St. Arnaud out of deference to the Emperor of the French, and because Lord Raglan, too, did not see his way to decline the responsibility of it. The allied forces were, therefore, conveyed to the south-western shore of the Crimea, and effected a landing in Kalamita Bay, a short distance north of the point at which the river Alma runs into the sea. Sebastopol itself lies about 30 miles to the south; and then, more southward still, divided by the bulk of a jutting promontory from Sebastopol, is the harbor of Balaklava. The disembarkation began on the morning of September 14th, 1854. It was completed on the fifth day; and there were then some 27,000 English, 30,000 French, and 7,000 Turks landed on the shores of Catherine the Great's Crimea. The landing was effected without any opposition from the Russians. On September 19th, the allies marched out of their encampments and moved southward in the direction of Sebastopol. They had a skirmish or two with a reconnoitring force of Russian cavalry and Cossacks; but they had no business of genuine war until they reached the nearer bank of the Alma. The Russians, in great strength, had taken up a splendid position on the heights that fringed the other side of the river. The allied forces reached the Alma about noon on September 20th. They found that they had to cross the river in the face of the Russian batteries armed with heavy guns on the highest point of the hills or bluffs, of scattered artillery, and of dense masses of infantry which covered the hills. The Russians were under the command of Prince Mentschikoff. It is certain that Prince Ments-

chikoff believed his position unassailable, and was convinced that his enemies were delivered into his hands when he saw the allies approach and attempt to effect the crossing of the river. . . . The attack was made with desperate courage on the part of the allies, but without any great skill of leadership or tenacity of discipline. It was rather a pell-mell sort of fight, in which the headlong courage and the indomitable obstinacy of the English and French troops carried all before them at last. A study of the battle is of little profit to the ordinary reader. It was an heroic scramble. There was little coherence of action between the allied forces. But there was happily an almost total absence of generalship on the part of the Russians. The soldiers of the Czar fought stoutly and stubbornly, as they have always done; but they could not stand up against the blended vehemence and obstinacy of the English and French. The river was crossed, the opposite heights were mounted, Prince Mentschikoff's great redoubt was carried, the Russians were driven from the field, the allies occupied their ground; the victory was to the Western Powers. . . . The Russians ought to have been pursued. They themselves fully expected a pursuit. They retreated in something like utter confusion. . . . But there was no pursuit. Lord Raglan was eager to follow up the victory; but the French had as yet hardly any cavalry, and Marshal St. Arnaud would not agree to any further enterprise that day. Lord Raglan believed that he ought not to persist; and nothing was done. . . . Except for the bravery of those who fought, the battle was not much to boast of. . . . At this distance of time it is almost touching to read some of the heroic contemporaneous descriptions of the great scramble of the Alma. . . . Very soon, however, a different note came to be sounded. The campaign had been opened under conditions differing from those of most campaigns that went before it. Science had added many new discoveries to the art of war. Literature had added one remarkable contribution of her own to the conditions amidst which campaigns were to be carried on. She had added the 'special correspondent.' . . . When the expedition was leaving England it was accompanied by a special correspondent from each of the great daily papers of London. The 'Times' sent out a representative whose name almost immediately became celebrated — Mr. William Howard Russell, the 'preux chevalier' of war correspondents in that day, as Mr. Archibald Forbes of the 'Daily News' is in this. . . . Mr. Russell soon saw that there was confusion; and he had the soundness of judgment to know that the confusion was that of a breaking-down system. Therefore, while the fervor of delight in the courage and success of our army was still fresh in the minds of the public at home, while every music-hall was ringing with the cheap rewards of valor, in the shape of popular glorifications of our commanders and our soldiers, the readers of the 'Times' began to learn that things were faring badly indeed with the conquering army of the Alma. The ranks were thinned by the ravages of cholera. The men were pursued by cholera to the very battle-field, Lord Raglan himself said. . . . The hospitals were in a wretchedly disorganized condition. Stores of medicines and strengthening food were decaying in places where no one wanted them or could well get at them, while men were dying in hundreds among our tents in the Crimea for lack of them. The system of clothing, of transport, of feeding, of nursing — everything had broken down. Ample provisions had been got together and paid for; and when they came to be needed no one knew where to get at them. The special correspondent of the 'Times' and other correspondents continued to din these things into the ears of the public at home. Exultation began to give way to a feeling of dismay. The patriotic anger against the Russians was changed for a mood of deep indignation against our own authorities and our own war administration. It soon became apparent to every one that the whole campaign had been planned on the assumption that it was to be like the career of the hero whom Byron laments, 'brief, brave, and glorious.' Our military authorities here at home — we do not speak of the commanders in the field — had made up their minds that Sebastopol was to fall, like another Jericho, at the sound of the war-trumpets' blast. Our commanders in the field were, on the contrary, rather disposed to overrate than to underrate the strength of the Russians. . . . It is very likely that if a sudden dash had been made at Sebastopol by land and sea, it might have been taken almost at the very opening of the war. But the delay gave the Russians full warning, and they did not neglect it. On the third day after the battle of the Alma the Russians sank seven vessels of their Black Sea fleet at the entrance of the harbor of Sebastopol. This was done full in the sight of the allied fleets, who at first, misunderstanding the movements going on among the enemy, thought the Russian squadron were about to come out from their shelter and try conclusions with the Western ships. But the real purpose of the Russians became soon apparent. Under the eyes of the allies the seven vessels slowly settled down and sank in the water, until at last only the tops of their masts were to be seen; and the entrance of the harbor was barred as by sunken rocks against any approach of an enemy's ship. There was an end to every dream of a sudden capture of Sebastopol."— J. McCarthy, *Hist. of Our Own Times, ch.* 27 (*v.* 2).

Also in: Gen. Sir E. Hamley, *The War in the Crimea, ch.* 2–3.—W. H. Russell, *The British Expedition to the Crimea, bk.* 1–2.

A. D. 1854 (September—October).—Opening of the siege of Sebastopol.— Four days after the battle of the Alma the allies reached the Belbek, so close to Sebastopol that "it became a matter of necessity to decide upon their next step. It appears to have been the wish of the English at once to take advantage of their victory and assault the north side. It is now known that such a step would almost certainly have been successful. . . . But again St. Arnaud offered objections." It was then determined "to undertake a flank march round the head of the harbour, and to take possession of the heights on the south. It was a difficult operation, for the country was unknown and rough, and while in the act of marching the armies were open to any assault upon their left flank. It was however carried out unmolested. . . . On the 26th the English arrived at the little landlocked harbour of Balaclava, at the foot of the steep hills forming the eastern edge of the plateau. The fleet, duly warned of the operation, had already arrived.

. . . Canrobert . . . had now succeeded the dying St. Arnaud. . . . A similar question to that which had arisen on the 24th now again rose. Should Sebastopol be attacked at once or not? Again it would appear that Lord Raglan, Sir Edmund Lyons, and others, were desirous of immediate assault. Again the French, more instructed in the technical rules of war, and supported by the opinion of Sir John Burgoyne, who commanded the English Engineers, declined the more vigorous suggestion, and it was determined at least to wait till the siege guns from the fleet were landed, and the artillery fire of the enemy weakened, in preparation for the assault. In the light of subsequent knowledge, and perhaps even with the knowledge then obtainable if rightly used, it appears that in all the three instances mentioned the bolder less regular course would have been the true wisdom. For Menschikoff had adopted a somewhat strange measure of defence. He had given up all hopes of using his fleet to advantage. He had caused some of his vessels to be sunk at the entrance of the harbour, which was thus closed; and having drawn the crews, some 18,000 in number, from the ships, he had intrusted to them the defence of the town, and had marched away with his whole army. The garrison did not now number more than 25,000, and they were quite unfit — being sailors — for operations in the field. The defences were not those of a regular fortress, but rather of an entrenched position. . . . There were in Sebastopol two men who, working together, made an extraordinary use of their opportunities. Korniloff, the Admiral, forcing himself to the front by sheer nobleness of character and enthusiasm, found in Colonel von Todleben, at that time on a voluntary mission in the town, an assistant of more than common genius. . . . The decision of the allies to await the landing of their siege train was more far-reaching than the generals at the time conceived, although some few men appear to have understood its necessary result. It in fact changed what was intended to be a rapid coup de main into a regular siege — and a regular siege of an imperfect and inefficient character, because the allied forces were not strong enough to invest the town. . . . Preparation had not been made to meet the change of circumstances. The work thrown upon the administration was beyond its powers; the terrible suffering of the army during the ensuing winter was the inevitable result. . . . The bombardment of the suburb, including the Malakoff and the Redan, fell to the English; the French undertook to carry it out against the city itself, directing their fire principally against the Flagstaff battery. . . . Slowly the siege trains were landed and brought into position in the batteries marked out by the engineers. . . . It was not till the 16th of October that these preparations were completed. . . . The energy of Korniloff and the skill of Todleben had by this time roused the temper of the garrison, and had rendered the defences far more formidable; and in the beginning of October means had been taken to persuade Menschikoff to allow considerable bodies of troops to return to the town. . . . On the 17th the great bombardment began. The English batteries gained the mastery over those opposed to them, but the efforts of the French, much reduced by the fire of the besieged, were brought to a speedy conclusion by a great explosion within their lines. Canrobert sent word to Lord Raglan that he should be unable to resume the fire for two days. The attack by the fleet had been to little purpose. . . . Every day till the 25th of October the fire of the allies was continued. But under cover of this fire (always encountered by the ceaseless energy of Todleben) the change had begun, and the French were attacking the Flagstaff bastion by means of regular approaches. On that day the siege was somewhat rudely interrupted. The presence of the Russian army outside the walls and the defect in the position of the allies became evident." — J. F. Bright, *Hist. of Eng.*, 1837–1880, *pp.* 251–256.

Also in: A. W. Kinglake, *The Invasion of the Crimea, v.* 3–4.

A. D. 1854 (October—November).—The Crimean War: Balaclava and Inkermann.— "The Russian general soon showed that he was determined not to allow the allies to carry on their operations against the town undisturbed. Large parties of Russian soldiers had for some time been reconnoitring in the direction of Balaclava, showing that an attack in that quarter was meditated. At length, on the 25th of October, an army of 30,000 Russians advanced against the English position, hoping to get possession of the harbours and to cut the allies off from their supplies, or at any rate to destroy the stores which had already been landed. The part of the works on which the Russian troops first came was occupied by redoubts, defended by a body of Turkish recruits, recently arrived from Tunis, who, after offering a very feeble resistance, fled in confusion. But when the Russians, flushed with this first success, attempted to pursue the advantage they had gained, they soon encountered a very different foe in the Highlanders, commanded by Sir Colin Campbell, who bore the brunt of the Russian attack with great firmness. The British cavalry particularly distinguished themselves in this action, routing a far superior force of Russian cavalry. It was in the course of this engagement that the unfortunate blunder occurred, in consequence of which 607 men [the 'Light Brigade' immortalized by Tennyson] galloped forth against an army, and only 198 came back, the rest having been killed, wounded, or made prisoners. A long, unsatisfactory controversy was carried on some time after, having for its object to decide who was to blame for throwing away, in this foolish manner, the lives of so many gallant men. It seems that the orders were not very clearly expressed, and that the general — Lord Lucan — by whom they were received, misapprehended them more completely than a man in his position ought to have done. In the end, the Russians were forced to retire, without having effected their object; but as they retained some portion of the ground that had been occupied by the allies at the commencement of the battle, they too claimed the victory, and Te-Deums were sung all over Russia in honour of this fragmentary success. However, the Russian commander did not abandon the hope of being able to obtain possession of Balaclava. On the very day following the affair which has just been related, the Russians within the town made a sortie with a force of about 6,000 men; but near the village of Inkermann they encountered so strong a resistance from a far inferior force, that they were obliged to retreat. The Russian

army at Balaclava had been prepared to coöperate with them; but the promptitude and vigour with which the allies repelled the sortie prevented the Russians from entrenching themselves at Inkermann, and thus frustrated the plan of a combined attack on the allied position which had probably been formed. The village of Inkermann, which was the scene of this skirmish, shortly after witnessed a more deadly and decisive contest. It was on the morning of Sunday, November 5th, that the approach of the Russian army was heard, while it was still concealed from view by the mists which overhung the British position. That army had been greatly increased by the arrival of large reinforcements, and every effort had been made to exalt the courage of the soldiers: they had been stimulated by religious services and exhortations, as well as by an abundant supply of ardent spirits; and they came on in the full confidence that they would be able to sweep the comparatively small British force from the position it occupied. That position was the centre of a grand attack made by the whole Russian army. The obscurity prevented the generals of the allies from discovering what was going on, or from clearly discerning, among a series of attacks on different parts of their position, which were real, and which were mere feints. There was a good deal of confusion in both armies; but the obscurity, on the whole, favoured the Russians, who had received their instructions before they set out, and were moving together in large masses. It was, in fact, a battle fought pell-mell, man against man, and regiment against regiment, with very little guidance or direction from the commanding officers, and consequently one in which the superior skill of the British gave them little advantage. The principal point of attack throughout was the plateau of Inkermann, occupied by the Guards and a few British regiments, who maintained a long and unequal struggle against the main body of the Russian army. It was, in fact, a hand-to-hand contest between superior civilization on the one hand, and superior numbers on the other, in which it is probable that the small British force would have been eventually swept off the field. Bosquet, the ablest of the French generals, with a soldier's instinct at once divined, amid all the obscurity, turmoil, and confusion, that the British position was the real point of attack; and therefore, leaving a portion of his force to defend his own position, he marched off to Inkermann, and never halted till his troops charged the Russians with such fury that they drove them down the hill, and decided the fate of the battle in favour of the allies. . . . Meanwhile Mr. Sidney Herbert, the minister at war, had succeeded in inducing Miss Florence Nightingale, well known in London for her skilful and self-denying benevolence, to go out and take charge of the military hospitals in which the wounded soldiers were received. Everything connected with the hospitals there was in a state of the most chaotic confusion. The medical and other stores which had been sent out were rotting in the holds of vessels, or in places where they were not wanted. Provisions had been despatched in abundance, and yet nothing could be found to support men who were simply dying from exhaustion. The system of check and counter-check, which had been devised to prevent waste and extravagance in the time of peace, proved to be the very cause of the most prodigious waste, extravagance, and inefficiency in the great war in which England was now embarked. The sort of dictatorial authority which had been conferred on Miss Nightingale, supported by her own admirable organising and administrative ability, enabled her to substitute order for confusion, and procure for the multitudes of wounded men who came under her care the comforts as well as the medical attendance they needed. She arrived at Scutari with her nurses on the very day of the battle of Inkermann. Winter was setting-in in the Crimea with unusual rigour and severity."—W. N. Molesworth, *Hist. of Eng.*, 1830–1874, *v.* 3, *ch.* 1.

Also in: E. H. Nolan, *Illustrated Hist. of the War against Russia, ch.* 40–48 (*v.* 1).—*Chambers' Pict. Hist. of the Russian War, ch.* 7–8.

A. D. 1854-1855.— Siege and capture of Kars.—"Everywhere unsuccessful in Europe, the Russians were more fortunate in Asia. Towards the close of 1854, the Turkish army at Kars was in a wretched and demoralised condition. Its unsatisfactory state, and the reverses it had experienced, resulting, it was well known, from the misconduct of the Turkish officials, induced the British government to appoint colonel Williams as a commissioner to examine into the causes of previous failures, and endeavour to prevent a repetition of them. . . . Colonel Williams, attended only by major Teesdale and Dr. Sandwith, arrived at Kars at the latter end of September, 1854, where he was received with the honour due to his position. Kars, in past times considered the key of Asia Minor, is 'a true Asiatic town in all its picturesque squalor,' and has a fortress partly in ruins, but once considered most formidable. On inspecting the Turkish army there, colonel Williams found the men in rags; their pay fifteen and even eighteen months in arrear; the horses half-starved; discipline so relaxed that it could be scarcely said to exist; and the officers addicted to the lowest vices and most disorderly habits. . . . Though treated with an unpardonable superciliousness and neglect by lord Stratford de Redcliffe, the British ambassador at Constantinople, colonel Williams succeeded in promoting a proper discipline, and in securing the men from being plundered by their officers. In the January of 1855, the Turkish government granted colonel Williams the rank of terik, or general in the Ottoman army, together with the title of Williams Pasha. The inactivity of the Russian army at Gumri excited much surprise; but notwithstanding the condition of the Turks, they permitted spring to pass away, and summer to arrive, before active hostilities were resumed. . . . During this period, the Turks at Kars had been employed, under the direction of colonel Lake, in throwing up fortifications around the town, which gradually assumed the appearance of a formidably intrenched camp. Early in June the Russians left Gumri, and encamped within five leagues of Kars. They were estimated at 40,000 men; while the Turkish troops amounted to about 15,000 men, who had been familiarised with defeat, and scourged by fever and the scurvy. In addition to this, their provisions were insufficient to enable them to sustain a siege of any considerable duration, and their stock of ammunition was very low The Russians made a partial attack on the town on the 16th of June, but they met with a repulse. . . . The road to Erzeroum was in their posses-

sion, and the supplies intended for the Turks fell into their hands. In effect, they had blockaded Kars by drawing a cordon of troops around it. A period of dreary inaction followed this movement of the Russians, broken only by trivial skirmishes at the outposts. Want was already felt within the town, and the prospect of surrender or starvation was imminent. . . . Omar Pasha, and a large body of Turkish troops from the Crimea, had landed at Batoum, and it was expected that they would soon arrive to raise the siege of Kars. This circumstance, occurring shortly after the arrival of the news of the fall of Sebastopol, induced many of the officers of the besieged army to believe that the Russians were about to retire. This surmise was strengthened by the fact, that, for several days, large convoys of heavily laden waggons were observed leaving the Russian camp. General Williams, however, was not deceived by this artifice, and correctly regarded it as the prelude to an extensive attack upon Kars. An hour before dawn on the 29th of September, the tramp of troops and the rumble of artillery wheels was heard in the distance, and the Turkish garrison made hurried preparations to receive the foe. Soon the dim moonlight revealed a dark moving mass in the valley. It was an advancing column of the enemy, who had hoped to take the Turks by surprise. In this they were deceived; for no sooner were they within range, than a crushing shower of grape informed them that the Moslems were on the alert. The battle commenced almost immediately. The assailants rushed up the hill with a shout, and advanced in close column on the breastworks and redoubts. From these works a murderous fire of musketry and rifles was poured forth, aided by showers of grape from the great guns. This told with terrible effect upon the dense masses of the foe, who fell in heaps. . . . Riddled with shot, the Russians were completely broken, and sent headlong down the hill, leaving hundreds of dead behind them. . . . Had not the Turkish cavalry been destroyed by starvation — a circumstance which rendered pursuit impossible — the Russian army might have been almost annihilated. The Turks had obtained an unequivocal victory, after a battle of nearly seven hours' duration. Their loss did not exceed 463 killed, of whom 101 were townspeople, and 631 wounded. That of the Russians was enormous; 6,300 of them were left dead upon the field, and it is said that they carried 7,000 wounded off the ground. Though the Russians had suffered a severe reverse, they were not driven from the position they held prior to the battle . . . and were enabled to resume the blockade of the city with as much strictness as before. The sufferings of the unhappy garrison and inhabitants of Kars form one of the most terrible pictures incidental to this war. Cholera and famine raged within the town; and those who were enfeebled by the last frequently fell victims to the first. The hospitals were crowded with the sick and wounded, but the nourishment they required could not be obtained. The flesh of starved horses had become a luxury, and the rations of the soldiers consisted only of a small supply of coarse bread, and a kind of broth made merely of flour and water. . . . Children dropt and died in the streets; and every morning skeleton-like corpses were found in various parts of the camp. The soldiers deserted in large numbers, and discipline was almost at an end. . . . As all hope of relief from Selim Pasha or Omar Pasha had expired, general Williams resolved to put an end to these miseries by surrendering the town to the foe. . . . Articles of surrender were signed on the 25th of November. . . . The fall of Kars was a disgrace and a scandal to all who might have contributed to prevent it."—T. Gaspey, *Hist. of Eng., Geo. III.–Victoria, ch.* 56 (*v.* 3).

Also in: T. H. Ward, *Humphrey Sandwith, ch.* 9.—S. Lane-Poole, *Life of Stratford Canning, ch.* 31 (*v.* 2).

A. D. 1854-1856.—Unfruitful peace negotiations at Vienna.—Renewed bombardment of Sebastopol.—Battle of the Tchernaya.—Repulse of the English from the Redan.—Taking of the Malakhoff by the French.—The congress at Paris.—Peace.—In November, 1854, the Czar, Nicholas I., authorized Gortschakoff, his Minister at Vienna, to signify to the Western Powers his willingness to conclude peace on the basis of "the four points" which the latter had laid down in the previous spring. These "four points" were as follows: "(1) The protectorate which Russia had hitherto exercised over the Principalities was to be replaced by a collective guarantee; (2) the navigation of the mouths of the Danube was to be freed from all impediments; (3) the treaty of 1841 was to be revised in the interests of the European equilibrium; and (4) Russia was to renounce all official protectorate over the Sultan's subjects, of whatever religion they might be. . . . The Czar's new move was not entirely successful. It did not prevent Austria from concluding a close arrangement with the Western Powers, and it induced her, in concert with France and England, to define more strictly the precise meaning attached to the four points. With some disappointment, Russia was doomed to find that every successive explanation of these points involved some fresh sacrifice on her own part. The freedom of the lower Danube, she was now told, could not be secured unless she surrendered the territory between that river and the Pruth which she had acquired at the treaty of Adrianople; the revision of the treaty of 1841, she was assured, must put an end to her preponderance in the Black Sea. These new exactions, however, did not deter the Czar from his desire to treat. By no other means was it possible to prevent Austria from taking part against him; and a conference, even if it ultimately proved abortive, would in the interim confine her to neutrality. Under these circumstances, Nicholas consented to negotiate. . . . The conference which it was decided to hold in December did not assemble till the following March. The negotiation which had been agreed to by Aberdeen, was carried out under Palmerston; and, with the double object of temporarily ridding himself of an inconvenient colleague, and of assuring the presence of a statesman of adequate rank at the conference, Palmerston entrusted its conduct to Russell. While Russell was on his way to Vienna, an event occurred of momentous importance. Sore troubled at the events of the war, alarmed at the growing strength of his enemies, the Emperor of Russia had neither heart nor strength to struggle against a slight illness. His sudden death [March 2, 1855] naturally made a profound impression on the mind of Europe. . . . Alexander, his successor,

a monarch whose reign commenced with disaster and ended with outrage, at once announced his adherence to the policy of his father. His accession, therefore, did not interrupt the proceedings of the Conference; and, in the first instance, the diplomatists who assembled at Vienna succeeded in arriving at a welcome agreement. On the first two of the four points all the Powers admitted to the Conference were substantially in accord. On the third point no such agreement was possible. The Western Powers were determined that an effectual limitation should be placed on the naval strength of Russia in the Black Sea; and they defined this limit by a stipulation that she should not add to the six ships of war which they had ascertained she had still afloat. Russia, on the contrary, regarded any such condition as injurious to her dignity and her rights, and refused to assent to it. Russia, however, did not venture on absolutely rejecting the proposal of the allies. Instead of doing so, she offered either to consent to the opening of the Dardanelles and the Bosphorus to the ships of war of all nations, or to allow the Sultan a discretion in determining whether he would open them to the vessels either of the Western Powers or of Russia. The Western Powers, however, were firm in their determination to prevent the fleets of Russia from passing into the Mediterranean, and refused the alternative. With its rejection the Conference practically terminated. After its members separated, however, Buol, the Austrian Minister, endeavoured to evolve from the Russian offer a possible compromise. . . . The rejection of the Austrian alternative necessitated the continuance of the war. But the struggle was resumed under conditions very different from those on which it had previously been conducted. Austria, indeed, considered that the rejection of her proposal released her from the necessity of actively joining the Western Powers, and, instead of taking part in the war, reduced her armaments. But the Western Powers obtained other aid. The little State of Sardinia sent a contingent to the Crimea; later on in the year Sweden joined the alliance. Fresh contingents of troops rapidly augmented the strength of the French and English armies, and finer weather as well as better management banished disease from the camp. Under these circumstances the bombardment was renewed in April. In May a successful attack on Kertch and Yenikale, at the extreme east of the Crimea, proved the means of intercepting communication between Sebastopol and the Caucasian provinces, and of destroying vast stores intended for the sustenance of the garrison. In June the French, to whose command Pelissier, a Marshal of more robust fibre than Canrobert, had succeeded, made a successful attack on the Mamelon, while the English concurrently seized another vantage-ground. Men at home, cheered by the news of these successes, fancied that they were witnessing the beginning of the end. Yet the end was not to come immediately. A great assault, delivered on the 18th of June, by the French on the Malakhoff, by the English on the Redan, failed; and its failure, among other consequences, broke the heart of the old soldier [Lord Raglan] who for nine months had commanded the English army. . . . His capacity as a general does not suffer from any comparison with that of his successor, General Simpson. That officer had been sent out to the Crimea in the preceding winter; he had served under Raglan as chief of the staff; and he was now selected for the command. He had, at least, the credit which attaches to any military man who holds a responsible post in the crisis of an operation. For the crisis of the campaign had now come. On both sides supreme efforts were made to terminate the struggle. On the 16th of August the Russian army in force crossed the Tchernaya, attacked the French lines, but experienced a sharp repulse. On the 8th of September the assault of June was repeated; and though the British were again driven back from the Redan, the French succeeded in carrying the Malakhoff. The Russians, recognising the significance of the defeat, set Sebastopol and their remaining ships on fire, and retreated to the northern bank of the harbour. After operations, which had lasted for nearly a year, the allies were masters of the south side of the city. It is, perhaps, unnecessary to prolong any further the narrative of operations which had little influence on history. The story of the defence of Kars, and of the bombardment of Sweaborg have an interest of their own. But they had no effect on the events which followed or on the peace which ensued. Soon after, the Vienna Conference was dissolved, indeed, it became evident that the war was approaching its close. The cost and the sacrifices which it involved were making the French people weary of the struggle, and the accidental circumstances, which gave them in August and September the chief share in the glory, disposed them to make peace. The reasons which made the French, however, eager for peace, did not apply to the English. They, on the contrary, were mortified at their failures. Their expectations had been raised by the valour of their army at Alma, at Balaklava, and at Inkerman. But, since the day of Inkerman, their own share in the contest had added no new page of splendour to the English story. The English troops had taken no part in the battle of the Tchernaya; their assaulting columns had been driven back on the 18th of June; they had been repulsed in the final attack on the Redan; and the heroic conduct of their own countrymen at Kars had not prevented the fall of that fortress. Men at home, anxious to account for the failure of their expectations, were beginning to say that England is like the runner, never really ripe for the struggle till he has gained his second wind. They were reluctant that she should retire from the contest at the moment when, having repaired her defective administration and reinforced her shattered army, she was in a position to command a victory. Whatever wishes, however, individual Englishmen might entertain, responsible statesmen, as the autumn wore on, could not conceal from themselves the necessity of finding some honourable means for terminating the war. In October the British Cabinet learned with dismay that the French Emperor had decided on withdrawing 100,000 men from the Crimea. About the same time the members of the Government learned with equal alarm that, if war were to be continued at all, the French public were demanding that France should secure some advantage in Poland, in Italy, and on the left bank of the Rhine. In November the French ministry took a much more extreme course, and concerted with Austria terms of peace without the

knowledge of England. . . . It was impossible any longer to depend on the co-operation of France, and . . . it was folly to continue the struggle without her assistance. The protocol which Austria had drawn up, and to which France had assented, was, with some modifications, adopted by Britain and presented, as an ultimatum, to Russia by Austria. In the middle of January, 1856, the ultimatum was accepted by Russia; a Congress at which Clarendon, as Foreign Minister, personally represented his country, was assembled at Paris. The plenipotentiaries, meeting on the 25th of February, at once agreed on a suspension of hostilities. Universally disposed towards peace, they found no difficulty in accommodating differences which had proved irreconcilable in the previous year, and on the 30th of March, 1856, peace was signed. The peace which was thus concluded admitted the right of the Porte to participate in the advantages of the public law of Europe; it pledged all the contracting parties, in the case of any fresh misunderstanding with the Turk, to resort to mediation before using force. It required the Sultan to issue and to communicate to the Powers a firman ameliorating the condition of his Christian subjects; it declared that the communication of the firman gave the Powers no right, either collectively or separately, to interfere between the Sultan and his subjects; it neutralised the Black Sea, opening its waters to the mercantile marine of every nation, but, with the exception of a few vessels of light draught necessary for the service of the coast, closing them to every vessel of war; it forbade the establishment or maintenance of arsenals on the shores of the Euxine; it established the free navigation of the Danube; it set back the frontier of Russia from the Danube; it guaranteed the privileges and immunities of the Principalities of Wallachia and Moldavia; it similarly guaranteed the privileges of Servia, though it gave the Sultan the right of garrison in that province; and it undertook that Russia and Turkey should restore the conquests which they had made in Asia [Kars, etc.] one from another during the war. Such were the terms on which the war was terminated. Before the plenipotentiaries separated they were invited by Walewski, the Foreign Minister and first representative of France, to discuss the condition of Greece, of the Roman States, and of the two Sicilies; to condemn the licence to which a free press was lending itself in Belgium; and to concert measures for the mitigation of some of the worst evils of maritime war"—(see DECLARATION OF PARIS). —S. Walpole, *Hist. of Eng. from* 1815, *ch.* 24.

ALSO IN: E. Hertslet, *The Map of Europe by Treaty, v.* 2, *doc's* 263–272.

A. D. 1855.—Accession of Alexander II.

A. D. 1859. — Improved treatment of the Jews. See JEWS: A. D. 1727–1880.

A. D. 1859-1876. — Conquests in Central Asia.— Subjugation of Bokhara, Khiva and Khokand. — "The original cause of Russia's appearance in Central Asia or Turkestan may be considered either the turbulence of the Kirghiz tribes, or the ambitious and clearly defined policy of Peter the Great. . . . Although the Czarina Anne received in 1734 the formal surrender of all the Kirghiz hordes, it was not until the present century had far advanced that the Russian Government could so much as flatter itself that it had effectually coerced them. . . . When the Kirghiz were subjugated Russia found no difficulty in reaching the lower course of the Jaxartes, on which [in 1849] . . . she established her advanced post at Kazala, or Fort No. 1. With her ultimate task thus simplified, nothing but the Crimean War prevented Russia's immediate advance up the Jaxartes into Turkestan. . . . The conquest of the Khanate of Turkestan began with the siege and capture of the forts Chulak Kurgan and Yani Kurgan in 1859; its successful progress was shown by the fall of the fortified towns of Turkestan and Auliata in 1864; and it was brought to a conclusion with the storming of Tashkent in 1865. The conquest of this Khanate, which had been united early in the century with that of Khokand, was thus speedily achieved, and this rapid and remarkable triumph is identified with the name of General Tchernaieff."—D. C. Boulger, *Central Asian Questions, ch.* 1.— "Khudayar Khan, the ruler of Khokand, a noted coward even in Central Asia, had soon lost his spirits, and implored Muzaffar-ed-din-Khan for assistance. Bokhara, reputed at that time the very stronghold of moral and material strength in Central Asia, was soon at hand with an army outnumbering the Russian adventurers ten or fifteen times; an army in name only, but consisting chiefly of a rabble, ill-armed, and devoid of any military qualities. By dint of preponderating numbers, the Bokhariots succeeded so far as to inflict a loss upon the daring Russian general at Irdjar, who, constrained to retreat upon Tashkend, was at once deposed by his superiors in St. Petersburg, and, instead of praises being bestowed upon him for the capture of Tashkend, he had to feel the weight of Russian ingratitude. His successor, General Romanovsky, played the part of a consolidator and a preparer, and as soon as this duty was fulfilled he likewise was superseded by General Kauffmann, a German from the Baltic Russian provinces, uniting the qualities of his predecessors in one person, and doing accordingly the work entrusted to him with pluck and luck in a comparatively short time. In 1868 the Yaxartes valley, together with Samarkand, the former capital of Timur, fell into the hands of Russia, and General Kauffmann would have proceeded to Bokhara, and even farther, if Muzaffar-ed-din-Khan . . . had not voluntarily submitted and begged for peace. At the treaty of Serpul, the Emir was granted the free possession of the country which was left to him, beginning beyond Kermineh, as far as Tchardjui in the south. . . . Of course the Emir had to pledge himself to be a true and faithful ally of Russia. He had to pay the heavy war indemnity . . . ; he had to place his sons under the tutorship of the Czar in order to be brought up at St. Petersburg . . . ; and ultimately he had to cede three points on his southern frontier—namely, Djam, Kerki, and Tchardjui. . . . Scarcely five years had elapsed when Russia . . . cast her eyes beyond the Oxus upon the Khan of Khiva. . . . A plea for a 'casus belli' was soon unearthed. . . . The Russian preparations of war had been ready for a long time, provisions were previously secured on different points, and General Kauffmann, notoriously fond of theatrical pageantries, marched through the most perilous route across bottomless sands from the banks of the Yaxartes to the Oxus [1873]. . . . Without fighting a

single battle, the whole country on the Lower Oxus was conquered. Russia again showed herself magnanimous by replacing the young Khan upon the paternal throne, after having taken away from him the whole country on the right bank of the Oxus, and imposed upon his neck the burden of a war indemnity which will weigh him down as long as he lives, and cripple even his successors, if any such are to come after him. Three more years passed, when Russia . . . again began to extend the limits of her possessions in the Yaxartes Valley towards the East. In July, 1876, one of the famous Russian embassies of amity was casually (?) present at the Court of Khudayar Khan at Khokand, when suddenly a rebellion broke out, endangering not only the lives of the Russian embassy but also of the allied ruler. No wonder, therefore, that Russia had to take care of the friend in distress. An army was despatched to Khokand, the rebellion was quelled, and, as a natural consequence, the whole Khanate incorporated into the dominions of the Czar. The Khokandians, especially one portion of them called the Kiptchaks, did not surrender so easily as their brethren in Bokhara and Khiva. The struggle between the conquerer and the native people was a bloody and protracted one; and the butchery at Namangan, an engagement in which the afterwards famous General Skobeleff won his spurs, surpasses all the accounts hitherto given of Russian cruelty. Similar scenes occurred in Endidjan and other places, until the power of the Kiptchaks, noted for their bravery all over Central Asia, was broken, and 'peace,' a pendant to the famous tableau of Vereshtchagin, 'Peace at Shipka,' prevailed throughout the valleys of Ferghana, enabling the Russian eagle to spread his wings undisturbedly over the whole of Central Asia, beginning from the Caspian Sea in the west to the Issyk Kul in the east, and from Siberia to the Turkoman sands in the south."— A. Vambéry, *The Coming Struggle for India, ch.* 2.

Also in: F. von Hellwald, *The Russians in Central Asia, ch.* 7–11. — J. Hutton, *Central Asia, ch.* 12 *and* 18.

A. D. 1860-1880. — The rise, spread and character of Nihilism. See Nihilism.

A. D. 1861. — Emancipation of serfs. See Slavery, Mediæval and Modern: Russian serfdom.

A. D. 1864.—Organization of Public Instruction. See Education, Modern: European Countries.—Russia.

A. D. 1867.—Sale of Alaska to the United States. See Alaska: A. D. 1867.

A. D. 1869-1881.—Advance in Central Asia from the Caspian.—Capture of Geok Tepe.—Subjugation of the Turkomans.—Occupation of Merv.—"Down to 1869 the Russian advance into Central Asia was conducted from Orenburg and the various military posts of Western Siberia. Year by year the frontier was pushed to the southward, and the map of the Asiatic possessions of Russia required frequent revision. The long chain of the Altai Mountains passed into the control of the Czar; the Aral Sea became a Russian lake; and vast territories with a sparse population were brought under Russian rule. . . . The Turcoman country extends westward as far as the Caspian Sea. To put a stop to the organized thieving of the Turcomans, and more especially to increase the extent of territory under their control, and open the land route to India, the Russians occupied the eastern shore of the Caspian in 1869. A military expedition was landed at Krasnovodsk, where it built a fort, and took permanent possession of the country in the name of the Czar. Points on the eastern coast of the Caspian had been occupied during the time of Peter the Great, and again during the reign of Nicholas I., but the occupation of the region was only temporary. The force which established itself at Krasnovodsk consisted of a few companies of infantry, two sotnias of Cossacks, and half a dozen pieces of artillery. Three men who afterwards obtained considerable prominence in the affairs of Central Asia, and one of whom gained a world-wide reputation as a soldier, were attached to this expedition. The last was Skobeleff, the hero of Plevna and the Russo-Turkish campaign of 1877–78. The others were Stolietoff and Grodekoff. . . . The Yomut Turcomans in the Caspian region made no resistance; they are far less warlike than the Tekke Turcomans farther to the east, who afterwards became the defenders of Geok Tepe. . . . From 1869 to 1873 there were numerous skirmishes and reconnoitrings, during which the steppes were pretty well explored as far as Kizil-Arvat. General Stolietoff was in command until 1872, when he was succeeded by Colonel Markusoff, who pushed his explorations to the wells of Igdy, then bending to the southwest, he passed Kizil-Arvat on his return to Krasnovodsk. There appeared to be no obstacle to a Russian advance into the heart of the country. But when General Lomakin was ordered there during the years between 1873 and '79, he found that beyond Kizil-Arvat were the Tekke Turcomans, who seemed determined to make a decided opposition to the Muscovite designs. . . . He advanced with 4,000 men and reached Geok Tepe without resistance, but no sooner was he in front of it than the Turcomans fell upon him. He was severely defeated and made a hasty retreat to Krasnovodsk with the remnant of his army. General Tergukasoff was next appointed to the command, but when he saw the difficulties confronting him he resigned. He was succeeded by General Petrussovitch under the chief command of Skobeleff. Thus from Stolietoff to Skobeleff there were no fewer than seven generals who had tried to conquer the Tekke Turcomans. Skobeleff, seeing the vast difficulties of the situation, matured a skilful and scientific plan of operations, for which he obtained the imperial sanction. . . . Skobeleff's first work [1880] was to secure a safe transport, establish a regular line of steamers across the Caspian, to build suitable docks, secure 20,000 camels, and build a railway from Michaelovsk to Kizil-Arvat. Michaelovsk is a small bay near Krasnovodsk and better suited as a harbor than the latter place. Skobeleff's first reconnoitring convinced him that Geok Tepe could only be taken by a regular siege. . . . Geok Tepe, sometimes called Goek Tepe ('The Green Hills'), is situated on the Akhal oasis, in the Turcoman steppes, 387 versts (250 miles), east of the Caspian Sea. The chain of hills called the Kopet-Dag, lies south and southwest of Geok Tepe, and on the other side it touches the sandy desert of Kara Kum, with the hill of Geok on the east. The Turcomans, or rather the Tekke Turcomans, who held it are the most numerous of the nomad tribes in that region.

They are reported to count about 100,000 kibitkas, or tents; reckoning 5 persons to a kibitka, this would give them a strength of half a million. Their great strength in numbers and their fighting abilities enabled them to choose their position and settle on the most fertile oases along the northern border of Persia for centuries. These oases have been renowned for their productiveness, and in consequence of the abundance of food, the Tekkes were a powerful race of men, and were feared throughout all that part of Asia. . . . The fortress of Geok Tepe at the time of the Russian advance consisted of walls of mud 12 or 15 feet high towards the north and west, and 6 or 8 feet thick. In front of these walls was a ditch, 6 feet deep, supplied by a running stream, and behind the walls was a raised platform for the defenders. The space between the first and second interior wall was from 50 to 60 feet wide, and occupied by the kibitkas of the Tekke Turcomans and their families. The second wall was exactly like the outer one." The Russian siege was opened at the beginning of the year 1881. "The first parallel, within 800 yards of the walls, was successfully cut by January 4th. From that date it was a regular siege, interrupted occasionally by sallies of the Tekkes within the fort or attacks by those outside. In one of these fights General Petrussovitch was killed. The besieging army was about 10,000 strong, while the besieged were from 30,000, to 40,000. . . . Throughout the siege the Turcomans made frequent sallies and there was almost continuous fighting. Sometimes the Turcomans drove the Russians from the outposts, and if they had been as well armed as their besiegers it is highly probable that Skobeleff would have fared no better than did Lomakin in his disastrous campaign. . . . The storming columns were ordered to be ready for work on January 24th. . . . At 7 o'clock in the morning of the 24th, Gaidaroff advanced to attack the first fortification on the south front, supported by 36 guns. The wall had already been half crumbled down by an explosion of powder and completely broken by the firing of a dynamite mine. At 11.20 the assault took place, and during the action the mine on the east front was exploded. It was laid with 125 cwt. of gunpowder, and in its explosion completely buried hundreds of Tekkes. . . . About 1.30 P. M. Gaidaroff carried the southwestern part of the walls, and a battle raged in the interior. Half an hour later the Russians were in possession of Denghil-Tepe, the hill redoubt commanding the fortress of Geok Tepe. The Tekkes then seemed to be panic-stricken, and took to flight leaving their families and all their goods behind. . . . The ditches to Geok Tepe were filled with corpses, and there were 4,000 dead in the interior of the fortress. The loss of the enemy was enormous. In the pursuit the Russians are said to have cut down no less than 8,000 fugitives. The total loss of the Tekkes during the siege, capture, and pursuit was estimated at 40,000. . . . Skobeleff pushed on in pursuit as far as Askabad, the capital of the Akhal Tekkes, 27 miles east of Geok Tepe, and from Askabad he sent Kuropatkin with a reconnoitring column half-way across the desert to Merv. Skobeleff wanted to capture Merv; but . . . he did not feel strong enough to make the attempt. Kuropatkin was recalled to Askabad, which remained the frontier post of the Russians for several months, until circumstances favored the advance upon Sarakhs and the Tejend, and the subsequent swoop upon Merv, with its bloodless capture [February, 1884]. The siege and capture of Geok Tepe was the most important victory ever achieved by the Russians in Central Asia. It opened the way for the Russian advance to the frontier of India, and carried the boundaries of the empire southward to those of Persia. In the interest of humanity, it was of the greatest importance, as it broke up the system of man-stealing and its attendant cruelties, which the Turcomans had practised for centuries. The people of Northern Persia no longer live in constant terror of Turcoman raids; the slave markets of Central Asia are closed, and doubtless forever."—T. W. Knox, *Decisive Battles since Waterloo, ch.* 22.—"There is a vast tract of country in Central Asia that offers great possibilities for settlement. Eastern Afghan, and Western Turkestan, with an area of 1,500,000 square miles, have a population which certainly does not exceed 15,000,000, or ten to the square mile. Were they peopled as the Baltic provinces of Russia are—no very extreme supposition — they would support 90,000,000. It is conceivable that something like this may be realized at no very distant date, when railroads are carried across China, and when water—the great want of Turkestan—is provided for by a system of canalisation and artesian wells. Meanwhile it is important to observe that whatever benefit is derived from an increase of population in these regions will mostly fall to China. That empire possesses the better two-thirds of Turkestan, and can pour in the surplus of a population of 400,000,000. Russia can only contribute the surplus of a population of about 100,000,000; and though the Russian is a fearless and good colonist, there are so many spaces in Russia in Europe to be filled up, so many growing towns that need workmen, so many counter-attractions in the gold bearing districts of Siberia, that the work of peopling the outlying dependencies of the empire is likely to be very gradual. Indeed it is reported that Russia is encouraging Chinese colonists to settle in the parts about Merv."—C. H. Pearson, *National Life and Character, pp.* 43–44.

Also in: Gen. Skobeleff, *Siege and Assault of Denghil-Tépé (Geok-Tépé): Official Rep't.*—C. Marvin, *The Russians at the Gates of Herat, ch.* 1–2.

A. D. 1877-1878.—Successful war with Turkey.—Siege and reduction of Plevna.—Threatening advance towards Constantinople.—Treaty of San Stefano.—Congress and Treaty of Berlin. See Turks: A. D. 1861–1877; 1877–1878; and 1878.

A. D. 1878-1880.—Movements in Afghanistan. See Afghanistan: A. D. 1869–1881.

A. D. 1879-1881.—Nihilist attempts against the life of the Czar Alexander II.—His assassination.—In November, 1879, "the Czar paid his annual visit to the memorial church at Sevastopol, when a requiem was celebrated, and he left the Crimea on November 30. The following evening, as his train was entering Moscow, followed by another carrying his baggage, an explosion took place under the baggage train from a mine of dynamite below the rails, which destroyed one carriage, and threw seven more off

the line. He was informed of the cause of the noise he had just heard, as he stepped on to the platform at Moscow, and it proved to be another Nihilist outrage [see NIHILISM], designed chiefly by an ex-Jew, who escaped to France, and by Sophia Perovsky, who was afterwards concerned in the Emperor's death. A similar mine, of which the wire was accidentally cut by a passing cart before the train arrived, had been laid further south at Alexandrovsk; and another nearer to Odessa was discovered in time by the officials, who reversed the usual position of the Imperial trains, thereby probably saving the Czar's life. He telegraphed the same night to the Empress at Cannes that he had arrived safely at Moscow, but did not mention his escape, which she learned from the newspapers, and from her attendants. In her weak, nervous state, it is not surprising that the effect was most injurious. . . . Another plot was discovered to blow up the landing stage at Odessa when the Emperor embarked for Yalta on his way from Warsaw in September; but the arrest of the conspirators frustrated a scheme by which hundreds as well as the sovereign might have perished. . . . The Revolutionary Committee put forth a circular acknowledging their part in the explosion, and calling on the people to aid them against the Czar. . . . A formal sentence of death was forwarded to him at Livadia by the Revolutionary Committee in the autumn of 1879; and December 1 was evidently selected for the Moscow attempt, being the anniversary of the death of Alexander I.; therefore a fatal day for monarchs in the eyes of the Nihilists. The Empress continued very ill, and her desire to return to Russia increased. At last it was decided to gratify her, as her case was pronounced hopeless. . . . The Emperor joined her in the train three stations before she arrived at St. Petersburg, and drove alone with her in the closed carriage, in which she was removed from the station to the Winter Palace. Only a fortnight later [February 17, 1880], a diabolical attempt was made to destroy the whole Imperial family. The hours when they assembled in the dining-room were well known. . . . The Empress was confined to her room, only kept alive by an artificial atmosphere being preserved in her apartment, which was next to the dining-room. Her only surviving brother, Prince Alexander of Hesse-Darmstadt, had arrived the same evening on a visit, and his letter to his wife on the occasion describes the result of the plot: . . . 'We were proceeding through a large corridor to His Majesty's rooms, when suddenly a fearful thundering was heard. The flooring was raised as if by an earthquake, the gas lamps were extinguished, and we were left in total darkness. At the same time a horrible dust and the smell of gunpowder or dynamite filled the corridor. Some one shouted to us that the chandelier had fallen down in the saloon where the table was laid for the dinner of the Imperial family. I hastened thither with the Czarovitz and the Grand-Duke Vladimir, while Count Adlerberg, in doubt as to what might happen next, held back the Emperor. We found all the windows broken, and the walls in ruins. A mine had exploded under the room. The dinner was delayed for half an hour by my arrival, and it was owing to this that the Imperial family had not yet assembled in the dining-hall.' One of the Princes remarked that it was a gas explosion; but the Emperor, who fully retained his composure, said, 'O no, I know what it is;' and it was subsequently stated that for several weeks past he had found a sealed black-bordered letter on his table every morning, always containing the same threat, that he should not survive the 2nd of March, the twenty-fifth anniversary of his accession. His first care was to see that his daughter was safe, and he then asked her to go to the Empress, and prevent her from being alarmed, while he personally inspected the scene of the catastrophe. General Todleben was of opinion that 144 lbs. of dynamite must have been used; and one of the cooks — a foreigner — and another official disappeared; but none of those concerned in the plot was arrested at that time. Subsequent information showed that the explosion was intended for the 2nd of March, but hastened on account of the arrest of some one acquainted with the plot. It was caused by machinery placed in the flue, and set for 6 P. M. It killed and wounded two servants and thirty-three brave soldiers of the Finnish Guard, who were assembled in the hall under the dining-room and above the flue where the dynamite was laid. . . . The Russian and foreign newspapers teemed with advice to the Emperor to grant a constitution, or abdicate in order to save his life; and it is reported that in a Council of his Ministers and relations he offered to hand over the sceptre at once to his eldest son, if they agreed that it would be best for their own safety, and for Russia; but that he was earnestly requested to continue in power. However this might be, he took an extraordinary and decisive step. He appointed an Armenian, General Melikof, a man of 56 years of age, distinguished in the war with Turkey, and subsequently as Governor of Charkof, to be the temporary dictator of the Empire, with almost absolute powers, and over the six Governors-General who in 1879 were established throughout Russia. The Commission was for six months. . . . The explosion in the Winter Palace caused the greatest panic in St. Petersburg, and people would no longer take tickets for the opera, till they ascertained that the Emperor was not likely to be there. . . . The sad condition of the Empress, who lingered, hardly conscious, between life and death, the incessant Nihilist circulars which day after day were found among his clothes, or on his writing table, with the real attempts made to poison him in letters and other ways, and of assassins to penetrate into the Palace under the guise of sweeps, petitioners, fire-lighters, and guards, the danger to which his nearest relations were exposed, and the precautions which he looked upon as a humiliation that were taken to ensure his safety, added to the cares of Empire, must have rendered his [the Emperor's] existence hardly tolerable. It is not surprising that at last he desired to be left to take his chance. . . . He was again seen driving in the streets in an open droschky, with only his coachman and one Cossack. . . . In May the Court usually repaired to Gateschina for the summer manœuvres of the troops. . . . The Empress, having somewhat rallied, desired to go as usual to Gateschina. . . . But early in the morning of June 3, she passed quietly away in her sleep. . . . It has been since ascertained that the Nihilists had planned to blow up the bridge over which the

funeral procession must pass, so as to destroy all the mourners, including the foreign princes, the Imperial hearse, and the numerous guards and attendants; but a tremendous storm of rain and wind on the previous night and morning, which raised the Neva to a level with its banks, and threatened to postpone the ceremony, prevented the last measures being taken to secure the success of the plot. . . . On March 2, the Emperor, as usual, attended the Requiem Mass for his father, and the service to celebrate his own accession to the throne. During the last week of his life, he lived in comparative retirement, as it was Lent, and he was preparing for the Holy Communion, which he received with his sons on the morning of Saturday, March 12. At 12 that day, Melikof came to tell him of the capture of one of the Nihilists concerned in the explosion in the Winter Palace. This man refused to answer any questions, except that his capture would not prevent the Emperor's certain assassination, and that his Majesty would never see another Easter. Both Melikof and the Czarovitz begged the Emperor in vain not to attend the parade the next day. . . . After the Parade [Sunday, March 13, 1881] the Emperor drove with his brother Michael to the Michael Palace, the abode of their cousin, the widowed Grand-Duchess Catherine; and, leaving his brother there, he set off about two o'clock by the shortest way to the Winter Palace, along the side of the Catherine Canal. There, in the part where the road runs between the Summer Garden and the Canal, a bombshell was hurled under the Imperial carriage, and exploded in a shower of snow, throwing down two of the horses of the escort, tearing off the back of the carriage, and breaking the glass, upsetting two lamp-posts, and wounding one of the Cossacks, and a baker's boy who was passing with a basket on his head. As soon as he saw the two victims lying on the pavement, the Emperor called to the coachman to stop, but the last only drove on faster, having received private orders from the Emperor's family to waive all ceremony, and to prevent his master from going into dangerous situations, or among crowds. However, the Emperor pulled the cord round the coachman's arm till he stopped; and then, in spite of the man's request to let himself be driven straight home, got out to speak to the sufferers, and to give orders for their prompt removal to the hospital, as the thermometer was below zero. . . . The Emperor gave his directions, and seeing the man who had thrown the bomb in the grasp of two soldiers, though still struggling to point a revolver at his sovereign, he asked his name, on which the aid-de-camp replied: 'He calls himself Griaznof, and says he is a workman.' The Emperor made one or two more remarks, and then turned to go back to his carriage. It was observed he was deadly pale, and walked very slowly; and as splashes of blood were found in the carriage, it was afterwards supposed that he had already received slight wounds. Several men had been placed at different points of the road with explosive bombs, and hearing the first explosion, two of these hurried up to see the effect. One of them flung a bomb at the Emperor's feet when he had gone a few paces towards his carriage, and it exploded, blowing off one leg, and shattering the other to the top of the thigh, besides mortally wounding the assassin himself, who fell with a shriek to the ground, and injuring twenty foot passengers. The other accomplice, according to his own evidence, put down his bomb, and instinctively ran forward to help the Emperor, who did not utter a sound, though his lips moved as if in prayer. He was supporting himself with his back against a buttress by grasping the rails on the canal. His helmet was blown off, his clothes torn to rags, and his orders scattered about on the snow, while the windows of houses 150 yards distant were broken by the explosion, which raised a column of smoke and snow, and was heard even at the Anitchkof Palace. . . . Besides his shattered limbs, the Emperor had a frightful gash in the abdomen, his left eye-lid was burnt, and his sight gone, his right hand was crushed, and the rings broken. . . . The Emperor expired from loss of blood at five-and-twenty minutes to four. . . . More than twenty persons were killed and injured by the two bombs."— C. Joyneville, *Life of Alexander II.*, *ch.* 13.

Also in: *Annual Register*, 1879-1881.

A. D. 1881.—Accession of Alexander III.

A. D. 1881-1894.—Character and reign of Alexander III.—Persecution of Jews and unorthodox Christians.—Hostility to western civilization.—"According to an apparently authentic report in the Cracow paper 'Czas,' confirmed by later publications, the Emperor Alexander II. had signed the very morning of the day on which he was murdered a Ukase addressed to the Senate, by which a committee was to be appointed for realising Count Loris Melikow's project of a general representative assembly composed of delegates from the provincial assemblies. On March 20th Alexander III. convoked a grand council of the principal dignitaries, asking their opinion on Loris Melikow's proposal. A lively discussion took place, of which the 'Czas' gives a detailed account. . . . The Emperor, thanking the members, said that the majority had declared for the convening of an assembly elected by the nation for discussing the affairs of the State, adding, 'I share this opinion of the majority, and wish that the reform Ukase shall be published as under the patronage of my father, to whom the initiative of this reform is due.' The Ukase, however, was not published, Podobenoszew and Ignatiew having succeeded in discrediting it in the eyes of the Czar, asserting that it would only create excitement and increase the existing fermentation. On May 13th a manifesto appeared, in which the Czar declared his will 'to keep firmly the reins in obedience to the voice of God, and, in the belief in the force and truth of autocratic power, to fortify that power and to guard it against all encroachments.' A few days later Count Ignatiew, the head of the Slavophil party, was appointed Minister of the Interior, and by-and-by the other more liberal Ministers of Alexander II. disappeared. By far the most important personage under the present government is Podobenoszew, High Procurator of the Holy Synod, an office equivalent to a Minister of Public Worship for the State Church. Laborious and of unblemished integrity, this man is a fanatic by conviction. Under Alexander II., who was too much of a European to like him, he had but a secondary position, but under his pupil, the present Emperor, he has become all-powerful,

the more so because his orthodoxy wears the national garb, and he insists that the break-down of the Nicolas I. system was only caused through governing with Ministers of German origin. He is seconded by Count Tolstoi, the Minister of Internal Affairs (who replaced the more liberal Saburow), to whom belong the questions concerning the foreign, i. e., non-orthodox, confessions. These two, supported by the Minister of Justice, Manasseïn, have enacted persecutions against Catholics, Uniates, Protestants, and Jews [see JEWS: 19TH CENTURY], which seem incredible in our age, but which are well attested. Thousands of persons who have committed no wrong other than that of being faithful to their inherited creed have been driven from their homes, and exiled to Siberia, or to distant regions without any means of livelihood. As regards Catholics, these measures are principally directed against the clergy; but the Uniates, i. e., the Catholics who have the Slav liturgy, are unsparingly deported if they refuse to have their children baptised by an orthodox Pope, and this is done with men, women, and children, peasants and merchants. Twenty thousand Uniates alone have been removed from the western provinces to Szaratow. Those who remain at home have Cossacks quartered upon them, and all sorts of compulsory means are used to stamp out this sect. . . . It is pretty certain that Alexander III. is ignorant of the atrocities committed in his name, for he is not a man to sanction deliberate injustice or to tolerate persons of manifest impurity in important offices. Though the Czar insists upon having personally honest Ministers, mere honesty is not sufficient for governing a great empire. Truth does not penetrate to the ear of the autocrat; the Russian Press does not reflect public opinion with its currents, but is simply the speaking-tube of the reigning coterie, which has suppressed all papers opposed to it, while the foreign Press is only allowed to enter mutilated by the censorship. Some people have, indeed, the privilege to read foreign papers in their original shape, but the Autocrat of All the Russias does not belong to them. . . . The Emperor is peaceful and will not hear of war: he has, in fact, submitted to many humiliations arising from Russia's conduct towards Bulgaria. . . . With all this, however, he is surrounded by Panslavists and allows them to carry on an underground warfare against the Balkan States. . . . He is strongly opposed to all Western ideas of civilisation, very irritable, and unflinching in his personal dislikes, as he has shown in the case of Prince Alexander of Battenberg; and, with his narrow views, he is unable to calculate the bearing of his words and actions, which often amount to direct provocation against his neighbours. If, nevertheless, tolerable relations with England, Austria, and Germany have been maintained, this is for the most part the merit of M. de Giers, the Foreign Secretary, an unpretending, cautious, and personally reliable man of business, whose influence with the Czar lies in the cleverness with which he appears not to exercise any."—Prof. Geffcken, *Russia under Alexander III.* (*New Review, Sept.*, 1891).

ALSO IN: H. von Samson-Himmelstierna, *Russia under Alexander III.*

A. D. 1894.—Death of Alexander III.—Accession of Nicholas II.—The Czar Alexander III. died on the 1st of November, 1894, at Livadia, and the accession of his eldest son, who ascends the throne as Nicholas II., was officially proclaimed at St. Petersburg on the following day. The new autocrat was born in 1868. He is to wed the Princess Alix of Hesse Darmstadt.

RUSSIA, Great, Little, White, and Black.—"Little Russia consists of the governments of Podolia, Volhynia, Kief, Tchernigof, Poltava, and Kharkof. . . . To protect Poland from Tartar raids, the Polish king entrusted to the keeping of the Cossacks the whole south-east frontier of Poland, the former Grand Duchy of Kief, which acquired the name of Ukraine, 'border land,' and also of Little Russia, in contradistinction to the Grand Duchy of Moscow or Great Russia [see COSSACKS]. . . . The provinces of Moghilef, Minsk, and Vitebsk are popularly known by the name of White Russia. . . . The peaceful, industrious, good tempered White Russians are descendants of the old Slav race of the Krevitchi. . . . The name of 'the land of the Krevitchi,' by which White Russia was called in the 11th century, died out on the rise of the Principalities of Polotsk, Misteslavsk, and Minsk, which belonged first to Kief, next to Lithuania, and later still to Poland."—H. M. Chester, *Russia, Past and Present, pp.* 225, 228, 270-271.—"The epithet of 'White,' applied also to the Muscovite Russians in the sense of 'free,' at the time when they were rescued from the Tatar yoke, has been the special designation of the Russians of the Upper Dnieper only since the end of the 14th century. At first applied by the Poles to all the Lithuanian possessions torn from the Muscovites, it was afterwards used in a more restricted sense. Catherine II. gave the name of White Russia to the present provinces of Vitebsk and Moghilov, and Nicholas abolished the expression altogether, since when it has lost all its political significance, while preserving its ethnical value. . . . The term 'White' is generally supposed to refer to the colour of their dress in contradistinction to the 'Black Russians,' between the Pripet and Niemen, who form the ethnical transition from the Little to the White Russians. . . . The terms Little Russia (Malo-Russia, Lesser Russia), Ukrania, Ruthenia, have never had any definite limits, constantly shifting with the vicissitudes of history, and even with the administrative divisions. . . . The name itself of Little Russia appears for the first time in the Byzantine chronicles of the 13th century in association with Galicia and Volhynia, after which it was extended to the Middle Dnieper, or Kiyovia. In the same way Ukrania—that is 'Frontier'—was first applied to Podolia to distinguish it from Galicia, and afterwards to the southern provinces of the Lithuanian state, between the Bug and Dnieper."—É. Reclus, *The Earth and its Inhabitants: Europe, v.* 5. *pp.* 282-290.

RUSSIAN AMERICA. See ALASKA.

RUSTCHUK, Battle of (1594). See BALKAN AND DANUBIAN STATES: 14-18TH CENTURIES (ROUMANIA, ETC.).

RUTENI, The.—The Ruteni were a Gallic tribe, who bordered on the Roman Gallia Provincia, between the Cevennes and the Cadurci occupying the district of France called Rouergue before the Revolution.—G. Long, *Decline of the Roman Republic, v.* 4, *ch.* 17.

RUTENNU, The. See ROTENNU.

RÜTLI, OR GRÜTLI, The Meadow of. See SWITZERLAND: THE THREE FOREST CANTONS.

RUTULIANS, The. See LATIUM.

RUTUPIÆ.—The principal Kentish seaport of Roman Britain; now Richborough. It was celebrated for its oysters.—T. Wright, *Celt, Roman and Saxon, ch.* 5.

ALSO IN: C. Roach Smith, *Antiq. of Richborough.*—See ENGLAND: A. D. 449–473.

RUWARD OF BRABANT.—"This office was one of great historical dignity, but somewhat anomalous in its functions. . . . A Ruward was not exactly dictator, although his authority was universal. He was not exactly protector, nor governor, nor stadholder. His functions . . . were commonly conferred on the natural heir to the sovereignty — therefore more lofty than those of ordinary stadholders."— J. L. Motley, *The Rise of the Dutch Republic, pt.* 5, *ch.* 4.

RYE-HOUSE PLOT, The. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1681–1683.

RYOTS OF BENGAL, The. See INDIA: A. D. 1785–1793.

RYSWICK, The Peace of. See FRANCE: A. D. 1695–1696; and 1697.

S.

SAARBRÜCK, OR SAARBRÜCKEN: United to France (1680). See FRANCE: A. D. 1679–1681.

SAARBRÜCK, OR SAARBRÜCKEN, Battle of. See FRANCE: A. D. 1870 (JULY—AUGUST).

SABÆANS, The. See ARABIA: ANCIENT SUCCESSION AND FUSION OF RACES.

SABANA DE LA CRUZ, Battle of (1859). See VENEZUELA: A. D. 1829–1886.

SABBATHAISTS.—A Jewish sect, believers in the Messianic pretensions of one Sabbathai Sevi, of Smyrna, who made an extraordinary commotion in the Jewish world about the middle of the 17th century, and who finally embraced Mahometanism.—H. H. Milman, *Hist. of the Jews, bk.* 28.

SABELLIANS, The. See SABINES; also, ITALY: ANCIENT.

SABELLIANS, The sect of the. See NOËTIANS.

SABINE CROSS ROADS, OR MANSFIELD, Battle of. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1864 (MARCH—MAY: LOUISIANA).

SABINE WARS, The.—The Roman historians — Dionysius, Plutarch, Livy, and others — gave credit to traditions of a long and dangerous war, or series of wars, with the Sabines, following the expulsion of the Tarquins from Rome and the founding of the Republic. But modern skeptical criticism has left little ground for any part of the story of these wars. It seems to have been derived from the chronicles of an ancient family, the Valerian family, and, as a recent writer has said, it is suspicious that "a Valerius never holds a magistracy but there is a Sabine war." Ihne conjectures that some annalist of the Valerian family used the term Sabine in relating the wars of the Romans with the Latins, and with the Tarquins, struggling to regain their lost throne, and that this gave a start to the whole fictitious narrative of Sabine wars.— W. Ihne, *Hist. of Rome, bk.* 1, *ch.* 12.

SABINE WOMEN, The Rape of the. See ROME: B. C. 753–510.

SABINES, OR SABELLIANS, The.—"The greatest of the Italian nations was the Sabellian. Under this name we include the Sabines, who are said by tradition to have been the progenitors of the whole race, the Samnites, the Picenians, Vestinians, Marsians, Marrucinians, Pelignians, and Frentanians. This race seems to have been naturally given to a pastoral life, and therefore fixed their early settlements in the upland valleys of the Apennines. Pushing gradually along this central range, they penetrated downwards towards the Gulf of Tarentum; and as their population became too dense to find support in their native hills, bands of warrior youths issued forth to settle in the richer plains below. Thus they mingled with the Opican and Pelasgian races of the south, and formed new tribes known by the names of Apulians, Lucanians, and Campanians. These more recent tribes, in turn, threatened the Greek colonies on the coast. . . . It is certain that the nation we call Roman was more than half Sabellian. Traditional history . . . attributes the conquest of Rome to a Sabine tribe. Some of her kings were Sabine; the name borne by her citizens was Sabine; her religion was Sabine; most of her institutions in war and peace were Sabine; and therefore it may be concluded that the language of the Roman people differed from that of Latium Proper by its Sabine elements, though this difference died out again as the Latin communities were gradually absorbed into the territory of Rome."— H. G. Liddell, *Hist. of Rome, introd., sect.* 2.— See, also, ITALY, ANCIENT; and LATIUM.

SABINIAN, Pope, A. D. 604–606.

SABRINA.—The ancient name of the Severn river.

SAC AND SOC.—A term used in early English and Norman times to signify grants of jurisdiction to individual land-owners. The manorial court-leets were the products of these grants. — W. Stubbs, *Const. Hist. of Eng., ch.* 7, *sect.* 73. —See, also, MANORS.

SAC, OR SAUK, INDIANS, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: ALGONQUIAN FAMILY, and SACS, FOXES, ETC.

SACÆ, The.—"The Sacæ were neighbours of the Hyrcanians, the Parthians, and the Bactrians in the steppes of the Oxus. Herodotus tells us that the Sacæ were a nation of the tribe of the Scyths, and that their proper name was Amyrgians; the Persians called all the Scythians Sacæ."— M. Duncker, *Hist. of Antiquity, bk.* 8, *ch.* 2 (*v.* 5).—See, also, SCYTHIANS.

SACERDOTES. — These were the public priests of the ancient Romans, who performed the 'sacra publica' or religious rites for the people, at public expense.— E. Guhl and W. Koner, *Life of the Greeks and Romans, sect.* 103.

SACHEM.— SAGAMORE. —"Each totem of the Lenape [or Delaware Indians of North America] recognized a chieftain, called sachem, 'sakima,' a word found in most Algonkin dialects, with slight variations (Chip., 'ogima,' Cree, 'okimaw,' Pequot, 'sachimma'), and derived from a root 'ŏki,' signifying above in

space, and, by a transfer frequent in all languages, above in power. . . . It appears from Mr. Morgan's inquiries, that at present and of later years, 'the office of sachem is hereditary in the gens, but elective among its members.' Loskiel, however, writing on the excellent authority of Zeisberger, states explicitly that the chief of each totem was selected and inaugurated by those of the remaining two. By common and ancient consent, the chief selected from the Turtle totem was head chief of the whole Lenape nation. The chieftains were the 'peace chiefs.' They could neither go to war themselves, nor send nor receive the war belt—the ominous string of dark wampum, which indicated that the tempest of strife was to be let loose. . . . War was declared by the people at the instigation of the 'war captains,' valorous braves of any birth or family who had distinguished themselves by personal prowess."—D. G. Brinton, *The Lenape and their Legends, ch.* 3.—"At the institution of the League [of the Iroquois] fifty permanent sachemships were created, with appropriate names; and in the sachems who held these titles were vested the supreme powers of the confederacy. . . . The sachems themselves were equal in rank and authority, and instead of holding separate territorial jurisdictions, their powers were joint, and coextensive with the League. As a safeguard against contention and fraud, each sachem was 'raised up' and invested with his title by a council of all the sachems, with suitable forms and ceremonies. . . . The sachemships were distributed unequally between the five nations, but without thereby giving to either a preponderance of political power. Nine of them were assigned to the Mohawk nation, nine to the Oneida, fourteen to the Onondaga, ten to the Cayuga and eight to the Seneca. The sachems united formed the Council of the League, the ruling body, in which resided the executive, legislative and judicial authority."—L. H. Morgan, *The League of the Iroquois, bk.* 1, *ch.* 3.—"The New-England Indians had functionaries; . . . the higher class known as sachems, the subordinate, or those of inferior note or smaller jurisdiction, as sagamores. . . . This is the distinction commonly made (Hutchinson, Mass., I. 410). But Williamson (Maine, I. 494) reverses it; Dudley (Letter to the Countess of Lincoln) says, 'Sagamore, so are the kings with us called, as they are sachems southward' (that is, in Plymouth); and Gookin (Mass. Hist. Coll., I. 154) speaks of the two titles of office as equivalent."—J. G. Palfrey, *Hist. of New Eng., v.* 1, *ch.* 1, *and foot-note.*

SACHEVERELL, Henry: Impeachment of. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1710–1712.

SACKETT'S HARBOR: Naval headquarters in the war of 1812. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1812 (SEPTEMBER—NOVEMBER).

SÄCKINGEN: Capture by Duke Bernhard (1637). See GERMANY: A. D. 1634–1639.

SACRAMENTARIANS. See SWITZERLAND: A. D. 1528–1531.

SACRED BAND OF CARTHAGE. See CARTHAGE, THE DOMINION OF.

SACRED BAND OF THEBES. See THEBES, GREECE: B. C. 378.

SACRED MONTH OF THE CHARTISTS, The. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1838–1842.

SACRED MOUNT AT ROME, The. See ROME: B. C. 494–492.

SACRED PROMONTORY, The.—The southwestern extremity of Spain—Cape St. Vincent—was anciently called the Sacred Promontory, and supposed by early geographers to be the extreme western point of the known world. —E. H. Bunbury, *Hist. of Ancient Geog., ch.* 28, *pt.* 1 (*v.* 2).

SACRED ROADS IN GREECE.—"After the chariot races came into vogue [at the sacred festivals and games] these equally necessitated good carriage roads, which it was not easy to make in a rocky locality like Delphi. Thus arose the sacred roads, along which the gods themselves were said to have first passed, as Apollo once came through pathless tracks to Delphi. . . . Hence the art of road-making and of building bridges, which deprived the wild mountain streams of their dangers, took its first origin from the national sanctuaries, especially from those of Apollo. While the foot-paths led across the mountain ridges, the carriage-roads followed the ravines which the water had formed. The rocky surface was leveled, and ruts hollowed out which, carefully smoothed, served as tracks in which the wheels rolled on without obstruction. This style of roads made it necessary, in order to a more extended intercourse, to establish an equal gauge, since otherwise the festive as well as the racing chariots would have been prevented from visiting the various sanctuaries. And since as a matter of fact, as far as the influence of Delphi extended in the Peloponnesus and in central Greece, the same gauge of 5 ft. 4 in. demonstrably prevailed, not merely the extension, but also the equalization, of the net-work of Greek roads took its origin from Delphi."—E. Curtius, *Hist. of Greece, bk.* 2, *ch.* 4.

SACRED TRUCE, The. See OLYMPIC GAMES.

SACRED WAR, The First. See ATHENS: B. C. 610–586, and DELPHI.

The Second.—The Phocians, B. C. 449, counting on the support of Athens, whose allies they were, undertook to acquire possession of the sacred and wealthy city of Delphi. The Spartans sent an army to the defense of the sanctuary and expelled them; whereupon the Athenians sent another and restored them.—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece, pt.* 2, *ch.* 45.

The Ten Years. See GREECE: B. C. 357–336.

SACRED WAY AT ATHENS.—The road which led from the great gate of Athens called Dipylum straight to Eleusis, along which the festive processions moved, was called the Sacred Way.—W. M. Leake, *Topography of Athens, sect.* 2.

SACRED WAY AT ROME, The. See VIA SACRA.

SACRIPORTUS, Battle of (B. C. 83). See ROME: B. C. 88–78.

SADDUCEES, The.—"There is a tradition that the name of Sadducee was derived from Zadok, a disciple of Antigonus of Socko. But the statement is not earlier than the seventh century after the Christian Era, and the person seems too obscure to have originated so widespread a title. It has been also ingeniously con-

jectured that the name, as belonging to the whole priestly class, is derived from the famous high priest of the time of Solomon. But of this there is no trace in history or tradition. It is more probable that, as the Pharisees derived their name from the virtue of Isolation (pharishah) from the Gentile world on which they most prided themselves, so the Sadducees derived theirs from their own special virtue of Righteousness (zadikah), that is, the fulfillment of the Law, with which, as its guardians and representatives of the law, they were specially concerned. The Sadducees — whatever be the derivation of the word — were less of a sect than a class."—Dean Stanley, *Lect's on the Hist. of the Jewish Church, lect.* 49.—"At the time when we first meet with them [the Sadducees] in history, that is to say, under Jonathan the Asmonean [B. C. 159–144 — see JEWS: B. C. 166–40], they were, though in a modified form, the heirs and successors of the Hellenists [see JEWS: B. C. 332–167]. . . . Hellenism was conquered under the Asmoneans, and beaten out of the field, and a new gush of Jewish patriotism and zeal for the law had taken its place. The Sadducees, who from the first appear as a school suited for the times, including the rich and educated statesmen, adopted the prevailing tone among the people. They took part in the services and sacrifices of the temple, practised circumcision, observed the Sabbath, and so professed to be real Jews and followers of the law, but the law rightly understood, and restored to its simple text and literal sense. They repudiated, they said, the authority of the new teachers of the law (now the Pharisees), and of the body of tradition with which they had encircled the law. In this tradition they of course included all that was burdensome to themselves. . . . The peculiar doctrines of the Sadducees obviously arose from the workings of the Epicurean philosophy, which had found special acceptance in Syria. They admitted indeed the creation, as it seems, but denied all continuous operation of God in the world. . . . The Sadducees proved they were real followers of Epicurus, by denying the life of the soul after death. The soul, they said, passes away with the body. . . . The mass of the people stood aloof from the Sadducees, whom they regarded with mistrust and aversion."—J. J. I. Döllinger, *The Gentile and the Jew in the Courts of the Temple of Christ, v.* 2, *pp.* 302–303.

ALSO IN: E. Schürer, *Hist. of the Jewish People in the Time of Christ, sect.* 26 (*div.* 2, *v.* 2).

SADOWA, OR KÖNIGGRÄTZ, Battle of. See GERMANY: A. D. 1866.

SAFFARY DYNASTY, The. See SAMANIDES.

SAGAMORE. See SACHEM.

SAGAMOSO, Battle of (1819). See COLOMBIAN STATES: A. D. 1810–1819.

SAGARTIANS, The. — A nomadic people, described by Herodotus, who wandered on the western borders of the great Iranian desert — the desert region of modern Persia.

SAGAS. See NORMANS. — NORTHMEN: A. D. 860–1100.

SAGGENASH, The. See YANKEE.

SAGUENAY. See CANADA: NAMES.

SAGUNTUM, Capture of, by Hannibal. See PUNIC WAR, THE SECOND.

SAHAPTINS, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: NEZ PERCÉS.

SAHAY, Battle of. See AUSTRIA: A. D. 1742 (JUNE—DECEMBER).

SAILOR'S CREEK, Battle of. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1865 (APRIL: VIRGINIA).

SAIM. See TIMAR.

SAINT ALBANS (England). Origin of. See VERULAMIUM.

A. D. 1455-1461.—Battles of York and Lancaster.— The town of St. Albans, in England, was the scene of two battles in the lamentable Wars of the Roses. The first collision of the long conflict between Lancaster and York occurred in its streets on the 23d of May, 1455, when King Henry VI. was taken prisoner by the Duke of York and 5,000 to 8,000 of his supporters were slain. Six years later, on the 17th of February, 1461, the contending forces met again in the streets of St. Albans with a different result. The Yorkists were put to flight by the Lancastrians under Queen Margaret. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1455–1471.

SAINT ALBANS CONFEDERATE RAID. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1864 (OCTOBER) THE ST. ALBANS RAID.

SAINT ALBANS FENIAN RAID. See CANADA: A. D. 1866–1871.

SAINT ANDREW, The Russian order of.—An order of knighthood instituted in 1698 by Peter the Great.

The Scottish order of. —"To keep pace with other sovereigns, who affected forming orders of knighthood, in which they themselves should preside, like Arthur at his round table, or Charlemagne among his paladins, James [IV. of Scotland, A. D. 1488–1513] established the order of Saint Andrew, assuming the badge of the thistle, which since that time has been the national emblem of Scotland."—Sir W. Scott, *Hist. of Scotland, ch.* 21.

SAINT ANDREWS, Siege of the Castle of. See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1546.

SAINT ANGELO, Castle. See CASTLE ST. ANGELO.

SAINT AUGUSTINE, Canons of. See AUSTIN CANONS.

SAINT AUGUSTINE, Florida: A. D. 1565. —Founded by the Spaniards. See FLORIDA: A. D. 1565.

A. D. 1701.—Attack from South Carolina. See SOUTH CAROLINA: A. D. 1701–1706.

A. D. 1740. — Unsuccessful attack by the English of Georgia and Carolina. See GEORGIA: A. D. 1738–1743.

A. D. 1862. — Temporary occupation by Union forces. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1862 (FEBRUARY—APRIL: GEORGIA—FLORIDA).

SAINT BARTHOLOMEW'S DAY, The Massacre of. See FRANCE: A. D. 1572 (AUGUST).

SAINT BRICE'S DAY, The Massacre of. See ENGLAND: A. D. 979–1016.

SAINT CHRISTOPHER, The Island: Ceded to England (1713). See UTRECHT: A. D. 1712–1714.

SAINT CLAIR, General Arthur. — Campaign against the Indians, and defeat. See NORTHWEST TERRITORY: A. D. 1790–1795.

SAINT CLOUD DECREE, The. See FRANCE: A. D. 1806–1810.

SAINT DENIS (France), Battle of (1567). See FRANCE: A. D. 1563–1570.

SAINT DENIS (Belgium), Battle of (1678). See NETHERLANDS (HOLLAND): A. D. 1674–1678.

SAINT DIDIER, Battle of. See FRANCE: A. D. 1814 (JANUARY—MARCH).

SAINT DOMINGO, OR HAYTI, The Island. See HAYTI.

SAINT DOMINGO, The Republic. See HAYTI: A. D. 1804–1880.

SAINT GEORGE, Bank of. See MONEY AND BANKING: GENOA; also GENOA: A. D. 1407–1448.

SAINT GEORGE, The order of.—Founded by Catherine II. of Russia in 1769.

SAINT GERMAIN-EN-LAYE, Peace of (1570). See FRANCE: A. D. 1563–1570.

SAINT GERMAINS, The French court. See FRANCE: A. D. 1647–1648.

The Jacobite court.—When James II., driven from England by the Revolution of 1688, took refuge in France, he was received with great hospitality by Louis XIV., who assigned to the exiled king the palace of Saint-Germains for his residence, with a pension or allowance which enabled him to maintain a regal court of imposing splendor. "There was scarcely in all Europe a residence more enviably situated than that which the generous Lewis had assigned to his suppliants. The woods were magnificent, the air clear and salubrious, the prospects extensive and cheerful. No charm of rural life was wanting; and the towers of the greatest city of the Continent were visible in the distance. The royal apartments were richly adorned with tapestry and marquetry, vases of silver, and mirrors in gilded frames. A pension of more than 40,000 pounds sterling was annually paid to James from the French treasury. He had a guard of honour composed of some of the finest soldiers in Europe. . . . But over the mansion and the domain brooded a constant gloom, the effect, partly of bitter regrets and of deferred hopes, but chiefly of the abject superstition which had taken complete possession of his own mind, and which was affected by all those who aspired to his favour. His palace wore the aspect of a monastery. . . . Thirty or forty ecclesiastics were lodged in the building; and their apartments were eyed with envy by noblemen and gentlemen who had followed the fortunes of their Sovereign, and who thought it hard that, when there was so much room under his roof, they should be forced to sleep in the garrets of the neighbouring town. . . . All the saints of the royal household were praying for each other and backbiting each other from morning to night."—Lord Macaulay, *Hist. of Eng., ch.* 20 (*v.* 4).

SAINT GOTHARD, Battle of (1664). See HUNGARY: A. D. 1660–1664.

SAINT GREGORY, Order of.—Instituted in 1831 by Pope Gregory XVI.

SAINT HELENA, Napoleon's captivity at. See FRANCE: A. D. 1815 (JUNE—AUGUST).

SAINT ILDEFONSO, Treaty of. See ARGENTINE REPUBLIC: A. D. 1580–1777; and LOUISIANA: A. D. 1798–1803.

SAINT ILDEFONSO, University of. See EDUCATION, MEDIÆVAL: SPAIN AND PORTUGAL.

SAINT JAGO, Knights of the order of. See CALATRAVA.

SAINT JAMES, The Palace and Court of.—"Of the British Monarchy the official and diplomatic seat is St. James', a dingy and shabby pile of brick, which by its meanness, compared with the Tuileries and Versailles, aptly symbolizes the relation of the power which built it to that of the Monarchy of Louis XIV. . . . At St. James' are still held the Levees. But those rooms having been found too small for the prodigiously increasing crowds of ladies, foreign and colonial, who pant, by passing under the eye of Royalty, to obtain the baptism of fashion, the Drawing-Rooms are now held in Buckingham Palace. . . . The modern town residence of Royalty, Buckingham Palace, is large without being magnificent, and devoid of interest of any kind, historical or architectural."—Goldwin Smith, *A Trip to England, p.* 54.

SAINT JAMES OF COMPOSTELLA, Knights of. See CALATRAVA.

SAINT JEAN D'ACRE. See ACRE.

SAINT JOHN, Knights of; or Hospitallers. See HOSPITALLERS.

SAINT JOHN OF THE LATERAN, Order of.—An order of knighthood instituted in 1560 by Pope Pius IV.

SAINT JUST, and the French Revolutionary Committee of Public Safety. See FRANCE: A. D. 1793 (JUNE—OCTOBER), to 1794 (JULY).

SAINT LAWRENCE: Discovery and naming of the River by Jacques Cartier. See AMERICA: A. D. 1534–1535.

SAINT LAZARUS, Knights of.—"Some historians of the order of St. Lazarus have traced its origin to a supposed association of Christians in the first century against the persecution of their Jewish and Pagan enemies. This account is fabulous. It appears certain, however, that in very early times Christian charity founded establishments for the sick. . . . Lazarus became their tutelary saint and the buildings were styled Lazarettos. One of those hospitals was in existence at Jerusalem at the time of the first crusade. It was a religious order, as well as a charitable institution, and followed the rule of St. Augustin. For purposes of defence against the Muselman tyrants, the members of the society became soldiers, and insensibly they formed themselves into distinct bodies of those who attended the sick, and those who mingled with the world. The cure of lepers was their first object, and they not only received lepers into their order, for the benefit of charity, but their grand master was always to be a man who was afflicted with the disorder, the removal whereof formed the purpose of their institution. The cavaliers who were not lepers, and were in a condition to bear arms, were the allies of the Christian kings of Palestine. . . . The habits of those knights is not known; it only appears that the crosses on their breasts were always green, in opposition to those of the knights of St. John, which were white, and the red crosses of the Templars. . . . But neither the names nor the exploits of the knights of St. Lazarus often appear in the history of the Crusades."—C. Mills, *Hist. of the Crusades, ch.* 8, *with foot-notes.*

SAINT LEGER'S EXPEDITION. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1777 (JULY—OCTOBER).

SAINT LOUIS, Missouri: A. D. 1764.—The founding of the city.—"St. Louis had arisen out of the transfer of the east bank of the Mississippi to Great Britain [see SEVEN YEARS WAR: THE TREATIES]. Rather than live as aliens, under English laws, many French settlers went with Pierre Laclede, across the Mississippi, to a place already nicknamed by them Pain Court, where, in February, 1764, they founded a new town with the name of St. Louis, in honor of Louis XV. These people were mostly French Canadians."—S. A. Drake, *The Making of the Great West, p.* 179.—See, also, ILLINOIS: A. D. 1765.

A. D. 1861.—Events at the outbreak of the rebellion.—The capture of Camp Jackson. See MISSOURI: A. D. 1861 (FEBRUARY—JULY).

A. D. 1864. — General Price's attempt against. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1864 (MARCH — OCTOBER: ARKANSAS — MISSOURI).

SAINT LOUIS, The Order of.—An order of knighthood instituted in 1693 by Louis XIV. of France. See FRANCE: A. D. 1693 (JULY).

SAINT MAHÉ, Battle of.—A fierce naval fight, April 24, 1293, off St. Mahé, on the coast of Brittany, between English and French fleets, both of which were put afloat without open authority from their respective governments. The French were beaten with a loss of 8,000 men and 180 ships.—C. H. Pearson, *Hist. of Eng. during the Early and Middle Ages, v.* 2, *ch.* 13.

SAINT MALO: Abortive English expeditions against. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1758 (JUNE—AUGUST).

SAINT MARK, The winged lion of. See LION OF ST. MARK, and VENICE: A. D. 829.

SAINT MARKS, Jackson's capture of. See FLORIDA: A. D. 1816–1818.

SAINT MICHAEL, Knights of the Order of, in France.—"Louis XI. [of France] determined on instituting an order of chivalry himself. It was to be select in its membership, limited in its number, generous in its professions, and he fondly hoped the Garter and Fleece would soon sink into insignificance compared to the Order of Saint Michael. The first brethren were named from the highest families in France; the remaining great feudatories, who had preserved some relics of their hereditary independence, were fixed upon to wear this mark of the suzerain's friendship. But when they came to read the oaths of admission, they found that the Order of St. Michael was in reality a bond of stronger obligation than the feudal laws had ever enjoined. It was a solemn association for the prevention of disobedience to the sovereign. . . . The brotherhood of noble knights sank, in the degrading treatment of its founder, into a confederation of spies."—J. White, *Hist. of France, ch.* 7.

In Portugal. See PORTUGAL: A. D. 1095–1325.

SAINT MICHAEL AND SAINT GEORGE, The Order of.—A British Order of Knighthood, founded in 1818, "for the purpose of bestowing marks of Royal favour on the most meritorious of the Ionians [then under the protection of Great Britain] and Maltese, as well as on British subjects who may have served with distinction in the Ionian Isles or the Mediterranean Sea."—Sir B. Burke, *Book of the Orders of Knighthood, p.* 107.

SAINT OMER: A. D. 1638.—Unsuccessful siege by the French. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1635–1638.

A. D. 1677.—Taken by Louis XIV. See NETHERLANDS (HOLLAND): A. D. 1674–1678.

A. D. 1679.—Ceded to France. See NIMEGUEN, THE PEACE OF.

SAINT PATRICK, The order of.—An order of knighthood instituted in 1783 by George III. of England.

SAINT PAUL, Republic of. See BRAZIL: A. D. 1531–1641.

SAINT PAUL'S SCHOOL. See EDUCATION, RENAISSANCE: ENGLAND.

SAINT PETER'S CHURCH AT ROME.—"The first church which existed on or near the site of the present building was the oratory founded in A. D. 90, by Anacletus, bishop of Rome, who is said to have been ordained by St. Peter himself, and who thus marked the spot where many Christian martyrs had suffered in the circus of Nero, and where St. Peter was buried after his crucifixion. In 306 Constantine the Great yielded to the request of Pope Sylvester, and began the erection of a basilica on this spot, labouring with his own hands at the work. . . . Of the old basilica, the crypt is now the only remnant. . . . Its destruction was first planned by Nicholas V. (1450), but was not carried out till the time of Julius II., who in 1506 began the new St. Peter's from designs of Bramante. . . . The next Pope, Leo X., obtained a design for a church in the form of a Latin cross from Raphael, which was changed, after his death (on account of expense) to a Greek cross, by Baldassare Peruzzi, who only lived to complete the tribune. Paul III. (1534) employed Antonio di Sangallo as an architect, who returned to the design of a Latin cross, but died before he could carry out any of his intentions. Giulio Romano succeeded him and died also. Then the pope, 'being inspired by God,' says Vasari, sent for Michael Angelo, then in his seventy-second year, who continued the work under Julius III., returning to the plan of a Greek cross, enlarging the tribune and transepts, and beginning the dome on a new plan, which he said would 'raise the Pantheon in the air.'. . . The present dome is due to Giacomo della Porta, who brought the great work to a conclusion in 1590, under Sixtus V. . . . The church was dedicated by Urban VIII., November 18th, 1626; the colonnade added by Alexander VII., 1667, the sacristy by Pius VI., in 1780. The building of the present St. Peter's extended altogether over 176 years, and its expenses were so great that Julius II. and Leo X. were obliged to meet them by the sale of indulgences, which led to the Reformation. The expense of the main building alone has been estimated at £10,000,000. The annual expense of repairs is £6,300."—A. J. C. Hare, *Walks in Rome, ch.* 15.

ALSO IN: H. Grimm, *Life of Michael Angelo, ch.* 15–16.

SAINT PETERSBURG: The founding of the city. See RUSSIA: A. D. 1703–1718.

SAINT PRIVAT, OR GRAVELOTTE, Battle of. See FRANCE: A. D. 1870 (JULY—AUGUST).

SAINT QUENTIN: Origin of the town. See BELGÆ.

SAINT QUENTIN, Battle and siege of (1557). See FRANCE: A. D. 1547–1559.....**Battle of (1871).** See FRANCE: A. D. 1870–1871.

SAINT SEBASTIAN, Siege and capture of (1813). See SPAIN: A. D. 1812–1814.

SAINT STEPHEN, The Apostolic order.—This, the Hungarian national order of knighthood, was founded by Maria Theresa, on the day (May 5, 1764) when the Archduke, afterwards the Emperor Joseph II., was crowned King of Rome.

SAINT STEPHEN, The Crown of.—The crown of Hungary. See HUNGARY: A. D. 972–1114.

SAINT STEPHEN'S CHAPEL.—The Chamber of the House of Commons. See WESTMINSTER PALACE.

SAINT THOMAS OF ACRE, The Knights of.—"This was a little body of men who had formed themselves into a semi-religious order on the model of the Hospitallers. In the third Crusade, one William, an English priest, chaplain to Ralph de Diceto, Dean of S. Paul's, had devoted himself to the work of burying the dead at Acre, as the Hospitallers had given themselves at first to the work of tending the sick. He had built himself a little chapel there, and bought ground for a cemetery; like a thorough Londoner of the period, he had called it after S. Thomas the Martyr; and, somehow or other, as his design was better known, the family of the martyr seem to have approved of it; the brother-in-law and sister of Becket became founders and benefactors, and a Hospital of S. Thomas the Martyr of Canterbury, of Acre, was built in London itself on the site of the house where the martyr was born. . . . They [the knights] had their proper dress and cross: according to Favin their habit was white, and the cross a full red cross charged with a white scallop; but the existing cartulary of the order describes the habit simply as a mantle with a cross of red and white. . . . The Chronicle of the Teutonic knights, in relating the capture of Acre, places the knights of S. Thomas at the head of the 5,000 soldiers whom the king of England had sent to Palestine, and Herman Corner, who however wrote a century later, mentions them amongst the defenders of Acre. We know from their cartulary that they had lands in Yorkshire, Middlesex, Surrey, and Ireland."—W. Stubbs, *Seventeen Lectures on the Study of Medieval and Modern History, lect.* 8.

SAINT VALERY.—The port, at the mouth of the Somme, from which the fleet of William the Conqueror sailed for England, September 27, A. D. 1066.

SAINT VINCENT, Naval battle of. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1797.

SAINTONGE, Origin of the name of. See PICTONES.

SAIONES.—"The Saiones were apparently a class of men peculiar to the Ostrogothic monarchy [of Theodoric, in Italy]. More honoured than the Roman lictor (who was but a menial servant of the magistrate), but hardly perhaps rising to the dignity of a sheriff or a marshal, they were, so to speak, the arms by which Royalty executed its will. If the Goths had to be summoned to battle with the Franks, a Saio carried round the stirring call to arms. If a Prætorian Prefect was abusing his power to take away his neighbour's lands by violence, a Saio was sent to remind him that under Theodoric not even Prætorian Prefects should be allowed to transgress the law. . . . The Saiones seem to have stood in a special relation to the King. They are generally called 'our Saiones,' sometimes 'our brave Saiones,' and the official virtue which is always credited to them (like the 'Sublimity' or the 'Magnificence' of more important personages) is 'Your Devotion.' One duty which was frequently entrusted to the Saio was the 'tuitio' of some wealthy and unwarlike Roman. It often happened that such a person, unable to protect himself against the rude assaults of sturdy Gothic neighbours, appealed to the King for protection. . . . The chief visible sign of the King's protection, and the most effective guarantee of its efficiency, was the stout Gothic soldier who as Saio was quartered in the wealthy Roman's house."—T. Hodgkin, *Italy and Her Invaders, bk.* 4, *ch.* 7 (*v.* 3).

SAJO, Battle of the (1241). See HUNGARY: A. D. 1114–1301.

SAKKARAH, Necropolis of.—The most ancient and important cemetery of Memphis, Egypt.—A. Mariette, *Monuments of Upper Egypt, p.* 86.

SAKKARAH, Tablet of.—An important list of Egyptian kings, found by M. Mariette and now preserved in the Museum of Cairo.—F. Lenormant, *Manual of Ancient Hist. of the East, bk.* 3, *ch.* 1 (*v.* 1).

SALADIN: The Empire of.—Among the revolutions which attended the breaking up of the empire of the Seljuk Turks was one that brought about the rise to power in Syria and Mesopotamia of a vigorous and capable soldier named Zenghi or Zengui. Zenghi and his son Noureddin acquired a wide dominion, with its capital, as it enlarged, shifting from Mossoul to Aleppo, from Aleppo to Damascus, and they were the first formidable enemies with whom the Christians of the Crusade settlements in Syria had to contend. The dynasty of sultans which they founded was one of those called Atabecks, or Atabegs, signifying "governors of the prince." Having found an opportunity (A. D. 1162–1168) to interfere in the affairs of Egypt, where the Fatimite caliphs were still nominally reigning, Noureddin sent thither one of his most trusted officers, Shiracouh, or Shirkoh, a Koord, and Shiracouh's nephew, Saladin,—then a young man, much addicted to elegant society and the life of pleasure, at Damascus. Shiracouh established his master's authority in Egypt—still leaving the puppet caliph of the Fatimites on his throne—and he was succeeded by Saladin, as the representative of the sultan Noureddin, and grand vizier of the caliph. But in 1171, the latter, being on his death-bed, was quietly deposed and the sovereignty of the Abbaside caliph of Bagdad was proclaimed. "This great 'coup d'état,' which won Egypt over to the Orthodox Mohammedan sect, and ultimately enabled Saladin to grasp the independent sovereignty of the country, was effected, as an Arab historian quaintly observes, 'so quietly, that not a brace of goats butted over it.'" Saladin had now

developed great talents as a ruler, and great ambitions, as well. On the death of Nouraddin, in 1174, he was prepared to seize the sultan's throne, and succeeded, after a short period of civil war, in making himself master of the whole Atabeg dominion. From that he went on to the conquest of Jerusalem, and the expulsion of the Christians from all Palestine, except Tyre and a small strip of coast. By his defense of that conquest against the crusaders of the Third Crusade, and by the decided superiority of character which he evinced, compared with his Christian antagonists, Richard Cœur de Lion and the rest, Saladin acquired surpassing renown in the western world and became a great figure in history. He died at Damascus, in March, 1193, in his fifty-seventh year. The dynasty which he founded was called the Ayoubite (or Aiyubite) dynasty, from the name of Saladin's father, Ayoub (Job), a native Koord of Davin.—W. Besant and E. H. Palmer, *Jerusalem, ch.* 16.—"Saladin gave no directions respecting the order of succession, and by this want of foresight prepared the ruin of his empire. One of his sons, Alaziz, who commanded in Egypt, caused himself to be proclaimed sultan of Cairo; another took possession of the sovereignty of Aleppo, and a third of the principality of Amath. Malek-Adel [called Seïf Eddin, the Sword of Religion, by which latter name, in the corrupted form Saphadin, he was known commonly to the crusaders], the brother of Saladin, assumed the throne of Mesopotamia and the countries in the neighbourhood of the Euphrates. The principal emirs, and all the princes of the race of the Ayoubites, made themselves masters of the cities and provinces of which they held the command. Afdhal [Almelek Alafdhal], eldest son of Saladin, was proclaimed sultan of Damascus. Master of Syria, and of the capital of a vast empire, sovereign of Jerusalem and Palestine, he appeared to have preserved something of the power of his father; but all fell into disorder and confusion." After some years of disorder and of war between the brothers, Malek Adel, or Saphadin, the more capable uncle of the young princes, gathered the reins of power into his hands and reunited most of the provinces of Saladin's empire. On his death, in 1217, the divisions and the disorder reappeared. The Ayoubite dynasty, however, held the throne at Cairo (to the dominion of which Palestine belonged) until 1250, when the last of the line was killed by his Mamelukes. The lesser princes of the divided empire were swept away soon after by the Mongol invasion. —J. F. Michaud, *Hist. of the Crusades, bks.* 9, 12–14.— See, also, JERUSALEM: A. D. 1149–1187.

SALADIN, The Tithe of.—"In England and in France, in order to defray expenses [of the Third Crusade], a tax called the Tithe of Saladin, consisting of a tenth part of all their goods, was levied on every person who did not take the Cross. . . . In every parish the Tithe of Saladin was raised in the presence of a priest, a Templar, a Hospitaller, a king's man, a baron's man and clerk, and a bishop's clerk."—W. Besant and E. H. Palmer, *Jerusalem, ch.* 15.

SALADO, OR GUADACELITO, Battle of (1340). See SPAIN: A. D. 1273–1460.

SALAMANCA, Battle of. See SPAIN: A. D. 1812 (JUNE—AUGUST).

SALAMANCA, University of. See EDUCATION, MEDIÆVAL: SPAIN AND PORTUGAL.

SALAMIS, Cyprus, Battle of (B. C. 449). See ATHENS: B. C. 460–449.....**Battle of (B. C. 306).** See MACEDONIA: B. C. 310–301.

SALAMIS, Greece: B. C. 610-600.—War of Athens and Megara for possession of the island. See ATHENS: B. C. 610–586.

B. C. 480.—Great battle between Greeks and Persians. See GREECE: B. C. 480.

SALANKAMENT, Battle of (1691). See HUNGARY: A. D. 1683–1699.

SALCES, OR SALSAS: A. D. 1639-1640.—Siege and capture by the French.—Recovery by the Spaniards. See SPAIN: A. D. 1637–1640.

SALEM, Mass.: A. D. 1628.—The first settlement. See MASSACHUSETTS: A. D. 1623–1629 THE DORCHESTER COMPANY.

A. D. 1631-1636.—Ministry and banishment of Roger Williams. See MASSACHUSETTS: A. D. 1636.

A. D. 1692.—The Witchcraft madness. See MASSACHUSETTS: A. D. 1692; and 1692–1693.

SALERNO, Principality of. See ITALY (SOUTHERN): A. D. 800–1016.

SALERNO, School of Medicine. See MEDICAL SCIENCE: 12–17TH CENTURIES.

SALIAN FRANKS, The. See FRANKS: ORIGIN, ETC.

SALIC LAW, The.—"A greatly exaggerated importance has been attributed to the Salic Law. You are acquainted with the reason of this error; you know that at the accession of Philippe-le-Long, and during the struggle of Philippe-de-Valois and Edward III. for the crown of France, the Salic law was invoked in order to prevent the succession of women, and that, from that time, it has been celebrated by a crowd of writers as the first source of our public law, as a law always in vigor, as the fundamental law of monarchy. Those who have been the most free from this illusion, as, for example, Montesquieu, have yet experienced, to some degree, its influence, and have spoken of the Salic law with a respect which it is assuredly difficult to feel towards it when we attribute to it only the place that it really holds in our history. . . . I pray you to recall that which I have already told you touching the double origin and the incoherence of the barbarous laws; they were, at once, anterior and posterior to the invasion; at once, German and Germano-Roman: they belonged to two different conditions of society. This character has influenced all the controversies of which the Salic law has been the object; it has given rise to two hypotheses: according to one, this law was compiled in Germany, upon the right bank of the Rhine, long before the conquest, and in the language of the Franks. . . . According to the other hypothesis, the Salic law was, on the contrary, compiled after the conquest, upon the left bank of the Rhine, in Belgium or in Gaul, perhaps in the seventh century, and in Latin. . . . I believe, however, that the traditions which, through so many contradictions and fables, appear in the prefaces and epilogues annexed to the law, . . . indicate that, from the eighth century, it was a general belief, a popular tradition, that the customs of the Salian

Franks were anciently collected. . . . We are not obliged to believe that the Salic law, such as we have it, is of a very remote date, nor that it was compiled as recounted, nor even that it was ever written in the German language; but that it was connected with customs collected and transmitted from generation to generation, when the Franks lived about the mouth of the Rhine, and modified, extended, explained, reduced into law, at various times, from that epoch down to the end of the eighth century — this, I think, is the reasonable result to which this discussion should lead. . . . At the first aspect it is impossible not to be struck with the apparent utter chaos of the law. It treats of all things — of political law, of civil law, of criminal law, of civil procedure, of criminal procedure, of rural jurisdiction, all mixed up together without any distinction or classification. . . . When we examine this law more closely, we perceive that it is essentially a penal regulation. . . . I say nothing of the fragments of political law, civil law, or civil procedure, which are found dispersed through it, nor even of that famous article which orders that 'Salic land shall not fall to woman; and that the inheritance shall devolve exclusively on the males.' No person is now ignorant of its true meaning. . . . When, in the fourteenth century, they invoked the Salic law, in order to regulate the succession to the crown, it had certainly been a long time since it had been spoken of, except in remembrance, and upon some great occasion."—F. Guizot, *Hist. of Civilization, v.* 2 (*France, v.* 1), *lect.* 9.

Also in: W. C. Perry, *The Franks, ch.* 10.— E. F. Henderson, *Select Hist. Doc's of the Middle Ages, bk.* 2, *no.* 1.

Applied to the regal succession in France. —Louis X., surnamed Hutin, king of France, died in 1316, leaving a daughter, Jeanne, and his queen with child. The late king's brother, Philip the Long, became regent; but when the queen bore a son and the child died, this Philip "hastened to Rheims, filled the Cathedral with his own followers, and compelled the archbishop to consecrate him King [Philip V.]. Thence he returned to Paris, assembled the citizens, and, in the presence of a great concourse of barons and notables of the realm, declared that no female could succeed to the crown of France. Thus began the so-called Salic Law of France, through the determined violence of an unscrupulous man. The lawyers round the throne, seeking to give to the act of might the sanction of right, bethought them of that passage in the law of the Salian Franks which declares 'That no part or heritage of Salic land can fall to a woman'; and it is from this that the law obtained the name of 'the Salic Law.'"—G. W. Kitchin, *Hist. of France, v.* 1, *bk.* 3, *ch.* 11, *sect.* 1–2. — "In this contest [after the death of Louis X., as mentioned above], every way memorable, but especially on account of that which sprung out of it, the exclusion of females from the throne of France was first publicly discussed. . . . It may be fairly inferred that the Salic law, as it was called, was not so fixed a principle at that time as has been contended. But however this may be, it received at the accession of Philip the Long a sanction which subsequent events more thoroughly confirmed. Philip himself leaving only three daughters, his brother Charles [IV.] mounted the throne; and upon his death the rule was so unquestionably established, that his only daughter was excluded by the count of Valois, grandson of Philip the Bold. This prince first took the regency, the queen-dowager being pregnant, and, upon her giving birth to a daughter, was crowned king [Philip of Valois]. No competitor or opponent appeared in France; but one more formidable than any whom France could have produced was awaiting the occasion to prosecute his imagined right with all the resources of valour and genius, and to carry desolation over that great kingdom with as little scruple as if he was preferring a suit before a civil tribunal." This was King Edward III. of England, whose mother Isabel was the sister of the last three French kings, and who claimed through her a right to the French crown.— H. Hallam, *The Middle Ages, ch.* 1, *pt.* 1.— See, also, France: A. D. 1328–1339.

SALICE, Battle of. See Germany: A. D. 1809 (January—June).

SALICES, Ad, Battle of. See Goths (Visigoths): A. D. 378.

SALINÆ.— A Roman town in Britain, celebrated for its salt-works and salt-baths. Its site is occupied by modern Droitwich.—T. Wright, *Celt, Roman and Saxon, ch.* 5.

SALINAN FAMILY, The. See American Aborigines: Salinan Family.

SALISBURY, Gemot of.—William the Conqueror, while establishing feudalism in England, "broke into its 'most essential attribute, the exclusive dependence of a vassal upon his lord,' by requiring in accordance with the old English practice, that all landowners, mesne tenants as well as tenants-in-chief, should take the oath of fealty to the King. This was formally decreed at the celebrated Gemot held on Salisbury Plain, on the 1st of August, 1086, at which the Witan and all the landowners of substance in England whose vassals soever they were, attended, to the number, it is reported, of 60,000. The statute, as soon as passed, was carried into immediate effect."— T. P. Taswell-Langmead, *Eng. Const. Hist., p.* 55.

SALISBURY MINISTRIES, The. See England: A. D. 1885; 1885–1886; and 1892–1893.

SALISHAN FAMILY, The. See American Aborigines: Flatheads.

SALLUVIANS. See Salyes.

SALON, Origin of the French. See Rambouillet, Hôtel de.

SALONA, Ancient.—"Amidst the decay of the empire in the third century Dalmatia suffered comparatively little; indeed, Salonae probably only reached at that time its greatest prosperity. This, it is true, was occasioned partly by the fact that the regenerator of the Roman state, the emperor Diocletian, was by birth a Dalmatian, and allowed his efforts, aimed at the decapitalising of Rome, to redound chiefly to the benefit of the capital of his native land; he built alongside of it the huge palace from which the modern capital of the province takes the name Spalato, within which it has for the most part found a place, and the temples of which now serve it as cathedral and as baptistery. Diocletian, however, did not make Salonae a great city for the first time, but, because it was such, chose it for his private residence; commerce, navigation, and trade must at that time in these waters have

been concentrated chiefly at Aquileia and at Salonae, and the city must have been one of the most populous and opulent towns of the west." —T. Mommsen, *Hist. of Rome, bk.* 8, *ch.* 6.

ALSO IN: E. A. Freeman, *Subject and Neighbor Lands of Venice.*—T. G. Jackson, *Dalmatia, the Quarnero and Istria, ch.* 1–2 *and* 10–12 (*v.* 1–2).

SALONICA.—The modern name of ancient Thessalonica. See THESSALONICA.

SALONIKI, The kingdom of.—The kingdom obtained by Boniface, Marquis of Montferrat, in the partition of the Byzantine Empire after its conquest by the Crusaders, A. D. 1204, comprised the province of Macedonia, with Thessalonica for its capital, and was called the kingdom of Saloniki. Its duration was brief. In 1222 the neighboring Greek despot of Epirus took Thessalonica and conquered the whole kingdom. He then assumed the title of emperor of Thessalonica, in rivalry with the Greek emperors of Nicæa and Trebizond. The title of king of Saloniki was cherished by the family of Montferrat for some generations; but those who claimed it never made good their title by possession of the kingdom.—G. Finlay, *Hist. of Greece from the Conquest by the Crusaders, ch.* 5.—See, also, BYZANTINE EMPIRE: A. D. 1204–1205.

SALOPIAN WARE.—Pottery manufactured by the Romans in Britain from the clay of the Severn valley. Two sorts are found in considerable abundance—one white, the other a light red color.—L. Jewitt, *Grave-Mounds, p.* 164.

SALSBACH, Death of Turenne at (1675). See NETHERLANDS (HOLLAND): A. D. 1674–1678.

SALT, French tax on. See TAILLE AND GABELLE.

SALT LAKE CITY: The founding of (1847). See MORMONISM: A. D. 1846–1848.

SALYES, OR SALLUVIANS.—The Salyes or Saluvii or Salluvians, named Salvii Yalli in Livy's Epitome, "were Ligurians or a mixed race of Celts and Ligurians. They perhaps occupied part of the coast east of Massilia: they certainly extended inland behind that town to the Rhone on the west and to the north as far as the river Druentia (Durance). They occupied the wide plain which you may see from the highest point of the great amphitheatre of Arelate (Arles) stretching east from Tarascon and the Rhone as far as the eye can reach." The Salyes were dangerous to Massilia and in 125 B. C. the latter appealed to the Romans, as allies. The latter responded promptly and sent Flaccus, one of the consuls, to deal with the Salyes. He defeated them; but in two or three years they were again in arms, and consul C. Sextius Calvinius was sent against them. "The Salyes were again defeated and their chief city taken, but it is uncertain whether this capital was Arelate (Arles) or the place afterwards named Aquae Sextiae (Aix). . . . The Roman general found in this arid country a pleasant valley well supplied with water from the surrounding hills, and here he established the colony named Aquae Sextiae." The chiefs of the conquered Salyes took refuge with the Allobroges, and that led to the subjugation of the latter (see ALLOBROGES).—G. Long, *Decline of the Roman Republic, v.* 1, *ch.* 17 *and* 21.

SALZBURG, Origin of.—"The foundation of a colony [by Hadrian] at Juvavium, or Salzburg, which received the name of Forum Hadriani, attests the vigilance which directed his view from the Rhine to the Salza, and the taste, I would willingly add, which selected for a town to bear his name the most enchanting site in central Europe."—C. Merivale, *Hist. of the Romans, ch.* 66.

SALZBURGERS, The. See GEORGIA: A. D. 1734.

SALZWEDEL. See BRANDENBURG.

SAM ADAMS REGIMENTS, The. See BOSTON: A. D. 1770.

SAMANA, The proposed cession of. See HAYTI: A. D. 1804–1880.

SAMANIDES OR SAMANIANS, The.—"As the vigour of the Khalifate began to pass away, and effeminate luxury crept imperceptibly into the palaces of Baghdad, the distant lieutenants gradually aspired to independence. At length, in 868 A. D., one Ya' kub-bin-Lais, the son of a brasier in Sistan, rose in rebellion, subdued Balkh, Kabul, and Fars, but died on his march to Baghdad. In former days he would have been treated as an audacious rebel against the authority of the Vicar of God; now the degenerate Khalifah appointed his brother 'Amr his lieutenant on the death of Ya' kub [A. D. 877], and allowed him to govern Fars, as the founder of the Saffary, or Brasier, dynasty. Ever fearful of the power of 'Amr, the Khalifah at length instigated a Tatar lord, named Isma'il Samany, to raise an army against the Saffaris, in Khurasan. 'Amr marched against him, and crossed the Oxus, but he was entirely defeated; and laughed heartily at a dog, who ran away with the little pot that was preparing the humble meal of the fallen king. That morning it had taken thirty camels to carry his kitchen retinue. 'Amr was sent to Baghdad, and put to death in 901 A. D. Isma'il, who traced his descent from a Persian noble who had rebelled against Khusru Parviz, now founded the Samany [or Samanide] dynasty, which ruled over Khurasan and the north of Persia, with their capital at Bukhara. The Dailamy [or Dilemite or Bouide] dynasty ruled in Fars and the south of Persia during the same period. To the Samanians Persia owes the restoration of its nationality, which had been oppressed and trodden under foot by the Arabian conquerors." The Samanide dynasty was overthrown in 998 by the founder of the Gaznevide Empire, which succeeded.—C. R. Markham, *General Sketch of the Hist. of Persia, ch.* 6.

ALSO IN: Sir J. Malcolm, *Hist. of Persia, v.* 1, *ch.* 6.—See, also, TURKS: A. D. 999–1183.

SAMARAH, Battle of.—This was the battle in which the Roman emperor Julian was killed (June 26, A. D. 363), during the retreat from his ill-starred expedition beyond the Tigris, against the Persians.—G. Rawlinson, *Seventh Great Oriental Monarchy, ch.* 10.

SAMARCAND.—Ancient Maracanda, the capital city of Sogdiana. See SOGDIANA; and BOKHARA.

6th Century.—Taken from the White Huns by the Turks. See TURKS: 6TH CENTURY.

A. D. 1209-1220.—Capital of the Khuarezmian empire. See KHUAREZM.

A. D. 1221.—Conquest and destruction by Jingis Khan.—When Jingis Khan, the Mongol conqueror and devastator of Central Asia, invaded the Khahrezmian Empire, Samarkand was

its capital and its most important city. "The fugitive Khahrezmian prince had left behind him for the defence 110,000 men—i. e., 60,000 Turks and 50,000 Tadjiks—with twenty elephants." But the Turkish mercenaries deserted in a body and the town was surrendered after a siege of three days. "The flourishing city of Samarkand and the fortress were laid even with the ground; and the inhabitants, stripped of all they possessed, shared the fate of their brethren of Bokhara. Those who had contrived to escape were lured back by false promises; all capable of bearing arms were compulsorily enrolled in the Mongolian army; the artistic gardeners of the place were sent off to the far East, where they were wanted to adorn the future Mongolo-Chinese capital with pleasure-grounds, after the fashion of those of Samarkand, and the celebrated artisans, especially the silk and cotton weavers, were either distributed as clever and useful slaves amongst the wives and relations of Djenghiz, or else carried with him to Khorasan. A few were sent as slaves to his sons Tchagatai and Oktai, who were then marching on Khahrezm. This was the end, in the year 618 (1221), of Samarkand, which Arabian geographers have described as the most brilliant and most flourishing spot on the face of the earth."—A. Vámbéry, *Hist. of Bokhara, ch.* 8.—"Samarkand was not only the capital of Trans-Oxiana, but also one of the greatest entrepots of commerce in the world. Three miles in circumference, it was surrounded with a wall having castles at intervals, and pierced by twelve iron gates."—H. H. Howorth, *Hist. of the Mongols, pt.* 1, *p.* 79.

A. D. 1371-1405.—The capital of Timour. See TIMOUR, THE CONQUESTS OF.

A. D. 1868.—Seizure by the Russians. See RUSSIA: A. D. 1859–1876.

SAMARIA.—SAMARITANS: Early history.—The Kingdom of Israel.—Overthrow by the Assyrians. See JEWS: KINGDOMS OF ISRAEL AND JUDAH.

Repopulation of the city and district by the Assyrian conqueror.—After the capture of the city of Samaria (B. C. 722) and the deportation of a large part of its inhabitants by the Assyrian conqueror (see as above), "these districts remained for many years in a condition of such desolation that they were overrun with wild beasts. In the meantime King Asarhaddon, whom we suppose to be Asarhaddon II., having reduced afresh several refractory towns about twenty years after the death of Sennacherib, and wishing to inflict on their inhabitants the favourite punishment of his predecessors, transported large bodies of their heathen populations into these deserted regions. . . . A great number of the settlers in Samaria, the former capital, appear to have come from the Babylonian city of Cuthah, from which arose the name of Cutheans, often applied in derision to the Samaritans by the later Jews. Other settlers were sent from Babylon itself," and "from the cities on the west of the Euphrates, Hamath, Ivah, and Sepharvaim."—H. Ewald, *Hist. of Israel, v.* 4, *pp.* 215–216.

After the Exile.—In the second and third generations after the return of the Judæans from exile, there began to be connections formed by marriage with the neighboring peoples. These peoples, "particularly the Samaritans, had given up idolatry, and were longing earnestly and truly to take part in the divine service at Jerusalem. They were, in fact, proselytes to the religion of Judæa; and were they always to be sternly repulsed? The principal Judæan families determined to admit the foreigners into the community, and the high priest of that time, either Jehoiakim or his son Eliashib, was ready to carry these wishes into effect. Marriages were therefore contracted with the Samaritans and other neighbouring people." But when Ezra and his party came from Babylon (B. C. 459–458) bringing an access of religious zeal and narrower interpretations of the law, these marriages were condemned, and those who had contracted them were forced to repudiate their foreign wives and the children borne by such. This cruelly fanatical action changed the friendly feeling of the Samaritans to hatred. Their leader, Sanballat, was a man of power, and he began against the restored Judæans a war which drove them from Jerusalem. It was not until Nehemiah came from Susa, with the authority of King Artaxerxes to rebuild the walls, that they recovered the city. "The strict observance of the Law enjoined by Ezra was followed out by Nehemiah; he strengthened the wall of separation between Judæans and Gentiles so securely that it was almost impossible to break through it." Sanballat, whose son-in-law, a priest, had been exiled on account of his Samaritan marriage, now "cunningly conceived the plan of undermining the Judæan community, by the help of its own members. How would it be were he to raise a temple to the God of Israel, in rivalry to the one which held sway in Jerusalem?" He executed his plan and the Samaritan temple was raised on Mount Gerizim. Thus "the Samaritans had their temple, around which they gathered; they had priests from the house of Aaron; they compared Mount Gerizim . . . to Mount Moriah; they drew the inference from the Book of the Law that God had designed Mount Gerizim as a site for a sanctuary, and they proudly called themselves Israelites. Sanballat and his followers being intent upon attracting a great many Judæans to their community, tempted them with the offer of houses and land, and in every way helped to support them. Those who had been guilty of crime and who feared punishment, were received with open arms by the Samaritans. Out of such elements a new semi-Judæan community or sect was formed. Their home was in the somewhat limited district of Samaria, the centre of which was either the city that gave its name to the province or the town of Shechem. The members of the new community became an active, vigorous, intelligent people, as if Sanballat, the founder, had breathed his spirit into them. . . . They actually tried to argue away the right of the Judæans to exist as a community. They declared that they alone were the descendants of Israel, and they denied the sanctity of Jerusalem and its Temple, affirming that everything achieved by the Judæan people was a debasement of the old Israelite character. . . . Upon the Judæan side, the hatred against their Samaritan neighbours was equally great. . . . The enmity between Jerusalem and Samaria that existed in the time of the two kingdoms blazed out anew; it no longer bore a political character, but one of a

religious tendency."—H. Graetz, *History of the Jews, ch.* 19-20 (*v.* 1).—"While the Hebrew writers unanimously represent the Samaritans as the descendants of the Cuthæan colonists introduced by Esarhaddon, a foreign and idolatrous race, their own traditious derive their regular lineage from Ephraim and Manasseh, the sons of Joseph. The remarkable fact, that this people have preserved the book of the Mosaic law in the ruder and more ancient character, while the Jews, after the return from Babylonia, universally adopted the more elegant Chaldean form of letters, strongly confirms the opinion that, although by no means pure and unmingled, the Hebrew blood still predominated in their race. In many other respects, regard for the Sabbath and even for the sabbatic year, and the payment of tithes to their priests, the Samaritans did not fall below their Jewish rivals in attachment to the Mosaic polity. The later events in the history of the kings of Jerusalem show that the expatriation of the ten tribes was by no means complete and permanent: is it then an unreasonable supposition, that the foreign colonists were lost in the remnant of the Israelitish people, and, though perhaps slowly and imperfectly weaned from their native superstitions, fell by degrees into the habits and beliefs of their adopted country? . . . Whether or not it was the perpetuation of the ancient feud between the two rival kingdoms, from this period [of the return from the captivity in Babylonia] the hostility of the Jews and Samaritans assumed its character of fierce and implacable animosity. No two nations ever hated each other with more unmitigated bitterness."—H. H. Milman, *Hist. of the Jews, bk.* 9.

Change of population by Alexander the Great.—After the submission of Palestine to Alexander the Great (B. C. 332), Samaria "rebelled and murdered the Macedonian governor, Andromachus. Alexander expelled the inhabitants, and planted a Macedonian colony in their room—another heathen element in the motley population of Samaria."—P. Smith, *Hist. of the World: Ancient, v.* 3, *ch.* 34.

Rebuilding of the city by Herod.—One of the measures of King Herod, for strengthening himself outside of Jerusalem, was "the rebuilding of Samaria, which he did (B. C. 25) on a scale of great magnificence and strength, and peopled it partly with his soldiers, partly with the descendants of the old Samaritans, who hoped to see their temple likewise restored." He changed the name of Samaria, however, to Sebaste—the August.—H. H. Milman, *Hist. of the Jews, bk.* 11.

Justinian's War.—The Christian zeal of the Emperor Justinian [A. D. 527-565] induced him to undertake the forcible conversion of all unbelievers in his empire. Among others, the Samaritans of Palestine were offered "the alternative of baptism or rebellion. They chose the latter: under the standard of a desperate leader they rose in arms, and retaliated their wrongs on the lives, the property, and the temples of a defenceless people. The Samaritans were finally subdued by the regular forces of the East; 20,000 were slain, 20,000 were sold by the Arabs to the infidels of Persia and India, and the remains of that unhappy nation atoned for the crime of treason by the sin of hypocrisy. It has been computed that 100,000 Roman subjects were extirpated in the Samaritan war, which converted the once fruitful province into a desolate and smoking wilderness."—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, ch.* 47.

SAMARKAND. See SAMARCAND.

SAMBUCA, The.—A great military engine, in ancient sieges, was a species of huge covered ladder, supported by two ships lashed together and floated up against the sea wall of the besieged town. The Greeks called it a Sambuca. Mithridates brought one into use when besieging Rhodes, B. C. 88, but with disastrous failure.—G. Long, *Decline of the Roman Republic, v.* 2, *ch.* 20.

SAMIAN WARE.—An elegant species of Roman pottery, red in color, which was in great repute among the ancients.

SAMMARINESI, The.—The citizens of San Marino. See SAN MARINO, THE REPUBLIC OF.

SAMNITE WARS, The. See ROME: B. C. 343-290.

SAMNITES, The.—"The Samnite nation [see ITALY: ANCIENT], which, at the time of the expulsion of the Tarquins from Rome, had doubtless already been for a considerable period in possession of the hill-country which rises between the Apulian and Campanian plains and commands them both, had hitherto found its further advance impeded on the one side by the Daunians, . . . on the other by the Greeks and Etruscans. But the fall of the Etruscan power towards the end of the third, and the decline of the Greek colonies in the course of the fourth century [B. C.], made room for them towards the west and south; and now one Samnite host after another marched down to, and even moved across, the south Italian seas. They first made their appearance in the plain adjoining the bay, with which the name of the Campanians has been associated from the beginning of the fourth century; the Etruscans there were suppressed, and the Greeks were confined within narrower bounds; Capua was wrested from the former [B. C. 424] Cumæ from the latter [B. C. 420]. About the same time, perhaps even earlier, the Lucanians appeared in Magna Graecia. . . . Towards the end of the fourth century mention first occurs of the separate confederacy of the Bruttii, who had detached themselves from the Lucanians—not, like the other Sabellian stocks, as a colony, but through a quarrel—and had become mixed up with many foreign elements. The Greeks of Lower Italy tried to resist the pressure of the barbarians. . . . But even the union of Magna Graecia no longer availed; for the ruler of Syracuse, Dionysius the Elder, made common cause with the Italians against his countrymen. . . . In an incredibly short time the circle of flourishing cities was destroyed or laid desolate. Only a few Greek settlements, such as Neapolis, succeeded with difficulty, and more by means of treaties than by force of arms, in preserving their existence and their nationality. Tarentum alone remained thoroughly independent and powerful. . . . About the period when Veii and the Pomptine plain came into the hands of Rome, the Samnite hordes were already in possession of all Lower Italy, with the exception of a few unconnected Greek colonies, and of the Apulo-Messapian coast."—T. Mommsen, *Hist. of Rome, bk.* 2, *ch.* 5.

SAMO, The Kingdom of. See AVARS: 7TH CENTURY.

SAMOA.—Samoa is the native name of the group of twelve volcanic islands in central Polynesea formerly known as the Navigator Islands. Their place on the chart is between the parallels of 13° and 15° south latitude, and 168° and 173° west longitude. The total area of the islands is about 1,700 square miles. The population consists of about 36,000 natives and a few hundred foreigners, English, American and German. The islands are said to have been first visited by the Dutch navigator, Roggewein, in 1722. A Christian mission was first established upon them in 1830, by the London Missionary Society. After some years the trade of the islands became important, and German traders acquired an influence which they seem to have used to bring about a state of civil war between rival kings. The United States, Great Britain and Germany, at length, in 1879, by joint action, intervened, and, after ten years more of disturbed and unsatisfactory government, the affairs of Samoa were finally settled at a conference of the three Powers held in Berlin in 1889. A treaty was signed by which they jointly guarantee the neutrality of the islands, with equal rights of residence, trade and personal protection to the citizens of the three signatory Powers. They recognize the independence of the Samoan Government, and the free right of the natives to elect their chief or king and choose the form of their government. The treaty created a supreme court, with jurisdiction over all questions arising under it. It stopped the alienation of lands by the natives, excepting town lots in Apia, the capital town; and it organized a municipal government for Apia, with an elected council under the presidency of a magistrate appointed by the three Powers. Other articles impose customs duties on foreign importations, and prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors to the natives.—*Appleton's Annual Cyclopædia*, 1888 and 1889.

Also in: *The Statesman's Year-Book*, 1894.—R. L. Stevenson, *A Foot-note to History*.—G. H. Bates, *Some Aspects of the Samoan Question, and Our Relations to Samoa* (*The Century, April and May*, 1889).

SAMOS.—SAMIANS.—The island now called Samo, lying close to the coast of Asia Minor, in the part of the Ægean Sea which was anciently known as the Icarian Sea. It is of considerable size, being about eighty miles in circumference. The narrow strait which separates it from the mainland is only about three-fourths of a mile wide. The ancient Samians were early and important members of the Ionian confederacy [see Asia Minor: The Greek Colonies] and acquired an early prominence among Greek communities in navigation, commerce, colonizing enterprise and advancement in the arts. Shortly before the Persian wars, in the last half of the sixth century B. C. the island became subject to a profoundly able and ambitious usurper, Polycrates, the most famous of all the Greek "tyrants" of the age, and under whom Samos rose to great power and great splendor of development. "Samos was at that time the brilliant centre of all Ionia, as far as the latter was yet untouched by the barbarians. For such a position she was pre-eminently fitted; for nowhere had the national life of the Ionians attained to so many-sided and energetic a development as on this particular island. . . . An unwearying impulse for inventions was implanted in these islanders, and at the same time a manly and adventurous spirit of discovery, stimulated by the dangers of unknown seas. . . . Under Polycrates, Samos had become a perfectly organized piratical state; and no ship could quietly pursue its voyages without having first purchased a safe-conduct from Samos. . . . But Polycrates intended to be something more than a freebooter. After he had annihilated all attempts at resistance, and made his fleet the sole naval power of the Archipelago, he began to take steps for creating a new and lasting establishment. The defenceless places on the coast had to buy security by the regular payment of tribute; under his protection they united into a body, the interests and affairs of which came more and more to find their centre in Samos, which from a piratical state became the federal capital of an extensive and brilliant empire of coasts and islands."—E. Curtius, *Hist. of Greece, bk.* 2, *ch.* 5 (*v.* 2).—Two of the great works of Polycrates in Samos, the aqueduct, for which a mountain was tunnelled, and the harbor breakwater, were among the wonders of antiquity. The Heræum, or temple of Here, was a third marvel. After the death of Polycrates, treacherously murdered by the Persians, Samos became subject to Persia. At a later time it came under the sovereignty of Athens, and its subsequent history was full of vicissitudes. It retained considerable importance even to Roman times.

B. C. 440.—Revolt from Athens.—Siege and subjugation. See Athens: B. C. 440–437.

B. C. 413.—Overthrow of the oligarchy.—Concession of freedom and alliance by Athens. See Greece: B. C. 413–412.

B. C. 33-32.—Antony and Cleopatra.—The winter of B. C. 33–32, before the battle of Actium, was passed by Mark Antony at Samos, in company with Cleopatra, the Queen of Egypt. "The delicious little island was crowded with musicians, dancers and stage players; its shores resounded with the wanton strains of the flute and tabret."—C. Merivale, *Hist. of the Romans, ch.* 28.

A. D. 1824.—Defeat of the Turks by the Greeks. See Greece: A. D. 1821–1829.

SAMOSATA. See Commagene.

SAMOTHRACE.—A mountainous island in the northern part of the Ægean sea, so elevated that its highest point is over 5,000 feet above the sea level. In ancient times it derived its chief importance from the mysteries of the little understood worship of the Cabiri, of which it seems to have been the chief seat.—G. S. Faber, *Mysteries of the Cabiri*.—"The temple and mysteries of Samothrace formed a point of union for many men from all countries: for a great portion of the world at that time, the temple of Samothrace was like the Caaba of Mecca, the tomb of the prophet at Medina, or the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem. Samothrace and Dodona were to the Pelasgian nations what perhaps Delphi and Delos were to the Hellenic world."—B. G. Niebuhr, *Lect's on the Hist. of Rome, lect.* 1.

SAN. See Zoan.

SAN ANTONIO, Battle of. See Mexico: A. D. 1847 (March—September).

SAN CARLOS, Battle of. See Venezuela: A. D. 1829–1886.

SAN DOMINGO, OR HAYTI. See Hayti.

SAN FRANCISCO: A. D. 1579.—Supposed visit by Drake: See CALIFORNIA: A. D. 1543–1781; and AMERICA: A. D. 1572–1580.

A. D. 1772-1776.—First exploration and naming of the Bay.—Founding of the Mission. See CALIFORNIA: A. D. 1543–1781.

A. D. 1846.—Possession taken by the Americans. See CALIFORNIA: A. D. 1846–1847.

A. D. 1846.—The naming of the Golden Gate.—The great Bay. See GOLDEN GATE.

A. D. 1848.—On the eve of the Gold discoveries. See CALIFORNIA: A. D. 1848–1849.

A. D. 1856.—The Vigilance Committee. See CALIFORNIA: A. D. 1856.

A. D. 1877-1880.—Kearney and the Sand Lot Party. See CALIFORNIA: A. D. 1877–1880.

SAN FRANCISCO, Battle of (1879). See CHILE: A. D. 1833–1884.

SAN JACINTO, Battle of (1836). See TEXAS: A. D. 1824–1836.

SAN JUAN OR NORTHWESTERN WATER-BOUNDARY QUESTION.—The treaty of 1846 which settled the Oregon boundary question left still in dispute the water-boundary between the territory of the United States and Vancouver's Island. Provision for submitting the determination of this San Juan water-boundary question, as it was called, to the Emperor of Germany was made in the Treaty of Washington (see ALABAMA CLAIMS: A. D. 1871). "The Emperor, it appears, referred the arguments on both sides to three experts, Dr. Grimm, Dr. Kiepert, and Dr. Goldschmidt, personages among the most eminent of his subjects in jurisprudence and in science, upon whose report he decided, on the 21st of October, 1872, in the terms of the reference, that the claim of the United States to have the line drawn through the Canal de Haro is most in accordance with the true interpretation of the treaty concluded on the 15th of June, 1846, between Great Britain and the United States. 'This Award,' says the President's Message of December 2, 1872, 'confirms the United States in their claim to the important archipelago of islands lying between the continent and Vancouver's Island, which for more than 26 years . . . Great Britain had contested, and leaves us, for the first time in the history of the United States as a nation, without a question of disputed boundary between our territory and the possessions of Great Britain on this continent.'"—C. Cushing, *The Treaty of Washington, p.* 222.—The Haro Archipelago, which formed the subject of dispute, is a group of many islands, mostly small, but containing one of considerable importance, namely the island of San Juan. The combined area of the islands is about 170 square miles. The archipelago is bounded on the north by the Canal de Haro and the Gulf of Georgia, on the east by Rosario Strait, on the west by the Canal de Haro, on the south by the Straits of Fuca. The entrance to the strait called the Canal de Haro is commanded by the Island of San Juan, which has, therefore, been called "'the Cronstadt of the Pacific.' Its position is such that a few batteries, skilfully placed, would render it almost impregnable." Hence the importance attached to the possession of this island, and especially on the part of Great Britain, looking to the future of British Columbia. By the decision of the Emperor of Germany the entire Archipelago became part of the recognized territory of the United States.—Viscount Milton, *Hist. of the San Juan Water Boundary Question* [*to* 1869].

SAN MARINO, The Republic of.—"The Republic of San Marino is a survival unique in the political world of Europe. . . . The sovereign independence of San Marino is due to a series of happy accidents which were crystallised into a sentiment. The origin of the State is ascribed to a Dalmatian saint who fled from the early persecutions at Rome and dwelt in a hermitage on Mount Titanus. But it is impossible to believe that there was no earlier population. The mountain is a detached block standing free of the Apennines,—a short twelve miles from the sea-coast, easily defensible and commanding a fertile undulating district. The hill-villages must have existed before the towns of the coast. As old as Illyrian pirates were the highland townships of Verrucchio, San Leo, Urbino, Osimo, Loretto, and above all San Marino. Yet, but for the saint and his noble benefactress Felicitá, San Marino would have shared the fate of other highland communes. This lady was a Countess Matilda on a small scale. She gave to the young congregation the proprietorship of the mountain, and the lower table-land was acquired by subsequent purchase and by the generosity of Pope Æneas Sylvius. But Felicitá could not give sovereignty,—she could give no more than she possessed. The sovereignty had rested with the Roman Republic—the Empire—the Goths—the Greeks—the Germans. The Papacy itself had as much claim to San Marino as to anything which it possessed. It was included at all events in the donation of Pepin. In the Pontificate of John XXII. the Bishop of Feltro, who claimed the ownership of the town, proposed to sell it, partly because he needed money to restore his church, partly because the Sammarinesi were rebellious subjects,—'not recognising superiors here on earth, and perchance not believing upon a superior in heaven.' Yet the Papacy appears in the 13th century to have accepted a judicial decision as to the sovereign independence of the Republic, and Pius II. considerably increased its territory in 1463 at the expense of Sigismund Malatesta. The sovereignty of San Marino is therefore almost as complete a puzzle as that of the mysterious Royaume d' Yvetot. . . . The Malatestas, originally lords of the neighboring upland fortress of Verrucchio would willingly have made the whole ridge the backbone of their State of Rimini. But this very fact secured for the Sammarinesi the constant friendship of the lords of Urbino. . . . Neither power could allow the other to appropriate so invaluable a strategic position. . . . The existing constitution is a living lesson on medieval history. . . . Theoretically, sovereignty in the last resort belongs to the people, and of old this was practically exercised by the Arengo, which thus has some correspondence in meaning and functions to the Florentine Parlamento. The Sammarinesi, however, were wiser than the Florentines. When the increase of population and territory rendered a gathering of the whole people an incompetent engine of legislation, the Arengo was not allowed to remain as a mischievous survival with ill-defined authority at the mercy of the governmental wire-pullers. The prerogatives which were reserved to the Arengo were small but definite. . . . It was after the accession of territory granted by

Pius II. in 1465 that the constitution of the State was fundamentally altered. . . . The people now delegated its sovereignty to the Council, which was raised to 60 members. . . . In 1600 an order of Patricians was established, to which was given one-third of the representation, and the Council now consists of 20 'nobili,' 20 'artisti,' artisans and shopkeepers, and 20 'contadini,' agriculturists. The harmony of the Republic is undisturbed by general elections, for the Council is recruited by co-optation. . . . At the head of the Executive stand the two Captains Regent. To them the statutes assign the sovereign authority and the power of the sword. . . . They draw a small salary, and during their six months of office are free from all State burdens."—E. Armstrong, *A Political Survival* (*Macmillan's Magazine, Jan.*, 1891).—"Between this miniature country and its institutions there is a delicious disproportion. The little area of thin soil has for centuries maintained a complicated government. . . . There is a national post-office; there is an army of nine hundred and fifty men and eight officers; there are diplomatic agents in Paris and Montevideo, and consuls in various European cities. Services rendered to the State or to science may be rewarded by knighthood, and so late as 1876 San Marino expressed its gratitude to an English lady for her gift of a statue of liberty, by making her Duchess of Acquaviva. Titles are by no means the most undemocratic part of the republic. On examination it is seen to be in fact an oligarchy. . . . Yet an oligarchy among yeoman farmers is a very different thing from an oligarchy among merchant princes. San Marino may be compared with colonial Massachusetts. The few voters have always really represented the mass of the people. It has been a singularly united, courageous, honorable, public-spirited, and prudent people. Union was possible because it was and is a poor community, in which there were no powerful families to fight and expel each other, or exiles to come back with an enemy's army. The courage of the people is shown by their hospitality to Garibaldi when he was fleeing after his defeat of 1849. An excellent moral fibre was manifested when, in 1868, the Republic refused to receive the gambling establishments which had been made illegal in other countries. The new town-hall is a monument to the enlightened public spirit of the San Marinese, as well as to their taste. That the State is prudent is shown by its distinction, almost unique in Europe, of having no public debt. Other little states in Europe have had similar good qualities, yet have long since been destroyed. Why has San Marino outlived them all? . . . The perpetuation of the government is due in the first place to a singular freedom from any desire to extend its borders. The outlying villages have been added by gift or by their own free will; and when, in 1797, Gen. Bonaparte invited the San Marinese to make their wishes known, 'if any part of the adjacent territory is absolutely necessary to you,' the hard-headed leaders declined 'an enlargement which might in time compromise their liberty.' On the other hand, the poor town had nothing worth plundering, and annexation was so difficult a task that Benedict XIV. said of Cardinal Alberoni's attempt in 1739: 'San Marino is a tough bread-crust; the man who tries to bite it gets his teeth broken.' Nevertheless, even peaceful and inoffensive communities were not safe during the last twelve centuries, without powerful protectors. The determining reason for the freedom of San Marino since 1300 has been the friendship of potentates, first of the neighboring Dukes of Urbino, then of the Popes, then of Napoleon, then of Italy. . . . When the kingdom of Italy was formed in 1860, no one cared to erase from the map a state which even the Pope had spared, and in which Europe was interested. Hence the San Marinese retained a situation comparable with that of the native states in India. A 'consolato' of the Italian Government resides in the town; the schools are assimilated to the Italian system; appeals may be had from the courts to the Italian upper courts, and precautions are taken to prevent the harboring of refugee criminals. Yet of the old sovereignty four important incidents are retained. San Marino has a post-office, a kind of national plaything; but the rare and beautiful stamps are much prized by collectors, and doubtless the sale helps the coffers of the state. The San Marinese manage, and well manage, their own local affairs, without any annoying interference from an Italian prefect. They owe no military service to Italy, and their own militia is no burden. Above all, they pay no taxes to Italy. If I were an Italian, I should like to be a San Marinese."—A. B. Hart, *The Ancient Commonwealth of San Marino* (*The Nation, Feb.* 1, 1894).

SAN MARTIN, General José de, and the liberation of Chile and Peru. See CHILE: A. D. 1810–1818; and PERU: A. D. 1820–1826.

SAN MARTINO, Battle of (1859). See ITALY: A. D. 1856–1859.

SAN SALVADOR, Bahamas.—The name given by Columbus to the little island in the Bahama group which he first discovered, and the identity of which is in dispute. See AMERICA: A. D. 1492.

SAN SALVADOR, Central America: A. D. 1821-1871.—Independence of Spain.—Brief annexation to Mexico.—Attempted Federations and their failure. See CENTRAL AMERICA: A. D. 1821–1871.

SAN STEFANO, Treaty of. See TURKS: A. D. 1877–1878, and 1878.

SANCHO I., King of Aragon, A. D. 1063–1094; IV. of Navarre, A. D. 1076–1094..... Sancho I., King of Leon and the Asturias, or Oviedo, 955–967.....Sancho I., King of Navarre, 905–925.....Sancho I., King of Portugal, 1185–1211.....Sancho II., King of Castile, 1065–1072.....Sancho II. (called The Great), King of Navarre, 970–1035; and I. of Castile, 1026–1035.....Sancho II., King of Portugal, 1223–1244.....Sancho III., King of Castile, 1157–1158.....Sancho III., King of Navarre, 1054–1076.....Sancho IV., King of Leon and Castile, 1284–1295.....Sancho V., King of Navarre, 1150–1194.....Sancho VI., King of Navarre, 1194–1236.

SAND LOT PARTY, The. See CALIFORNIA: A. D. 1877–1880.

SANDEMANIANS.—Robert Sandeman "was a Scotchman who held peculiar religious views: such as—that an intellectual belief would ensure salvation, without faith; and that this intellectual belief was certain to induce Christian virtues. He held these so strongly and urgently that he made a small sect; and in 1764 he came to Connecticut, and founded churches

at Danbury and at some other places, where his followers were called 'Sandemanians,' and where some traces of them exist still. . . . The followers of Robert Sandeman were nearly all Loyalists [at the time of the American Revolution], and many of them emigrated from Connecticut to New Brunswick."—C. W. Elliott, *The New Eng. Hist., v. 2, p.* 370.

SANDJAKS, OR SANJAKS. See Bey; also Timar.

SANDJAR, Seljuk Turkish Sultan, A. D. 1116–1157.

SANDWICH ISLANDS, The. See Hawaiian Islands.

SANGALA.—An ancient city in the Punjab, India, which was the easternmost of all the conquests of Alexander the Great. He took the town by storm (B. C. 326), slaying 17,000 of the inhabitants and taking 70,000 captives.—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece, pt. 2, ch.* 94.

SANHEDRIM, The.—"Beside the priesthood [of the Jewish church], ever since the time of Ezra, there had been insensibly growing a body of scholars, who by the time of Herod had risen to a distinct function of the State. Already under John Hyrcanus there was a judicial body known as the House of Judgment (Beth-Din). To this was given the Macedonian title of Synedrion [or Synhedrion], transformed into the barbarous Hebrew word Sanhedrim, or Sanhedrin."—Dean Stanley, *Lectures on the Hist. of the Jewish Church, lect.* 50.—"The Sanhedrin was the great court of judicature; it judged of all capital offences against the law; it had the power of inflicting punishment by scourging and by death. . . . The Great Sanhedrin was a court of appeal from the inferior Sanhedrins of twenty-three judges established in the other towns. The Sanhedrin was probably confined to its judicial duties—it was a plenary court of justice, and no more—during the reigns of the later Asmonean princes, and during those of Herod the Great and his son Archelaus. . . . When Judæa became a Roman province, the Sanhedrin either, as is more likely, assumed for the first time, or recovered its station as a kind of senate or representative body of the nation. . . . At all events, they seem to have been the channel of intercourse between the Roman rulers and the body of the people. It is the Sanhedrin, under the name of the chief priests, scribes, and elders of the people, who take the lead in all the transactions recorded in the Gospels. Jesus Christ was led before the Sanhedrin, and by them denounced before the tribunal of Pilate."—H. H. Milman, *Hist. of the Jews, bk.* 12.

SANHIKANS, The. See American Aborigines: Algonquian Family.

SANITARY COMMISSION, and Christian Commission, The United States.—"Soon after Mr. Lincoln issued his proclamation [April 15, 1861, at the outbreak of the American Civil War] . . . calling for 75,000 soldiers, many good men and women instituted what they termed 'Soldiers' Aid Societies.' At first the government did not look upon these with approval, under an apprehension that they might interfere with the discipline and efficiency of the armies. Certain physicians and clergymen who had interested themselves in these charitable undertakings perceived how much good could be accomplished by a more extensive and thorough organization. Seeking no remuneration, they applied to the government to give them recognition and moral support, and, after some difficulty, this being secured, they organized themselves and were recognized as 'the United States Sanitary Commission.' The Rev. Henry W. Bellows, D. D., was its president. Their intention was to aid by their professional advice the medical department of the government service; but soon, the field opening out before them, their operations were greatly enlarged. From being simply an advisory, they became more and more an executive body. . . . The Sanitary Commission now entered on an extraordinary career of usefulness. It ranged itself in affiliation with the government medical bureau. It gathered supporters from all classes of the people. . . . Soon the commission had an independent transportation of its own. It had hospital transports, wagons, ambulances, railroad ambulances, cars. Ingenious men devised for it inventions of better litters, better stretchers, better ambulances. It secured comfortable transportation for the wounded soldier from the battle-field to the hospital. On the railroad it soon had its hospital cars, with kitchen, dispensary, and a surgeon's car in the midst. As its work increased, so did its energies and the singular efficiency of its organization. It divided its services into several departments of duty. (1.) Its preventive service, or sanitary inspection department, had a corps of medical inspectors, who examined thoroughly troops in the field, and reported their condition and needs to its own officers and to the government. It had also a corps of special hospital inspectors, who visited the general hospitals of the army, nearly 300 in number, their reports being confidential, and sent to the surgeon general of the army. (2.) Its department of general relief. This consisted of twelve branches of the general commission, having dépôts in the large towns, each branch having from 150 to 1,200 auxiliaries engaged in obtaining supplies. These were sent to the main dépôt, and there assorted, repacked, and dispatched. One of these branches, the 'Woman's Central Association,' collected stores to the value of over a million of dollars; another, the Northwestern, at Chicago, furnished more than a quarter of a million. Care was taken to have no waste in the distribution. Soldiers of all the states were equally supplied; and even wounded enemies left on the field, or sick and abandoned in the hospitals, were tenderly cared for. (3.) Its department of special relief. This took under its charge soldiers not yet under, or just out of the care of the government; men on sick leave, or found in the streets, or left by their regiments. For such it furnished 'homes.' About 7,500 men were, on an average, thus daily or nightly accommodated. It also had 'lodges' wherein a sick soldier might stay while awaiting his pay from the paymaster general, or, if unable to reach a hospital, might stop for a time. Still more, it had 'Homes for the Wives, Mothers, and Children of Soldiers,' where those visiting the wounded or sick man to minister to his necessities might find protection, defense, food, shelter. It had its 'Feeding Stations,' where a tired and hungry soldier passing by could have a gratuitous meal. On the great military lines these stations were permanently established. On the chief rivers, the Mississippi, the Cumberland, the Potomac, it had 'sanitary

steamers' for transmitting supplies and transporting the sick and wounded. It established 'agencies' to see that no injustice was done to any soldier; that the soldier, his widow, his orphan, obtained pensions, back pay, bounties, or whatever money was due; that any errors in their papers were properly corrected, and especially that no sharper took advantage of them. It instituted hospital directories by which the friends of a soldier could obtain information without cost as to his place and condition, if within a year he had been an inmate of any hospital. It had such a record of not less than 900,000 names. Whenever permitted to do so, it sent supplies to the United States prisoners of war in confinement at Andersonville, Salisbury, Richmond. . . . (4.) Its department of field relief. The duty of this was to minister to the wounded on the field of battle; to furnish bandages, cordials, nourishment; to give assistance to the surgeons, and to supply any deficiencies it could detect in the field hospitals. It had a chief inspector for the armies of the East; another for the Military Department of the Mississippi, with a competent staff for each. (5.) Its auxiliary relief corps. This supplied deficiencies in personal attendance and work in the hospitals, or among the wounded on the field. Between May, 1864, when it was first organized, and January, 1865, it gave its services to more than 75,000 patients. It waited on the sick and wounded; wrote letters for them, gave them stationery, postage stamps, newspapers, and whiled away the heavy hours of suffering by reading magazines and books to them. To the Sanitary Commission the government gave a most earnest support; the people gave it their hearts. They furnished it with more than three millions of dollars in money, of which one million came from the Pacific States; they sent it nine millions' worth of supplies. From fairs held in its interest very large sums were derived. One in New York yielded a million and a quarter of dollars; one in Philadelphia more than a million. In towns comparatively small, there were often collected at such fairs more than twenty thousand dollars. . . . The Christian Commission emulated the noble conduct of the United States Sanitary Commission. It, too, received the recognition and countenance of the government. Its object was to promote the physical and spiritual welfare of soldiers and sailors. Its central office was in Philadelphia, but it had agencies in all the large towns. 'It aided the surgeon, helped the chaplain, followed the armies in their marches, went into the trenches and along the picket-line. Wherever there was a sick, a wounded, a dying man, an agent of the Christian Commission was near by.' It gave Christian burial whenever possible; it marked the graves of the dead. It had its religious services, its little extemporized chapels, its prayer-meetings. The American Bible Society gave it Bibles and Testaments; the Tract Society its publications. The government furnished its agents and supplies free transportation; it had the use of the telegraph for its purposes. Steamboat and railroad companies furthered its objects with all their ability. It distributed nearly five millions of dollars in money and supplies." —J. W. Draper, *Hist. of the American Civil War, ch.* 87 (*v.* 3).

Also in: L. P. Brockett, *Woman's Work in the Civil War.*—Mrs. M. A. Livermore, *My Story of the War.*—K. P. Wormeley, *The Other Side of the War.—The Sanitary Commission: its Works and Purposes.*—J. S. Newberry, *The U. S. Sanitary Com. in the Mississippi Valley.*—L. Moss, *Annals of the U. S. Christian Com.*

SANITARY SCIENCE AND LEGISLATION. See Medical Science: 19th Century.

SANJAKS, OR SANDJAKS. See Bey; also Timar.

SANQUHAR DECLARATION, The.—The Declaration affixed by the Cameronians to the market-cross of Sanquhar, in 1680, renouncing allegiance to King Charles II. See Scotland: A. D. 1681–1689.

SANS ARCS, The. See American Aborigines: Siouan Family.

SANSCULOTTES. See France: A. D. 1791 (October).

SANSCULOTTIDES, of the French Republican Calendar, The. See France: A. D. 1793 (October) The new republican calendar.

SANSKRIT.—"The name Sanskrit as applied to the ancient language of the Hindus is an artificial designation for a highly elaborated form of the language originally brought by the Indian branch of the great Aryan race into India. This original tongue soon became modified by contact with the dialects of the aboriginal races who preceded the Aryans, and in this way converted into the peculiar language ('bhasha') of the Aryan immigrants who settled in the neighbourhood of the seven rivers of the Panjab and its outlying districts ('Sapta-Sindhavas' = in Zand 'Hapta Hendu'). The most suitable name for the original language thus moulded into the speech of the Hindus is Hindu-i (= Sindhu-i), its principal later development being called Hindi, just as the Low German dialect of the Saxons when modified in England was called Anglo-Saxon. But very soon that happened in India which has come to pass in all civilized countries. The spoken language, when once its general form and character had been settled, separated into two lines, the one elaborated by the learned, the other popularized and variously provincialized by the unlearned. In India, however, . . . this separation became more marked, more diversified, and progressively intensified. Hence, the very grammar which with other nations was regarded only as a means to an end, came to be treated by Indian Pandits as the end itself, and was subtilized into an intricate science, fenced around by a bristling barrier of technicalities. The language, too, elaborated 'pari passu' with the grammar, rejected the natural name of Hindu-i, or 'the speech of the Hindus,' and adopted an artificial designation, viz. Sanskrita, 'the perfectly constructed speech,'. . . to denote its complete severance from vulgar purposes, and its exclusive dedication to religion and literature; while the name Prakrita — which may mean 'the original' as well as 'the derived' speech — was assigned to the common dialect." —M. Williams, *Indian Wisdom, introd., p. xxviii.*

SANTA ANNA, The career of. See Mexico: A. D. 1820–1826, to 1848–1861, and Texas: A. D. 1824–1836.

SANTA HERMANDAD. See Holy Brotherhood.

SANTA INES, Battle of (1859). See Venezuela: A. D. 1829–1886.

SANTA LUCIA, Battle of (1848). See ITALY: A. D. 1848-1849.

SANTALS, The. See INDIA: THE ABORIGINAL INHABITANTS.

SANTAREM, Battle of (1184). See PORTUGAL: A. D. 1095-1325.

SANTEES, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: SIOUAN FAMILY.

SANTIAGO, The founding of the city (1541). See CHILE: A. D. 1450-1724.

SANTIAGO, OR ST. JAGO, Knights of the Order of. See CALATRAVA.

SANTONES, The. See PICTONES.

SAPAUDIA.—The early name of Savoy. See BURGUNDIANS: A. D. 443-451.

SAPEIRES, The. See IBERIANS, EASTERN.

SAPIENZA, OR PORTOLONGO, Battle of (1354). See CONSTANTINOPLE: A. D. 1348-1355.

SARACENIC EMPIRE. See MAHOMETAN CONQUEST AND EMPIRE.

SARACENIC SCHOOLS. See EDUCATION, MEDIÆVAL.

SARACENS, The name.—"From Mecca to the Euphrates, the Arabian tribes were confounded by the Greeks and Latins under the general appellation of Saracens. . . . The name which, used by Ptolemy and Pliny in a more confined, by Ammianus and Procopius in a larger, sense, has been derived, ridiculously, from Sarah, the wife of Abraham, obscurely from the village of Saraka, . . . more plausibly from the Arabic words which signify a thievish character, or Oriental situation. . . . Yet the last and most popular of these etymologies is refuted by Ptolemy (Arabia, p. 2. 18. in Hudson, tom. iv.), who expressly remarks the western and southern position of the Saracens, then an obscure tribe on the borders of Egypt. The appellation cannot, therefore, allude to any national character; and, since it was imposed by strangers, it must be found, not in the Arabic, but in a foreign language."—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, ch.* 50, *and note.*—"Dr. Clarke (Travels, v. ii., p. 391) after expressing contemptuous pity for Gibbon's ignorance, derives the word from Zara, Zaara, Sara, the Desert, whence Saraceni, the children of the Desert. De Marlès adopts the derivation from Sarrik, a robber, Hist. des Arabes, vol. 1., p. 36; St. Martin from Scharkioun, or Sharkün, Eastern, vol. xi., p. 55."—H. Milman, *note to Gibbon, as above.*—The Kadmonites "are undoubtedly what their name expresses, Orientals, Saracens, otherwise 'B'ne Kedem,' or Sons of the East; a name restricted in practice to the east contiguous to Palestine, and comprising only the Arabian nations dwelling between Palestine and the Euphrates. . . . The name Saraceni was in use among the Romans long before Islam, apparently from the time of Trajan's and Hadrian's wars."—H. Ewald, *Hist. of Israel, introd., sect.* 4, *with foot-note* (*v.* 1).—In the Middle Ages the term Saracen became common in its application to the Arabs, and, in fact, to the Mahometan races pretty generally. See ROME: A. D. 96-138.

SARAGOSSA: Origin. See CÆSAR-AUGUSTA.

A. D. 543.—Siege by the Franks. See GOTHS (VISIGOTHS): A. D. 507-711.

A. D. 713.—Siege and conquest by the Arab-Moors. See SPAIN: A. D. 711-713.

A. D. 778.—Siege by Charlemagne. See SPAIN: A. D. 778.

A. D. 1012-1146.—The seat of a Moorish kingdom. See SPAIN: A. D. 1031-1086.

A. D. 1710.—Defeat of the Spaniards by the Allies. See SPAIN: A. D. 1707-1710.

A. D. 1808.—Fruitless siege by the French. See SPAIN: A. D. 1808 (MAY—SEPTEMBER).

A. D. 1808-1809.—Siege and capture by the French.—Extraordinary defense of the city. See SPAIN: A. D. 1808-1809 (DECEMBER—MARCH).

A. D. 1809.—Siege by the French. See SPAIN: A. D. 1809 (FEBRUARY—JULY).

A. D. 1809.—Battle and Spanish defeat. See SPAIN: A. D. 1809 (FEBRUARY—JUNE).

SARANGIANS.—The name given by Herodotus to a warlike people who dwelt anciently on the shores of the Hamun and in the Valley of the Hilmend—southwestern Afghanistan. By the later Greeks they were called Zarangians and Drangians; by the Persians Zaraka.—M. Duncker, *Hist. of Antiquity, bk.* 7, *ch.* 1 (*v.* 5).

SARATOGA, Burgoyne's surrender at. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1777 (JULY—OCTOBER).

SARATOGA, The proposed State of.—See NORTHWEST TERRITORY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1784.

SARCEES (TINNEH). See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: BLACKFEET, AND ATHAPASCAN FAMILY.

SARDINIA (The Island): Name and early history.—"The name of the island 'Sardo' is derived with probability from the Phœnician, and describes its resemblance to the human footstep. . . . Diodorus reckons this island among the places to which the Phœnicians sent colonies, after they had enriched themselves by the silver of Spain. . . . What the primitive population of the island was, which the Phœnicians found there when they touched at its southern ports on their way to Spain, whether it had come from the coast of Italy, or Africa, we can only conjecture. In historical times it appears to have been derived from three principal sources,—immigrations from Africa, represented by the traditions of Sardus and Aristæus; from Greece, represented by Iolaus, and from the south and south-east of Spain, represented by Norax. . . . The name Norax has evidently a reference to those singular remains of ancient architecture, the Nuraghi of Sardinia,—stone towers in the form of a truncated cone, with a spiral staircase in the thickness of the wall, which to the number of 3,000 are scattered over the island, chiefly in the southern and western parts. Nothing entirely analogous to these has been found in any other part of the world; but they resemble most the Athalayas [or Talajots] of Minorca, whose population was partly Iberian, partly Libyan. . . . The Carthaginians, at the time when their naval power was at its height, in the sixth and fifth centuries B. C., subdued all the level country, the former inhabitants taking refuge among the mountains, where their manners receded towards barbarism."—J. Kenrick, *Phœnicia, ch.* 4, *sect.* 3.

A. D. 1017.—Conquest from the Saracens by the Pisans and Genoese. See PISA: ORIGIN OF THE CITY.

A. D. 1708.—Taken by the Allies. See SPAIN: A. D. 1707–1710.

A. D. 1713.—Ceded to the Elector of Bavaria with the title of King. See UTRECHT: A. D. 1712–1714.

A. D. 1714.—Exchanged with the emperor for the Upper Palatinate. See UTRECHT: A. D. 1712–1714.

A. D. 1717—Retaken by Spain. See SPAIN: A. D. 1713–1725.

A. D. 1719.—Given up by Spain and acquired by the Duke of Savoy in exchange for Sicily, giving its name to his kingdom. See SPAIN: A. D. 1713–1725; also ITALY: A. D. 1715–1735.

SARDINIA (The Kingdom): A. D. 1742.—The king joins Austria in the War of the Austrian Succession. See ITALY: A. D. 1741–1743.

A. D. 1743.—Treaty of Worms, with Austria and England. See ITALY: A. D. 1743.

A. D. 1743.—The Bourbon Family Compact against the king. See FRANCE: A. D. 1743 (OCTOBER).

A. D. 1774.—The War of the Austrian Succession: French and Spanish invasion of Piedmont. See ITALY: A. D. 1744.

A. D. 1745.—The War of the Austrian Succession: Overwhelming reverses. See ITALY: A. D. 1745.

A. D. 1746-1747.—The War of the Austrian Succession: The French and Spaniards driven out. See ITALY: A. D. 1746–1747.

A. D. 1748.—Termination and results of the War of the Austrian Succession. See AIX-LA-CHAPELLE: THE CONGRESS.

A. D. 1792.—Annexation of Savoy and Nice to the French Republic. See FRANCE: A. D. 1792 (SEPTEMBER—DECEMBER).

A. D. 1793.—Joined in the Coalition against Revolutionary France. See FRANCE: A. D. 1793 (MARCH—SEPTEMBER).

A. D. 1794.—Passes of the Alps secured by the French. See FRANCE: A. D. 1794–1795 (OCTOBER—MAY).

A. D. 1795.—French victory at Loano. See FRANCE: A. D. 1795 (JUNE—DECEMBER).

A. D. 1796.—Submission to the French under Bonaparte.—Treaty of peace.—Cession of Savoy to the Republic. See FRANCE: A. D. 1796 (APRIL—OCTOBER).

A. D. 1798.—Piedmont taken by the French.—Its sovereignty relinquished by the king. See FRANCE: A. D. 1798–1799 (AUGUST—APRIL).

A. D. 1799.—French evacuation of Piedmont. See FRANCE: A. D. 1799 (APRIL—SEPTEMBER).

A. D. 1800.—Recovery of Piedmont by the French. See FRANCE: A. D. 1800–1801 (MAY—FEBRUARY).

A. D. 1802.—Annexation of part of Piedmont to France. See FRANCE: A. D. 1802 (AUGUST—SEPTEMBER).

A. D. 1814-1815.—The king recovers his kingdom.—Annexation of Genoa.—Cession of part of Savoy to France. See VIENNA, THE CONGRESS OF; also FRANCE: A. D. 1814 (APRIL—JUNE).

A. D. 1815.—Accession to the Holy Alliance. See HOLY ALLIANCE.

A. D. 1820-1821.—Abortive revolutionary rising and war with Austria.—The defeat at Novara. See ITALY: A. D. 1820–1821.

A. D. 1831.—Death of Charles Felix.—Accession of Charles Albert. See ITALY: A. D. 1830–1832.

A. D. 1848-1849.—Alliance with insurgent Lombardy and Venetia.—War with Austria.—Defeat.—Abdication of Charles Albert.—Accession of Victor Emmanuel II. See ITALY: A. D. 1848–1849.

A. D. 1855.—In the Alliance of the Crimean War against Russia. See RUSSIA: A. D. 1854–1856.

A. D. 1856-1870.—The great work of Count Cavour and King Victor Emmanuel.—Liberation of the whole Peninsula and creation of the kingdom of Italy. See ITALY: A. D. 1856–1859, to 1867–1870.

SARDIS.—When Cyrus the Great founded the Persian empire by the overthrow of that of the Medes, B. C. 558, his first enterprise of conquest, outside of the Median dominion, was directed against the kingdom of Lydia, then, under its famous king Crœsus, dominant in Asia Minor and rapidly increasing in wealth and power. After an indecisive battle, Crœsus retired to his capital city, Sardis, which was then the most splendid city of Asia Minor, and was followed by Cyrus, who captured and plundered the town, at the end of a siege of only fourteen days. The fall of Sardis was the fall of the Lydian kingdom, which was absorbed into the great empire of Persia.—G. Rawlinson, *Five Great Monarchies: Persia, ch.* 7.—Fifty-eight years later (about 500 B. C.) at the beginning of the Ionian Revolt, when the Greek cities of Asia Minor attempted to throw off the Persian yoke, Sardis was again plundered and burned by an invading force of Ionians and Athenians.—C. Thirlwall, *Hist. of Greece, ch.* 14.—See, also, PERSIA: B. C. 521–493.

SARGASSO SEA, The. See AMERICA: A. D. 1492.

SARISSA, The. See PHALANX.

SARK, Battle of (1448).—This was a severe defeat inflicted by the Scots upon an English force, invading Scottish territory, under Lord Percy. The English lost 3,000 men and Percy was taken prisoner.—Sir W. Scott, *Hist. of Scotland, ch.* 19.

SARMATIA. — SARMATIANS. — "The Scythians of the time of Herodotus were separated only by the river Tanais [modern Don] from the Sarmatians, who occupied the territory for several days' journey north-east of the Palus Mæôtis; on the south, they were divided by the Danube from the section of Thracians called Getæ. Both these nations were nomadic, analogous to the Scythians in habits, military efficiency, and fierceness. Indeed, Herodotus and Hippokratês distinctly intimate that the Sarmatians were nothing but a branch of Scythians, speaking a Scythian dialect, and distinguished from their neighbours on the other side of the Tanais chiefly by this peculiarity,—that the women among them were warriors hardly less daring and expert than the men."—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece, pt.* 2, *ch.* 17.—The Sarmatians ultimately gave their name to the whole region of northeastern Europe, and some writers have considered them to be, not Scythic or Mongolic in race, but progenitors of the modern Slavonic family. "By Sarmatia [Tacitus] seems to have understood what is now Moldavia and Wallachia,

and perhaps part of the south of Russia."—Church and Brodribb, *Geog. Notes to The Germany of Tacitus.*—See Slavonic Peoples.

SARMATIAN AND MARCOMANNIAN WARS OF MARCUS AURELIUS.—It was during the reign of Marcus Aurelius Antoninus that the inroads of the barbarians along the Danubian frontier of the Roman Empire began to be seriously frequent and bold. "It is represented as a simultaneous, and even a combined attack, of all the races on the northern frontier, who may be ranged under the three national divisions of Germans, Scythians, and Sarmatians; though we may question the fact of an actual league among tribes so many, so various, and so distant." The Marcomanni and the Quadi on the upper Danube, and the Sarmatian tribes on the lower, were the prominent intruders, and the campaigns which Aurelius conducted against them, A. D. 167–180, are generally called either the Marcomannian or the Sarmatian Wars. During these thirteen years, the noblest of all monarchs surrendered repeatedly the philosophic calm which he loved so well, and gave himself to the hateful business of frontier war, vainly striving to arrest in its beginning the impending flood of barbaric invasion. Repeatedly, he won the semblance of a peace with the unrelenting foe, and as repeatedly it was broken. He died in his soldier's harness, at Vindobona (Vienna), and happily did not live to witness the peace which Rome, in the end, stooped to buy from the foes she had no more strength to overcome.—C. Merivale, *Hist. of the Romans, ch.* 68.

Also in: P. B. Watson, *Marcus Aurelius Antoninus, ch.* 4–6.—See, also, Thundering Legion.

SARN HELEN, The.—A Roman road running through Wales, called by the Welsh the Sarn Helen, or road of Helen, from a notion that the Empress Helena caused it to be made.—T. Wright, *Celt, Roman and Saxon, ch.* 5.

SARPI, Fra Paolo, and the contest of Venice with the Papacy. See Venice: A. D. 1606–1607.

SARRE-LOUIS: A. D. 1680.—The founding of the city. See France: A. D. 1679–1681.

SARUS, Battle of the.—One of the victories of the Emperor Heraclius, A. D. 625, in his war with the Persians.—G. Rawlinson, *Seventh Great Oriental Monarchy, ch.* 24.

SASKATCHEWAN, The district of. See Northwest Territories of Canada.

SASSANIAN DYNASTY.—Artaxerxes I., who resurrected the Persian empire, or called a new Persian empire into existence, A. D. 226, by the overthrow of the Parthian monarchy and the subjection of its dominions, founded a dynasty which took the name of the Sassanian, or the family of the Sassanidæ, from one Sasan, who, according to some accounts was the father, according to others a remoter progenitor of Artaxerxes. This second Persian monarchy is, itself, often called the Sassanian, to distinguish it from the earlier Achæmenian Persian empire.—G. Rawlinson, *Seventh Great Oriental Monarchy.*—See, also, Persia: B. C. 150–A. D. 226.

SASTEAN FAMILY, The. See American Aborigines: Sastean Family.

SATOLLI, Apostolic Delegate in America. See Papacy: A. D. 1892.

SATRAP.—SATRAPIES.—Darius Hystaspis "has been well called 'the true founder of the Persian state.' He found the Empire a crude and heterogeneous mass of ill-assorted elements, hanging loosely together by the single tie of subjection to a common head; he left it a compact and regularly organized body, united on a single well-ordered system, permanently established everywhere. . . . It was the first, and probably the best, instance of that form of government which, taking its name from the Persian word for provincial ruler, is known generally as the system of 'satrapial' administration. Its main principles were, in the first place, the reduction of the whole Empire to a quasi-uniformity by the substitution of one mode of governing for several; secondly, the substitution of fixed and definite burthens on the subject in lieu of variable and uncertain calls; and thirdly, the establishment of a variety of checks and counterpoises among the officials to whom it was necessary that the crown should delegate its powers. . . . The authority instituted by Darius was that of his satraps. He divided the whole Empire into a number of separate governments—a number which must have varied at different times, but which seems never to have fallen short of twenty. Over each government he placed a satrap, or supreme civil governor, charged with the collection and transmission of the revenue, the administration of justice, the maintenance of order, and the general supervision of the territory. These satraps were nominated by the king at his pleasure from any class of his subjects, and held office for no definite term, but simply until recalled, being liable to deprivation or death at any moment, without other formality than the presentation of the royal 'firman.' While, however, they remained in office they were despotic—they represented the Great King, and were clothed with a portion of his majesty. . . . They wielded the power of life and death. They assessed the tribute on the several towns and villages within their jurisdiction at their pleasure, and appointed deputies—called sometimes, like themselves, satraps—over cities or districts within their province, whose office was regarded as one of great dignity. . . . Nothing restrained their tyranny but such sense of right as they might happen to possess, and the fear of removal or execution if the voice of complaint reached the monarch."—G. Rawlinson, *Five Great Monarchies: Persia, ch.* 7.

SATTAGYDÆ, The. See Gedrosians.

SATURNALIA, The Roman.—"The Saturnalia, first celebrated in Rome at the dedication [of the temple of Saturn, on the southern slope of the Capitoline Hill] . . . extended originally over three, but finally over seven days, during which all social distinctions were ignored; slaves were admitted to equality with their masters; and the chains which the emancipated from slavery used to hang, as thanksgiving, on or below the statue of the god, were taken down to intimate that perfect freedom had been enjoyed by all alike under the thrice-happy Saturnian reign. Varro mentions the practice of sending wax tapers as presents during this festival; and when we remember the other usage of suspending wax masks, during the Saturnalia, in a chapel beside the temple of the beneficent Deity, the analogies between these equalizing fêtes and the modern Carnival become more apparent."—C. I. Hemans, *Historic and Monumental Rome, ch.* 6.

SAUCHIE BURN, Battle of (1488). See Scotland: A. D. 1482–1488.

SAUCY CASTLE. See CHÂTEAU GAILLARD.

SAUK, OR SAC, Indians. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: ALGONQUIAN FAMILY, and SACS.

SAULCOURT, Battle of (A. D. 881).—A notable defeat inflicted upon the invading Northmen or Danes in 881 by the French king Louis III., one of the last of the Carolingian line. The battle is commemorated in a song which is one of the earliest specimens of Teutonic verse.—Sir F. Palgrave, *History of Normandy and England, bk.* 1, *ch.* 4 (*v.* 1).

SAULT STE. MARIE, The Jesuit mission at. See CANADA: A. D. 1634–1673.

SAULTEUR, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: OJIBWAYS.

SAUMUR: Stormed by the Vendeans. See FRANCE: A. D. 1793 (JUNE).

SAUROMATÆ, The. See SCYTHIANS.

SAVAGE STATION, Battle of. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1862 (JUNE—JULY: VIRGINIA).

SAVANNAH: A. D. 1732.—The founding of the city. See GEORGIA: A. D. 1732–1739.

A. D. 1775-1776.—Activity of the Liberty Party. See GEORGIA: A. D. 1775–1777.

A. D. 1778.—Taken and occupied by the British. See UNITED STATES OF AM: A. D. 1778–1779 WAR CARRIED INTO THE SOUTH.

A. D. 1779.—Unsuccessful attack by the French and Americans. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1779 (SEPTEMBER—OCTOBER).

A. D. 1861.—Threatened by the Union forces, in occupation of the islands at the mouth of the river. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1861 (OCTOBER—DECEMBER: SOUTH CAROLINA—GEORGIA).

A. D. 1862.—Reduction of Fort Pulaski by the national forces, and sealing up of the port. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1862 (FEBRUARY—APRIL: GEORGIA—FLORIDA).

A. D. 1864.—Confederate evacuation.—Sherman in possession. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1864 (NOVEMBER—DECEMBER: GEORGIA).

SAVANNAHS, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: ALGONQUIAN FAMILY.

SAVENAY, Battle of. See FRANCE: A. D. 1793 (JULY—DECEMBER) THE CIVIL WAR.

SAVERNE: Taken by Duke Bernhard (1636). See GERMANY: A. D. 1634–1639.

SAVERY, Thomas, and the Steam Engine. See STEAM ENGINE.

SAVONA, The Pope at. See PAPACY: A. D. 1808–1814.

SAVONAROLA, in Florence. See FLORENCE: A. D. 1490–1498.

SAVOY AND PIEDMONT: The founding of the Burgundian kingdom in Savoy. See BURGUNDIANS: A. D. 443–451.

11th Century.—The founders of the House of Savoy. See BURGUNDY: A. D. 1032.

11-15th Centuries.—Rise and growth of the dominions of the Savoyard princes, in Italy and the Burgundian territory.—Creation of the duchy.—Assumption of the title of Princes of Piedmont.—"The cradle of the Savoyard power lay in the Burgundian lands immediately bordering upon Italy and stretching on both sides of the Alps. It was to their geographical position, as holding several great mountain passes, that the Savoyard princes owed their first importance, succeeding therein in some measure to the Burgundian kings themselves. The early stages of the growth of the house are very obscure; and its power does not seem to have formed itself till after the union of Burgundy with the Empire. But it seems plain that, at the end of the 11th century, the Counts of Maurienne, which was their earliest title, held rights of sovereignty in the Burgundian districts of Maurienne, Savoy strictly so called, Tarantaise, and Aosta. . . . The early Savoyard possessions reached to the Lake of Geneva, and spread on both sides of the inland mouth of the Rhone. The power of the Savoyard princes in this region was largely due to their ecclesiastical position as advocates of the abbey of Saint Maurice. Thus their possessions had a most irregular outline, nearly surrounding the lands of Genevois and Faucigny. A state of this shape, like Prussia in a later age and on a greater scale, was, as it were, predestined to make further advances. But for some centuries those advances were made much more largely in Burgundy than in Italy. The original Italian possessions of the House bordered on their Burgundian counties of Maurienne and Aosta, taking in Susa and Turin. This small marchland gave its princes the sounding title of Marquesses in Italy. . . . In the 12th and 13th centuries, the princes of Savoy were still hemmed in, in their own corner of Italy, by princes of equal or greater power, at Montferrat, at Saluzzo, at Iverea, and at Biandrate. And it must be remembered that their position as princes at once Burgundian and Italian was not peculiar to them. . . . The Italian dominions of the family remained for a long while quite secondary to its Burgundian possessions. . . . The main object of Savoyard policy in this region was necessarily the acquisition of the lands of Faucigny and the Genevois. But the final incorporation of those lands did not take place till they were still more completely hemmed in by the Savoyard dominions through the extension of the Savoyard power to the north of the Lake. This began early in the 13th century [1207] by a royal grant of Moudon to Count Thomas of Savoy. Romont was next won, and became the centre of the Savoyard power north of the Lake. Soon after, through the conquests of Peter of Savoy [1263–1268], who was known as the Little Charlemagne and who plays a part in English as well as in Burgundian history, these possessions grew into a large dominion, stretching along a great part of the shores of the Lake of Neufchâtel and reaching as far north as Murten or Morat. . . . This new dominion north of the Lake was, after Peter's reign, held for a short time by a separate branch of the Savoyard princes as Barons of Vaud; but in the middle of the 14th century, their barony came into the direct possession of the elder branch of the house. The lands of Faucigny and the Genevois were thus altogether surrounded by the Savoyard territory. Faucigny had passed to the Dauphins of the Viennois, who were the constant rivals of the Savoyard counts, down to the time of the practical transfer of their dauphiny to France. Soon after that annexation, Savoy obtained Faucigny, with Gex and some other districts beyond the Rhone, in exchange for some small Savoyard possessions within the dauphiny. The long struggle for the

SAVOY AND PIEDMONT.

Genevois, the county of Geneva, was ended by its purchase in the beginning of the 15th century [1401]. This left the city of Geneva altogether surrounded by Savoyard territory, a position which before long altogether changed the relations between the Savoyard counts and the city. Hitherto, in the endless struggles between the Genevese counts, bishops, and citizens, the Savoyard counts . . . had often been looked on by the citizens as friends and protectors. Now that they had become immediate neighbours of the city, they began before long to be its most dangerous enemies. The acquisition of the Genevois took place in the reign of the famous Amadeus the Eighth, the first Duke of Savoy, who received that rank by grant of King Siegmund [1417], and who was afterwards the Antipope Felix [see PAPACY: A. D. 1431–1448]. In his reign the dominions of Savoy, as a power ruling on both sides of the Alps, reached their greatest extent. But the Savoyard power was still pre-eminently Burgundian, and Chambery was its capital. The continuous Burgundian dominion of the house now reached from the Alps to the Saône, surrounding the lake of Geneva and spreading on both sides of the lake of Neufchâtel. Besides this continuous Burgundian dominion, the House of Savoy had already become possessed [1388] of Nizza, by which their dominions reached to the sea. . . . After the 15th century, the Burgundian history of that house consists of the steps spread over more than 300 years by which this great dominion was lost. The real importance of the house of Savoy in Italy dates from much the same time as the great extension of its power in Burgundy. . . . During the 14th century, among many struggles with the Marquesses of Montferrat and Saluzzo, the Angevin counts of Provence, and the lords of Milan, the Savoyard power in Italy generally increased. . . . Before the end of the reign of Amadeus [the Eighth — 1391–1451], the dominions of Savoy stretched as far as the Sesia, taking in Biella, Santhia and Vercelli. Counting Nizza and Aosta as Italian, which they now practically were, the Italian dominions of the House reached from the Alps of Wallis to the sea. But they were nearly cut in two by the dominions of the Marquesses of Montferrat, from whom however the Dukes of Savoy now claimed homage. . . . Amadeus, the first Duke of Savoy, took the title of Count of Piedmont, and afterwards that of Prince. His possessions were now fairly established as a middle state, Italian and Burgundian, in nearly equal proportions."—E. A. Freeman, *Historical Geog. of Europe, ch.* 8, *sect.* 7.

ALSO IN: A. Gallenga, *Hist. of Piedmont, v.* 1, *ch.* 6–9, *v.* 2, *ch.* 1–6.

A. D. 1452-1454.—Alliance with Venice and Naples.—War with Milan and Florence. See MILAN: A. D. 1447–1454.

A. D. 1504-1535.—Struggles with the independent burghers of Geneva.—Loss of the Vidommate. See GENEVA: A. D. 1504–1535.

A. D. 1536-1544.—Conquest by the French and restoration to the Duke by the Treaty of Crespy. See FRANCE: A. D. 1532–1547.

A. D. 1559-1580.—End of the French occupation.—Recovery of his dominions by Emanuel Philibert.—His reconstruction of the state.—Treaties with the Swiss.—War with the Waldenses.—Tolerant Treaty of Cavour.—Settlement of government at Turin.—"The history of Piedmont begins where the history of Italy terminates. At the Peace of Château-Cambresis [see FRANCE: A. D. 1547–1559], in 1559, Piedmont was born again. Under Amadeus VIII. Savoy bade fair to become a State of the very first order. In the course of a century it had sunk to a third-rate power. . . . Piedmont, utterly prostrated by five-and-twenty years of foreign occupation, laid waste by the trampling of all the armies of Europe, required now the work of a constructive genius, and Emanuel Philibert was providentially fitted for the task. No man could better afford to be pacific than the conqueror of St. Quintin [see FRANCE: as above]. . . . After the battle of St. Quintin, Emanuel Philibert had France at his discretion. Had his counsels been instantly followed, the Spanish army would have dictated its own terms before or within the walls of Paris. . . . The reconciliation of France with the hero who had alarmed and humbled her seemed, nevertheless, to be sincere." Under the terms of the treaty, the Duke of Savoy's dominions, occupied by the French, were to be restored to him, except that Turin, Chieri, Chivasso, Pinerolo, and Villanova d' Asti, with part of their territories, "were to be occupied for three years, or until the settlement of the differences between the two Courts, chiefly with regard to the dowry of Louisa of Savoy, mother of Francis I., the original cause of dispute. . . . So long as France insisted on keeping the five above-mentioned places, Spain was also empowered to retain Asti and Vercelli." Philip II., however, gave up Vercelli and "contented himself with the occupation of Asti and Santia." The differences with France proved hard of settlement, and it was not until 1574 that "Emanuel Philibert found himself in possession of all his Subalpine dominions. No words can describe the meanness and arrogance by which the French aggravated this prolonged usurpation of their neighbour's territories. . . . Had Emanuel Philibert put himself at the head of one of [the factions which fought in France at this time] . . . he might have paid back . . . the indignities he had had to endure; but his mission was the restoration of his own State, not the subjugation of his neighbour's. . . . The same moderation and longanimity which enabled Emanuel Philibert to avoid a collision with France, because he deemed it unreasonable, equally distinguished him in his relations with his neighbours of Italy. There was now, alas! no Italy; the country had fallen a prey to the Spanish branch of the House of Austria, and the very existence of Mantua, Parma, Tuscany, etc., was at the mercy of Philip II. . . . This 'most able and most honest of all the princes of his line' was fully aware of the importance of his position as the 'bulwark of Italy,' and felt that on his existence hung the fate of such states in the Peninsula as still aspired to independence. 'I know full well,' he said in a moment of cordial expansion, 'that these foreigners are all bent on the utter destruction of Italy, and that I may be the first immolated; but my fall can be indifferent to no Italian state, and least of all to Venice.' Full of these thoughts, he was unwearied in his endeavours to secure the friendship of that republic. . . . The same instinctive dread of the crushing ascendancy of Spain and France, which made Emanuel Philibert cling to the Venetian alliance, equally urged

him to settle, no matter at what cost, the differences with the other old allies of his house — the Swiss. The Pays de Vaud, Gex, Chablais, and Lower Valais were still in the power of the confederates [see SWITZERLAND: A. D. 1531–1648]; and it was not without a murmur that the Duke of Savoy could part with so fair a portion of his forefathers' inheritance; but it was not long ere he learnt to resign all hope of its recovery. A new generation had sprung up in those provinces, amongst whom all loyalty to Savoy had died off. The Bernese had introduced the Reformation into the conquered lands. . . . Political freedom went hand in hand with religious innovation. . . . Geneva was the very head-quarters of reform; it was proud of the appellation of the 'Rome of Calvinism.' . . . Emanuel Philibert, ill-supported by Spain and thwarted by France, laid aside all ideas of an appeal to force, and trusted his cause to negotiation. There was happily division in the enemy's camp; religious difference had set the old forest cantons into opposition with Berne and her Protestant associates. The Duke of Savoy made a treaty at Lucerne (November 11, 1560) with Schwytz, Uri, Unterwald, Zug, Lucerne, Soleure, and even Zurich; and these promised their good offices with their Protestant brethren in behalf of Savoy. Lengthy and somewhat stormy conferences ensued, the result of which was the treaty of Lausanne (October 30, 1564); by the terms of which Berne retained Vaud, and Friburg Romont, and Savoy only recovered Gex and Chablais. At a later period (March 4th, 1569) Valais also came to terms at Thonon; it gave up its own share of Chablais, but remained in possession of Lower Valais. By the recovery of Gex and Chablais Savoy now encompassed Geneva on all sides, and caused that town incessant uneasiness; but the Duke . . . was . . . earnestly bent on peace, and he reassured the Genevese by new treaties, signed at Berne (May 5th, 1570), by which he engaged to give no molestation to Geneva. These same treaties bound Savoy to allow freedom of conscience and worship to those of her subjects who had embraced Protestantism during the Swiss occupation; and we hear, in fact, of no persecutions in the provinces round the Leman in Emanuel Philibert's lifetime; but it is important to inquire how that Prince dealt in these matters with his subjects in general. . . . We hear from several authorities that 'the Piedmontese were more than half Protestants.' The Waldensian ministers reckoned their sectaries at the foot of the Alps at 800,000. . . . The Waldenses considered the prevalence of the new tenets as their own triumph. From 1526 to 1530 they entered into communication with the Reformers, and modified their own creed and worship in accordance with the new ideas, identifying themselves especially with the disciples of Calvin. . . . Their valleys became a refuge for all persecuted sectaries, amongst whom there were turbulent spirits, who stirred up those simple and loyal mountaineers to mutiny and revolt. Although they thus called down upon themselves the enmity of all the foes to Protestantism, these valleys continued nevertheless to be looked upon as a privileged district, and their brethren of other provinces found there a safe haven from the storms which drove them from their homes." In 1559, the Duke issued his edict of Nice, "intended not so much to suppress heresy as to repress it." The Waldenses "assumed a mutinous attitude," and "applied for succour to the Huguenot chiefs of the French provinces." Then the Duke sent 4,000 foot and 200 horse into the valleys, under the Count de la Trinita, and a fierce and sanguinary war ensued. "Its horrors were aggravated by foreign combatants, as the ranks of La Trinita were swelled by both French and Spanish marauders; and the Huguenots of France, and even some Protestant volunteers from Germany, fought with the Waldenses. . . . But it was not for the interest of the Duke of Savoy that his subjects should thus tear each other to pieces. After repeated checks La Trinita met with, . . . a covenant was signed at Cavour on the 5th of June, 1561. The Waldenses were allowed full amnesty and the free exercise of their worship within their own territory. . . . Within those same boundaries they consented to the erection of Catholic churches, and bound themselves to a reciprocal toleration of Roman rites. . . . The Treaty of Cavour satisfied neither party. It exposed the Duke to the loud reprimands of Rome, France and Spain, no less than to the bitter invectives of all his clergy . . . ; and, on the other hand the Waldenses . . . again and again placed themselves in opposition to the authorities deputed to rule over them. . . . In his leniency towards the sectaries of the valleys, Emanuel Philibert was actuated by other motives besides the promptings of a naturally generous soul. . . . His great schemes for the regeneration of the country could only find their development in a few years of profound peace. . . . Whatever may be thought of the discontent to which his heavy taxes gave rise among the people, or his stern manners among the nobles, it is a beautiful consoling fact that the establishment of despotism in Piedmont did not cost a single drop of blood, that the prince subdued and disciplined his people by no other means than the firmness of his iron will. . . . The great work for which Piedmont will be eternally indebted to the memory of this great prince was the nationalization of the State. He established the seat of government at Turin, recalled to that city the senate which had been first convoked at Carignano, and the university which had been provisionally opened at Mondovi. Turin, whose bishop had been raised to metropolitan honours in 1515, had enjoyed comparative security under the French, who never lost possession of it from 1536 to 1562. It dates its real greatness and importance from Emanuel Philibert's reign, when the population . . . rose to 17,000 souls. . . . It was not without great bitterness that the transalpine provinces of Savoy submitted to the change, and saw the dignity and ascendancy of a sovereign state depart from them." Emanuel Philibert died in 1580, and was succeeded by his son, Charles Emanuel.—A. Gallenga, *Hist. of Piedmont, v.* 3, *ch.* 1.

A. D. 1580-1713.—Vicissitudes of a century and a quarter.—Profitable infidelities in war.—The Duke wins Sicily and the title of King.—Emanuel Philibert, by his "well-timed policy of peace, . . . was enabled to leave his duchy immensely strengthened to his son Charles Emanuel (1580–1630). The new duke was much more active in his policy. His marriage with a daughter of Philip II. bound him to the side of Spain and he supported the cause of the League

in France. With the help of the Catholic party he seized the vacant marquisate of Saluzzo, and thus involved himself in a long quarrel with Henry IV. In 1601 the peace of Lyons confirmed the duke in the possession of Saluzzo, in exchange for which he ceded Bresse on the Rhone frontier to Henry. All attempts made to recover Geneva for Savoy proved unsuccessful. Before his death the restless Charles Emanuel brought forward another claim to the marquisate of Montferrat. This had been held since 1533 by the dukes of Mantua, whose male line became extinct in 1627. The duke did not live to see the settlement of the Mantuan succession, but his son, Victor Amadeus I., obtained great part of Montferrat by the treaty of Cherasco (1631). Richelieu had now acquired Pinerolo and Casale for France and this effected a complete change in the policy of Savoy. Victor Amadeus was married to Christine, a daughter of Henry IV., and he and his successor remained till nearly the end of the century as faithful to France as his predecessors had been to Spain. Charles Emanuel II., who succeeded as a minor on the early death of his father, was at first under the guardianship of his mother, and when he came of age remained in the closest alliance with Louis XIV. His great object was to secure the Italian position which Savoy had assumed, by the acquisition of Genoa. But the maritime republic made a successful resistance both to open attack and to treacherous plots. Victor Amadeus II., who became duke in 1675, was married to a daughter of Philip of Orleans. But Louis XIV. had begun to treat Savoy less as an ally than as a dependency, and the duke, weary of French domination, broke off the old connexion, and in 1690 joined the League of Augsburg against Louis. His defection was well-timed and successful, for the treaty of Ryswick (1697) gave him the great fortresses of Pinerolo and Casale, which had so long dominated his duchy. In the war of the Spanish succession he first supported Louis and afterwards turned against him. His faithlessness was rewarded in the peace of Utrecht [1713] with the island of Sicily and the title of king. Within a few years, however, he was compelled to exchange Sicily for Sardinia."—R. Lodge, *Hist. of Modern Europe, ch.* 12, *sect.* 9.—See ITALY: A. D. 1701–1713, and UTRECHT: A. D. 1712–1714.

A. D. 1592.—French invasion of the Vaudois. See FRANCE: A. D. 1591–1593.

A. D. 1597-1598.—Invasion by the French. —Peace with France. See FRANCE: A. D. 1593–1598.

A. D. 1600.—French invasion.—Cession of territory to France. See FRANCE: A. D. 1599–1610.

A. D. 1602-1603.—Abortive attempt upon Geneva.—Treaty of St. Julien with that city. See GENEVA: A. D. 1602–1603.

A. D. 1620-1626.—The Valtelline War.—Alliance with France.—Unsuccessful attempt against Genoa. See FRANCE: A. D. 1624–1626.

A. D. 1627-1631.—War over the succession to the duchy of Mantua.—French invasion.—Extension of territory. See ITALY: A. D. 1627–1631.

A. D. 1635.—Alliance with France against Spain. See GERMANY: A. D. 1634–1639.

A. D. 1635-1659.—Alliance with France against Spain.—Civil war and foreign war.—Sieges of Turin.—Territory restored. See ITALY: A. D. 1635–1659.

A. D. 1655.—Second persecution of the Waldenses. See WALDENSES: A. D. 1655.

A. D. 1690.—Joins the Grand Alliance against France. See FRANCE: A. D. 1689–1690.

A. D. 1690-1691.—Overrun by the armies of France. See FRANCE: A. D. 1689–1691.

A. D. 1691.—Toleration granted to the Vaudois. See WALDENSES: A. D. 1691.

A. D. 1693.—French victory at Marsaglia. See FRANCE: A. D. 1693 (OCTOBER).

A. D. 1695-1696.—Desertion of the Grand Alliance by the Duke.—Treaty with France. See FRANCE: A. D. 1695–1696.

A. D. 1713.—Acquisition of Sicily from Spain. See UTRECHT: A. D. 1712–1714.

A. D. 1717-1719.—Sicily exchanged by the Duke for Sardinia, with the title of King. See SPAIN: A. D. 1713–1725; also, ITALY: A. D. 1715–1735.

A. D. 1792.—Savoy annexed to the French Republic. See FRANCE: A. D. 1792 (SEPTEMBER—DECEMBER).

A. D. 1796.—Savoy ceded by Sardinia to France. See FRANCE: A. D. 1796 (APRIL—OCTOBER).

A. D. 1798.—Piedmont taken by the French. —Its sovereignty relinquished by the King of Sardinia. See FRANCE: A. D. 1798–1799 (AUGUST—APRIL).

A. D. 1815.—Cession of a part of Savoy to France. See VIENNA, THE CONGRESS OF.

A. D. 1860.—Final cession of Savoy to France. See ITALY: A. D. 1859–1861.

SAVOY CONFERENCE, The. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1661 (APRIL—JULY).

SAWÂD, THE.—"The name Sawâd is given by the Arab writers to the whole fertile tract between the Euphrates and the Desert, from Hit to the Persian Gulf."—G. Rawlinson, *Seventh Great Oriental Monarchy, ch.* 26, *foot-note.* —See MAHOMETAN CONQUEST: A. D. 632–651.

SAXA RUBRA, Battle of (A. D. 312). See ROME: A. D. 305–323.

SAXE-COBURG, SAXE-GOTHA, SAXE-WEIMAR, etc. See SAXONY: A. D. 1180–1553; and WEIMAR.

SAXON HEPTARCHY. See ENGLAND: 7TH CENTURY.

SAXON SHORE, Count of the (Comes Littoris Saxonici).—The title of the Roman officer who had military command of the coast of Britain, between the Wash and the Isle of Wight, which was most exposed to the ravages of the Saxons. See BRITAIN: A. D. 323–337.

SAXONS, The.—"In the reign of Caracalla [A. D. 212–217] Rome first heard of the Goths and Alemanni; a little more than half a century later the Franks appear; and about the same time the Saxons, who had been named and placed geographically by Ptolemy [A. D. 130–160], make their first mark in history. They are found employed in naval and piratical expeditions on the coasts of Gaul in A. D. 287. Whatever degree of antiquity we may be inclined to ascribe to the names of these nations, and there is no need to put a precise limit to it, it can scarcely be supposed that they sprang from insignificance and obscurity to strength and power

in a moment. It is far more probable that under the names of Frank and Saxon in the fourth century had been sunk the many better known earlier names of tribes who occupied the same seats. . . . The Cherusci, the Marsi, the Dulgibini and the Chauci may have been comprehended under the name of Saxons. . . . Whilst the nations on the Lower Rhine were all becoming Franks, those between the Rhine and the Oder were becoming Saxons; the name implied as yet no common organisation, at the most only an occasional combination for attack or defence." —W. Stubbs, *Const. Hist. of Eng., ch.* 3 (*v.* 1).— "The hypothesis respecting the Saxons is as follows: The name Saxon was to the Kelts of Britain what German was to those of Gaul. Or, if not, what Suevi was — a name somewhat more specific. It probably applied to the Germans of the sea-coast, and the water-systems of the Lower Rhine, Weser, Lower Elbe, and Eyder; to Low Germans on the Rhine, to Frisians and Saxons on the Elbe, and to North Frisians on the Eyder. All the Angles were Saxons, but all the Saxons were not Angles. The reasoning in favour of this view is as follows: — That Saxon was a Britannic term is undenied. The Welsh and Gaels call us Saxons at the present moment. The Romans would take their name for certain Germans as they found it with the Britons. The Britons and Romans using the same name would be as two to one in favour of the Keltic name taking ground. It would be Roman and Keltic against a German name single-handed. The only question is whether the name Saxon was exclusively Britannic (Keltic), i. e., not German also. . . . I think, upon the whole, that Saxon was a word like 'Greek,' i. e., a term which, in the language of the Hellenes, was so very special, partial, and unimportant, as to have been practically a foreign term, or, at least, anything but a native name; whilst in that of the Romans it was one of general and widely extended import. Hence, mutatis mutandis, it is the insignificant Saxones of the neck of the Cimbric Chersonese, and the three Saxon islands, first mentioned by Ptolemy, who are the analogues of the equally unimportant Græci of Epirus; and these it was whose name eventually comprised populations as different as the Angles, and the Saxons of Saxony, even as the name Græcus in the mouth of a Roman comprised Dorians, Æolians, Macedonians, Athenians, Rhodians, &c. In this way the name was German; but its extended import was Keltic and Roman."—R. G. Latham, *The Germany of Tacitus: Epilegomena, sect.* 48.— See, also, GERMANY: THE NATIONAL NAMES; and ANGLES AND JUTES.

The sea-rovers of the 5th century.—"At the end of a long letter, written by Sidonius [Apolinaris, Bishop, at Clermont, in Auvergne, A. D. 471–488] to his friend Nammatius [an officer of the Channel fleet of the Romans, then chiefly occupied in watching and warding off the Saxon pirates], after dull compliments and duller banter, we suddenly find flashed upon us this life-like picture, by a contemporary hand, of the brothers and cousins of the men, if not of the very men themselves who had fought at Aylesford under Hengest and Horsa, or who were slowly winning the kingdom of the South Saxons: 'Behold, when I was on the point of concluding this epistle in which I have already chattered on too long, a messenger has suddenly arrived from Saintonge with whom I have spent some hours in conversing about you and your doings, and who constantly affirms that you have just sounded your trumpet on board the fleet, and that with the duties of a sailor and a soldier combined you are roaming along the winding shores of the Ocean, looking out for the curved pinnaces of the Saxons. When you see the rowers of that nation you may at once make up your mind that every one of them is an arch-pirate, with such wonderful unanimity do all at once command, obey, teach, and learn their one chosen business of brigandage. For this reason I ought to warn you to be more than ever on your guard in this warfare. Your enemy is the most truculent of all enemies. Unexpectedly he attacks, when expected he escapes, he despises those who seek to block his path, he overthrows those who are off their guard, he always succeeds in cutting off the enemy whom he follows, while he never fails when he desires to effect his own escape. Moreover, to these men a shipwreck is capital practice rather than an object of terror. The dangers of the deep are to them, not casual acquaintances, but intimate friends. For since a tempest throws the invaded off their guard, and prevents the invaders from being descried from afar, they hail with joy the crash of waves on the rocks, which gives them their best chance of escaping from other enemies than the elements. Then again, before they raise the deep-biting anchor from the hostile soil, and set sail from the Continent for their own country, their custom is to collect the crowd of their prisoners together, by a mockery of equity to make them cast lots which of them shall undergo the iniquitous sentence of death, and then at the moment of departure to slay every tenth man so selected by crucifixion, a practice which is the more lamentable because it arises from a superstitious notion that they will thus ensure for themselves a safe return. Purifying themselves as they consider by such sacrifices, polluting themselves as we deem by such deeds of sacrilege, they think the foul murders they thus commit are acts of worship to their gods, and they glory in extorting cries of agony instead of ransoms from these doomed victims.'"—T. Hodgkin, *Italy and Her Invaders, bk.* 3, *ch.* 3.

A. D. 451.—At the Battle of Chalons.— In the allied army of Romans and barbarians which count Aetius brought together to encounter the Hun, Attila, on the great and terrible battlefield of Chalons, July, 451, there is mention of the "Saxones." "How came our fathers thither; they, whose homes were in the long sandy levels of Holstein? As has been already pointed out, the national migration of the Angles and Saxons to our own island had already commenced, perhaps in part determined by the impulse northward of Attila's own subjects. Possibly, like the Northmen, their successors, the Saxons may have invaded both sides of the English Channel at once, and may on this occasion have been standing in arms to defend against their old foe some newly-won possessions in Normandy or Picardy."—T. Hodgkin, *Italy and Her Invaders, bk.* 2, *ch.* 3.

A. D. 477-527.—Conquests in Britain. See ENGLAND: A. D. 477–527.

A. D. 528-729. — Struggles against the Frank dominion, before Charlemagne. See GERMANY: A. D. 481–768.

A. D. 772-804.—Conquest by Charlemagne.—"In the time of Charlemagne, the possessions of this great league [the Saxons] were very extensive, stretching, at one point, from the banks of the Rhine nearly to the Oder, and on the other hand, from the North Sea to the confines of Hesse and Thuringia. Warlike in their habits, vigorous in body, active and impatient in mind, their geographical situation, operating together with their state of barbarism, rendered them pirates, extending the predatory excursions, common to all the northern tribes, to the sea as well as to the land. . . . They held, from an early period, greater part of the islands scattered round the mouths of the German rivers; and, soon beginning to extend their dominion, they captured, at different times, all those on the coast of France and in the British sea. Not contented, however, with this peculiar and more appropriate mode of warfare, the Saxons who remained on land, while their fellow-countrymen were sweeping the ocean, constantly turned their arms against the adjacent continental countries, especially after the conquest of Britain had, in a manner, separated their people, and satisfied to the utmost their maritime cupidity in that direction. Surpassing all nations, except the early Huns, in fierceness, idolaters of the most bloody rites, insatiable of plunder, and persevering in the purpose of rapine to a degree which no other nation ever knew, they were the pest and scourge of the north. Happily for Europe, their government consisted of a multitude of chiefs, and their society of a multitude of independent tribes, linked together by some bond that we do not at present know, but which was not strong enough to produce unity and continuity of design. Thus they had proceeded from age to age, accomplishing great things by desultory and individual efforts; but up to the time of Charlemagne, no vast and comprehensive mind, like that of Attila, had arisen amongst them, to combine all the tribes under the sway of one monarch, and to direct all their energies to one great object. It was for neighbouring kings, however, to remember that such a chief might every day appear. . . . Such was the state of the Saxons at the reunion of the French [or Frank] monarchy under Charlemagne; and it would seem that the first step he proposed to himself, as an opening to all his great designs, was completely to subdue a people which every day ravaged his frontier provinces, and continually threatened the very existence of the nations around."—G. P. R. James, *Hist. of Charlemagne, bk.* 3.—For generations before Charlemagne—from the period, in fact, of the sons of Clovis, early in the sixth century—the Frank kings had claimed supremacy over the Saxons and counted them among the tributaries of their Austrasian or German monarchy. Repeatedly, too, the Saxons had been forced to submit themselves and acknowledge the yoke, in terms, while they repudiated it in fact. When Charlemagne took in hand the conquest of this stubborn and barbarous people, he seems to have found the task as arduous as though nothing had been done in it before him. His first expedition into their country was undertaken in 772, when he advanced with fire and sword from the Rhine at Mayence to the Diemel in the Hessian country. It was on this occasion that he destroyed, near the head-waters of the Lippe, the famous national idol and fane of the Saxons called the Irminsul or Herminsaule—supposed to be connected with the memory of Hermann, the Cheruscan patriot chief who destroyed the Roman legions of Varus. The campaign resulted in the submission of the Saxons, with a surrender of hostages to guarantee it. But in 774 they were again in arms, and the next summer Charlemagne swept their country to beyond the Weser with the besom of destruction. Once more they yielded and gave hostages, who were taken to Frank monasteries and made Christians of. But the peace did not last a twelvemonth, and there was another great campaign in 776, which so terrified the turbulent heathen that they accepted baptism in large numbers, and a wholesale conversion took place at Paderborn in May, 777. But a chief had risen at last among the Saxons who could unite them, and who would not kneel to Charlemagne nor bow his head to the waters of baptism. This was Wittekind, a Westphalian, brother-in-law of the king of the Danes and friend of the Frisian king, Ratbod. While Charlemagne was in Spain, in 778, Wittekind roused his countrymen to a rising which cleared their land of crosses, churches, priests and Frank castles at one sweep. From that time until 785 there were campaigns every year, with terrible carnage and destruction in the Saxon country and industrious baptising of the submissive. At Badenfield, at Bockholz, near Zutphen, and at Detmold, there were fierce battles in which the Saxons suffered most; but at Sonnethal, on the Weser (the Dachtelfield), in 782, the Franks were fearfully beaten and slaughtered. Charlemagne took a barbarous vengeance for this reverse by beheading no less than 4,500 Saxon prisoners at Verden, on the Aller. Three years later, the country of the Saxons having been made, for the most part, a famine-smitten desert, they gave up the struggle. Even Wittekind accepted Christianity, became a monk—a missionary—a canonized saint—and disappeared otherwise from history. According to legend, the blood of more than 200,000 Saxons had "changed the very color of the soil," and the brown clay of the Saxon period gave way to the red earth of Westphalia." For seven years the Saxons were submissive and fought in Charlemagne's armies against other foes. Then there was a last despairing attempt to break the conqueror's yoke, and another long war of twelve years' duration. It ended in the practical annihilation of the Saxons as a distinct people in Germany. Many thousands of them were transplanted to other regions in Gaul and elsewhere; others escaped to Denmark and were absorbed into the great rising naval and military power of the Northmen. The survivors on their own soil were stripped of their possessions. "The Saxon war was conducted with almost unparalleled ferocity."—J. I. Mombert, *Hist. of Charles the Great, bk.* 2, *ch.* 3-4.

Also in: P. Godwin, *Hist. of France: Ancient Gaul, ch.* 16-17.

SAXONS OF BAYEUX.—"The district of Bayeux, occupied by a Saxon colony in the latest days of the old Roman Empire, occupied again by a Scandinavian colony as the result of its conquest by Rolf [or Rollo, the Northman], has retained to this day a character which distinguishes it from every other Romance-speaking portion of the Continent. The Saxons of Bayeux preserved

their name and their distinct existence under the Frankish dominion; we can hardly doubt that the Scandinavian settlers found some parts at least of the district still Teutonic, and that nearness of blood and speech exercised over them the same influence which the same causes exercised over the Scandinavian settlers in England. Danes and Saxons coalesced into one Teutonic people, and they retained their Teutonic language and character long after Rouen had become, in speech at least, no less French than Paris. With their old Teutonic speech, the second body of settlers seem to have largely retained their old Teutonic religion, and we shall presently find Bayeux the centre of a heathen and Danish party in the Duchy, in opposition to Rouen, the centre of the new speech and the new creed. The blood of the inhabitants of the Bessin must be composed of nearly the same elements, mingled in nearly the same proportions, as the blood of the inhabitants of the Danish districts of England."—E. A. Freeman, *Hist. of the Norman Conquest of England, ch.* 4.

SAXONY: The old Duchy.—"The great duchy of Saxony [as it existed under the Carolingian empire and after the separation of Germany from France] consisted of three main divisions, Westfalia, Engern or Angria, and Eastfalia. Thuringia to the south-east, and the Frisian lands to the north-west, may be looked on as in some sort appendages to the Saxon duchy. The duchy was also capable of any amount of extension towards the east, and the lands gradually won from the Wends on this side were all looked on as additions made to the Saxon territory. But the great Saxon duchy was broken up at the fall of Henry the Lion [A. D. 1191]. The archiepiscopal Electors of Köln received the title of Dukes of Westfalia and Engern. But in the greater part of those districts the grant remained merely nominal, though the ducal title, with a small actual Westfalian duchy, remained to the electorate till the end. From these lands the Saxon name may be looked on as having altogether passed away. The name of Saxony, as a geographical expression, clave to the Eastfalian remnant of the old duchy, and to Thuringia and the Slavonic conquests to the east. In the later division of Germany these lands formed the two circles of Upper and Lower Saxony; and it was within their limits that the various states arose which have kept on the Saxon name to our own time. From the descendants of Henry the Lion himself, and from the allodial lands which they kept, the Saxon name passed away, except so far as they became part of the Lower-Saxon circle. They held their place as princes of the Empire, no longer as Dukes of Saxony, but as Dukes of Brunswick, a house which gave Rome one Emperor and England a dynasty of kings. After some of the usual divisions, two Brunswick principalities finally took their place on the map, those of Lüneburg and Wolfenbüttel, the latter having the town of Brunswick for its capital. The Lüneburg duchy grew. Late in the seventeenth century it was raised to the electoral rank, and early in the next century it was finally enlarged by the acquisition of the bishoprics of Bremen and Verden. Thus was formed the Electorate, and afterwards Kingdom, of Hannover, while the simple ducal title remained with the Brunswick princes of the other line."—E. A. Freeman, *Hist. Geog. of Europe, ch.* 8, *sect.* 1.—See, also, GERMANY: A. D. 843–962.

A. D. 911-1024.—The Imperial House. See GERMANY: A. D. 911–936; 936–973; and 973–1122.

A. D. 1073-1075.—Revolt against Henry IV.—The Saxons were still unreconciled to the transfer of the imperial dignity from their own ducal family to the House of Franconia, when the third of the Franconian emperors, Henry IV., came to the throne while still a boy. His long minority encouraged them to a habit of independent feeling, while his rash and injudicious measures when he grew to manhood provoked their raging enmity. They were still a turbulent, wild people, and he undertook to force the yoke of the empire on their necks, by means of garrisoned fortresses and castles, distributed through their land. The garrisons were insolent, the people were not meek, and in 1073 a furious revolt broke out. "'All Saxony,' says a chronicler, 'revolted, as one man, from the king,' and marched, 80,000 strong, to the Hartzburg, a stately citadel near Goslar, which the king had built for a residence upon a commanding height. After useless negotiations, Henry made a narrow escape by flight. When he then summoned his princes around him, no one came; and here and there it began to be said that he must be entirely abandoned and another monarch chosen. In this extremity, the cities alone remained faithful to the emperor, who for some time lay sick almost to death in his loyal city of Worms." Henry's energy, and the great abilities which he possessed, enabled him to recover his command of resources and to bring a strong army into the field against the Saxons, in the early summer of 1075. They offered submission and he might have restored peace to his country in an honorable way; but his headstrong passions demanded revenge. "After a march of extraordinary rapidity, he fell suddenly upon the Saxons and their allies, the Thuringians, on the meadows of the Unstrutt, at Langensalza, near Hohenburg. His army drawn up in an order resembling that which Otto the Great had formed on the Lech [against the Hungarians], obtained, after a fierce hand-to-hand fight of nine hours, a bloody victory. When the Saxons finally yielded and fled, the battle became a massacre. . . . It is asserted that of the foot-soldiers, who composed the mass of the Saxon army of 60,000, hardly any escaped; though of the noblemen, who had swift horses, few were slain. But it was a battle of Germans with Germans, and on the very evening of the struggle, the lamentations over so many slain by kindred hands could not be suppressed in the emperor's own camp. Yet for the time the spirit of Saxon independence was crushed. Henry was really master of all Germany, and seemed to have established the imperial throne again." But little more than a year afterwards, Henry, under the ban of the great Pope Gregory VII., with whom he had quarrelled, was again deserted by his subjects. Again he recovered his footing and maintained a civil war until his own son deposed him, in 1105. The next year he died.—C. T. Lewis, *Hist. of Germany, bk.* 2, *ch.* 7, *sect.* 13–20.

ALSO IN: W. Menzel, *Hist. of Germany, ch.* 142.—See, also, GERMANY: A. D. 973–1122.

A. D. 1125-1152.—The origin of the electorate. See GERMANY: A. D. 1125–1152.

A. D. 1178-1183.—The dissolution of the old duchy.—In an account given elsewhere of the origin of the Guelf and Ghibelline parties and their names (see GUELFS AND GHIBELLINES), the circumstances under which Henry the Proud, in 1138, was stripped of the duchy of Saxony, and the duchy of Bavaria, have been briefly related. This Duke Henry the Proud died soon after that event, leaving a son who acquired the name of Henry the Lion. The Emperor Conrad, whose hostility to the father had been the cause of his ruin, now restored to the son, Henry the Lion, his duchy of Saxony, but required him to renounce the Bavarian duchy. But Conrad, dying in 1152, was succeeded on the imperial throne by his nephew, Frederick Barbarossa, who entertained a friendly feeling for the young Duke of Saxony, and who restored to him, in 1156, the whole of his father's forfeited possessions, Bavaria included. By his own warlike energies, Henry the Lion extended his dominions still further, making a conquest of the Obotrites, one of the tribes of heathen Slaves or Wends who occupied the Mecklenburg region on the Baltic. He was, now, the most powerful of the princes of the Germanic empire, and one of the most powerful in Europe. But he used his power haughtily and arbitrarily and raised up many enemies against himself. At length there arose a quarrel between the Emperor and Duke Henry, which the latter embittered by abruptly quitting the emperor's army, in Italy, with all his troops, at a time when (A. D. 1175) the latter was almost ruined by the desertion. From that moment Henry the Lion was marked, as his father had been, for ruin. Accusations were brought against him in the diet; he was repeatedly summoned to appear and meet them, and he obstinately refused to obey the summons. At length, A. D. 1178, he was formally declared to be a rebel to the state, and the "imperial ban" was solemnly pronounced against him. "This sentence placed Henry without the pale of the laws, and his person and his states were at the mercy of every one who had the power of injuring them. The archbishop of Cologne, his ancient enemy, had the ban promulgated throughout Saxony, and at his command Godfrey, Duke of Brabant; Philip, Count of Flanders; Otho, Count of Guelders; Thierry, Lord of Cleves; William of Juliers, with the Lords of Bonn Senef, Berg, and many others, levied forces, and joining the archbishop, entered Westphalia, which they overran and laid waste, before he was aware of their intentions." This was the beginning of a long struggle, in which Henry made a gallant resistance; but the odds were too heavily against him. His friends and supporters gradually fell away, his dominions were lost, one by one, and in 1183 he took refuge in England, at the court of Henry II., whose daughter Matilda he had married. After an exile of three years he was permitted to return to Germany and his alodial estates in Saxony were restored to him. The imperial fiefs were divided. The archbishop of Cologne received the greater part of Westphalia, and Angria. Bernard, Count of Anhalt, got the remainder of the old Saxon duchy, with its ducal title. When Henry the Lion died, in 1195, the alodial possessions that he had recovered were divided between his three sons.—Sir A. Halliday, *Annals of the House of Hanover, bk.* 4 (*v.* 1).—Fifty years afterwards these were converted into imperial fiefs and became the two duchies of the house of Brunswick, —Lüneburg and Wolfenbüttel, afterwards Hanover and Brunswick—the princes of which represented the old house of Saxony and inherited the name of Guelf.

ALSO IN: H. Hallam, *The Middle Ages, ch.* 5.—See, also, SAXONY: THE OLD DUCHY; GERMANY: A. D. 1138–1268; ITALY: A. D. 1174–1183.

A. D. 1180-1553.—The later Duchy and Electorate.—The House of Wettin.—Its Ernestine and Albertine lines, and their many branches.—"When Henry the Lion was deprived of the Duchy of Saxony in 1180, it [reduced to a small district around Lauenberg] was given to Bernhard, the youngest son of Albert the Bear, Elector of Brandenburg, and it continued with his descendants in the male line till 1422, when it was sold by the Emperor Sigismond to Frederick, surnamed the Warlike, Margrave of Misnia, descended in the female line from the Landgraves of Thuringen."—Sir A. Halliday, *Annals of the House of Hanover, v.* 1, *p.* 426.—This line has been known as the House of Wettin, taking that name from Dedo, count of Wettin, who was the first margrave of Misnia, or Meissen; being invested with the dignity in 1048. "The Wettin line of Saxon princes, the same that yet endures [1855], known by sight to every English creature (for the high individual, Prince Albert, is of it), had been lucky enough to combine in itself, by inheritance, by good management, chiefly by inheritance and mere force of survival, all the Three separate portions and divided dignities of that country: the Thüringen Landgraviate, the Meissen Markgraviate, and the ancient Duchy and Electorate of Saxony; and to become very great among the Princes of the German Empire. . . . Through the earlier portion of the 15th century, this Saxon House might fairly reckon itself the greatest in Germany, till Austria, till Brandenburg gradually rose to overshadow it. Law of primogeniture could never be accepted in that country; nothing but divisions, redivisions, coalescings, splittings, and never-ending readjustments and collisions were prevalent in consequence; to which cause, first of all, the loss of the race by Saxony may be ascribed." In 1464, Frederick II. was succeeded by his two sons, Ernest and Albert. These princes governed their country conjointly for upwards of 20 years, but then made a partition from which began the separation of the Ernestine and Albertine lines that continued ever afterwards in the House of Saxony. "Ernest, the elder of those two . . . boys, became Kurfürst (Elector); and got for inheritance, besides the 'inalienable properties' which lie round Wittenberg, . . . the better or Thuringian side of the Saxon country—that is, the Weimar, Gotha, Altenburg, &c. Principalities: —while the other youth, Albert, had to take the 'Osterland (Easternland), with part of Meissen,' what we may in general imagine to be (for no German Dryasdust will do you the kindness to say precisely) the eastern region of what is Saxony in our day. These Albertines, with an inferior territory, had, as their main towns, Leipzig and Dresden, a Residenz-Schloss (or sublime enough Ducal Palace) in each city, Leipzig as yet the grander and more common one. There, at Leipzig chiefly, I say, lived the august younger or Albertine Line. . . . As for Ernst,

the elder, he and his lived chiefly at Wittenberg, as I perceive; there or in the neighbourhood was their high Schloss; distinguished among palaces. But they had Weimar, they had Altenburg, Gotha, Coburg,—above all, they had the Wartburg, one of the most distinguished Strong Houses any Duke could live in, if he were of frugal and heroic turn. . . . Ernst's son was Frederick the Wise, successor in the Kur (Electorship) and paternal lands; which, as Frederick did not marry and there was only one other brother, were not further divided on this occasion. Frederick the Wise, born in 1463, was that ever-memorable Kurfürst who saved Luther from the Diet of Worms in 1521 [see PAPACY: A. D. 1521–1522]. . . . He died in 1525, and was succeeded by his brother, John the Steadfast. . . . He also was a wise and eminently Protestant man. He struggled very faithfully for the good Cause, during his term of sovereignty; died in 1532 (14 years before Luther), having held the Electorate only seven years. . . . His son was Johann Friedrich, the Magnanimous by epithet (der Grossmüthige), under whom the Line underwent sad destinies; lost the Electorship, lost much; and split itself after him into innumerable branches, who are all of a small type ever since." In the Albertine Line, Albert's eldest son, "successor in the eastern properties and residences, was Duke George of Saxony,—called 'of Saxony,' as all those Dukes, big and little, were and still are,—Herzog Georg von Sachsen: of whom, to make him memorable, it is enough to say that he was Luther's Duke George! Yes, this is he with whom Luther had such wrangling and jangling. . . . He was strong for the old religion, while his cousins went so valiantly ahead for the new. . . . George's brother, Henry, succeeded; lived only for two years; in which time all went to Protestantism in the eastern parts of Saxony, as in the western. This Henry's eldest son, and first successor, was Moritz, the 'Maurice' known in English Protestant books; who, in the Schmalkaldic League and War, played such a questionable game with his Protestant cousin, of the elder or Ernestine Line,—quite ousting said cousin, by superior jockeyship, and reducing his Line and him to the second rank ever since [see GERMANY: A. D. 1546–1552]. This cousin was Johann Friedrich the Magnanimous . . . whom we left above waiting for that catastrophe. . . . Duke Moritz got the Electorship transferred to himself; Electorship, with Wittenberg and the 'inalienable lands and dignities.' . . . Moritz kept his Electorship, and, by cunning jockeying, his Protestantism too; got his Albertine or junior Line pushed into the place of the Ernestine or first; in which dishonourably acquired position it continues to this day [1855]; performing ever since the chief part in Saxony, as Electors, and now as Kings of Saxony. . . . The Ernestine, or honourable Protestant line is ever since in a secondary, diminished, and as it were, disintegrated state, a Line broken small; nothing now but a series of small Dukes, Weimar, Gotha, Coburg, and the like, in the Thuringian region, who, on mere genealogical grounds, put Sachsen to their name: Sachsen-Coburg, Sachsen-Weimar, &c. [Anglicised, Saxe-Coburg, etc.]."—T. Carlyle, *The Prinzenraub* (*Essays, v.* 6).

ALSO IN: F. Shoberl, *Historical Account of the House of Saxony.*

A. D. 1500-1512.—Formation of the Circles of Saxony and Upper Saxony. See GERMANY: A. D. 1493–1519.

A. D. 1516-1546.—The Reformation. See PAPACY: A. D. 1516–1517, to 1517–1521, 1521–1522, 1522–1525, 1525–1529, 1530–1531; also, GERMANY: A. D. 1530–1532, and after.

A. D. 1525.—The Lutheran doctrines and system formally established in the electorate. See PAPACY: A. D. 1522–1525.

A. D. 1539.—Succession of a Protestant prince. See GERMANY: A. D. 1533–1546.

A. D. 1546-1547.—Treachery of Maurice of Saxony.—Transfer of the electorate to him. See GERMANY: A. D. 1546–1552.

A. D. 1619.—Adhesion of the Elector to the Emperor Ferdinand, against Frederick of Bohemia and the Evangelical Union. See GERMANY: A. D. 1618–1620.

A. D. 1631.—Ignoble trepidations of the Elector.—His final alliance with Gustavus Adolphus.—The battle of Breitenfeld. See GERMANY: A. D. 1631.

A. D. 1631-1632.—The Elector and his army in Bohemia. See GERMANY: A. D. 1631–1632.

A. D. 1633.—Standing aloof from the Union of Heilbronn. See GERMANY: A. D. 1632–1634.

A. D. 1634.—Desertion of the Protestant cause.—The Elector's alliance with the Emperor. See GERMANY: A. D. 1634–1639.

A. D. 1645.—Forced to a treaty of neutrality with the Swedes and French. See GERMANY: A. D. 1640–1645.

A. D. 1648.—The Peace of Westphalia. See GERMANY: A. D. 1648.

A. D. 1686.—The League of Augsburg. See GERMANY: A. D. 1686.

A. D. 1697-1698.—The crown of Poland secured by the Elector. See POLAND: A. D. 1696–1698.

A. D. 1706.—Invasion by Charles XII. of Sweden.—Renunciation of the Polish crown by the Elector Augustus. See SCANDINAVIAN STATES (SWEDEN): A. D. 1701–1707.

A. D. 1733.—Election of Augustus III. to the Polish throne, enforced by Russia and Austria. See POLAND: A. D. 1732–1733.

A. D. 1740.—The War of the Austrian Succession: Claims of the Elector upon Austrian territory. See AUSTRIA: A. D. 1740 (OCTOBER).

A. D. 1741.—The War of the Austrian Succession: Alliance against Austria. See AUSTRIA: A. D. 1741 (AUGUST—NOVEMBER).

A. D. 1745.—The War of the Austrian Succession: Alliance with Austria.—Subjugation by Prussia.—The Peace of Dresden. See AUSTRIA: A. D. 1744–1745.

A. D. 1755.—Intrigues with Austria and Russia against Prussia.—Causes of the Seven Years War. See GERMANY: A. D. 1755–1756.

A. D. 1756.—Swift subjugation by Frederick of Prussia. See GERMANY: A. D. 1756.

A. D. 1759-1760.—Occupied by the Austrians.—Mostly recovered by Frederick. See GERMANY: A. D. 1759 (JULY—NOVEMBER); and 1760.

A. D. 1763.—The end and results of the Seven Years War.—The electorate restored. See SEVEN YEARS WAR: THE TREATIES.

A. D. 1806.—The Elector, deserting Prussia, becomes the subject-ally of Napoleon, and

is made a king. See GERMANY: A. D. 1806 (OCTOBER—DECEMBER).

A. D. 1807.—Acquisition by the king of the grand duchy of Warsaw. See GERMANY: A. D. 1807 (JUNE—JULY).

A. D. 1809.—Risings against the French. See GERMANY: A. D. 1809 (APRIL—JULY).

A. D. 1813.—Occupied by the Allies.—Regained by the French.—Humiliating submission of the king to Napoleon.—French victory at Dresden and defeat at Leipsic.—Desertion from Napoleon's army by the Saxons.—The king a prisoner in the hands of the Allies.—French surrender of Dresden. See GERMANY: A. D. 1812–1813, to 1813 (OCTOBER—DECEMBER).

A. D. 1814-1815.—The Saxon question in the Congress of Vienna.—The king restored, with half of his dominions lost. See VIENNA, THE CONGRESS OF.

A. D. 1817.—Accession to the Holy Alliance. See HOLY ALLIANCE.

A. D. 1848 (March).—Revolutionary outbreak.—Concessions to the people. See GERMANY: A. D. 1848 (MARCH).

A. D. 1849.—Insurrection suppressed by Prussian troops. See GERMANY: A. D. 1848–1850.

A. D. 1866.—The Seven Weeks War.—Indemnity to Prussia.—Union with the North German Confederation. See GERMANY: A. D. 1866.

A. D. 1870-1871.—Embraced in the new German Empire. See GERMANY: A. D. 1870 (SEPTEMBER—DECEMBER); 1871 (JANUARY); and 1871 (APRIL).

SAXONY, The English titular Dukedom of. See WALES, PRINCE OF.

SCALDIS, The.—The ancient name of the river Scheldt.

SCALDS, OR SKALDS, The.—"Before the introduction or general diffusion of writing, it is evident that a class of men whose sole occupation was to commit to memory and preserve the laws, usages, precedents, and details of all those civil affairs and rights, and to whose fidelity in relating former transactions implicit confidence could be given, must of necessity have existed in society—must have been in every locality. . . . This class [among the Scandinavian peoples of the North of Europe] were the Scalds—the men who were the living books, to be referred to in every case of law or property in which the past had to be applied to the present. Before the introduction of Christianity, and with Christianity the use of written documents, and the diffusion, by the church establishment, of writing in every locality, the scald must have been among the pagan landowners what the parish priest and his written record were in the older Christianised countries of Europe. . . . The scalds in these Christianised countries were merely a class of wandering troubadours, poets, story-tellers, minnesingers. . . . The scalds of the north disappeared at once when Christian priests were established through the country. They were superseded in their utility by men of education, who knew the art of writing; and the country had no feudal barons to maintain such a class for amusement only. We hear little of the scalds after the first half of the 12th century."—S. Laing, *The Heimskringla: Preliminary Dissertation, ch.* 1.—"At the dawn of historical times we find the skalds practising their art everywhere in the North. . . . The oldest Norwegian skalds, like 'Starkad' and 'Brage the Old,' are enveloped in mythic darkness, but already, in the time of Harald Fairhair (872–930), the song-smiths of the Scandinavian North appear as thoroughly historical personages. In Iceland the art of poetry was held in high honor, and it was cultivated not only by the professional skalds, but also by others when the occasion presented itself. . . . When the Icelander had arrived at the age of maturity, he longed to travel in foreign lands. As a skald he would then visit foreign kings and other noblemen, where he would receive a most hearty welcome. . . . These Icelandic skalds became a very significant factor in the literary development of the North during the greater part of the middle ages."—F. W. Horn, *Hist. of the Literature of the Scandinavian North, pt.* 1, *ch.* 1.

SCALIGERI, The, or Della Scala Family. See VERONA: A. D. 1260–1338; also, MILAN: A. D. 1277–1447.

SCAMANDER, The. See TROJA.

SCANDERBEG'S WAR WITH THE TURKS. See ALBANIANS: A. D. 1443–1467.

SCANDINAVIAN STATES.

Early history.—"Those who lean implicitly on the chief props supplied by the Old Norse literature for the early history and genealogy of the North lean on very unsafe supports. The fact is, we must treat these genealogies and these continuous histories as compilations made up from isolated and detached traditions—epics in which some individual or some battle was described, and in which the links and the connections between the pieces have been supplied according to the ingenuity of the compilers; in which the arrangement and chronology are to a large extent arbitrary; and in which it has been a great temptation to transfer the deeds of one hero to another of the same name. Under these circumstances what is a modern historian to do? In the first place he must take the contemporary chronicles—Frank, English, and Irish—as his supreme guides, and not allow their statements to be perverted by the false or delusive testimony of the sagas, and where the two are at issue, sacrifice the latter without scruple, while in those cases where we have no contemporary and independent evidence then to construct as best we can our story from the glimmers of light that have reached us."—H. H. Howorth, *Early Hist. of Sweden* (*Royal Hist. Soc., Transactions, v.* 9).

Their relationships in language and blood.—"Scandinavia is not a very convenient word. Norway and Sweden it suits; because, in Norway and Sweden, the geographical boundaries coincide with the phenomena of language and blood. But Denmark is not only divided from them by water, but is in actual contact with Germany. More than this, it is connected with

the Empire: Holstein being German and Imperial, Sleswick partly German though not Imperial. . . . Generically, a Scandinavian is a German. Of the great German stock there are two divisions — the Scandinavian or Norse, and the Teutonic or German Proper. Of the Germans Proper, the nearest congeners to the Scandinavians are the Frisians; and, after them, the Saxons. . . . At present the languages of Sweden and Denmark, though mutually intelligible, are treated as distinct: the real differences being exaggerated by differences of orthography, and by the use on the part of the Swedes of the ordinary Italian alphabet, whilst the Danes prefer the old German black-letter. The literary Norwegian is Danish rather than Swedish. Meanwhile, the old language, the mother-tongue, is the common property of all, and so is the old literature with its Edda and Sagas; though . . . the Norwegians are the chief heroes of it. The language in which it is embodied is preserved with but little alteration in Iceland; so that it may fairly be called Icelandic, though the Norwegians denominate it Old Norse [see NORMANS —NORTHMEN: A. D. 960–1100]. . . . The histories of the three countries are alike in their general character though different in detail. Denmark, when we have got away from the heroic age into the dawn of the true historical period, is definitely separated from Germany in the parts about the Eyder — perhaps by the river itself. It is Pagan and Anti-Imperial; the Danes being, in the eyes of the Carlovingians, little better than the hated Saxons. Nor is it ever an integral part of the Empire; though Danish and German alliances are common. They end in Holstein being Danish, and in its encroaching on Sleswick and largely influencing the kingdom in general. As being most in contact with the civilization of the South, Denmark encroaches on Sweden, and, for a long time, holds Skaane and other Swedish districts. Indeed, it is always a check upon the ambition of its northern neighbour. Before, then, that Sweden becomes one and indivisible, the Danes have to be ejected from its southern provinces. Norway, too, when dynastic alliances begin and when kingdoms become consolidated, is united with Denmark. . . . In the way of language the Scandinavians are Germans — the term being taken in its wider and more general sense. Whether the blood coincide with the language is another question; nor is it an easy one. The one point upon which most ethnologists agree, is the doctrine that, in Norway and Sweden (at least), or in the parts north of the Baltic, the Germans are by no means aboriginal; the real aborigines having been congeners of either the Laps or the Fins; who, at a time anterior to the German immigrations, covered the whole land from the North Cape to the Naze in Norway, and from Tornea to Ystadt in Sweden. Towards these aborigines the newer occupants comported themselves much as the Angles of England comported themselves towards the Britons. At the same time, in both Britain and Scandinavia the extent to which the two populations intermarried or kept separate is doubtful. It may be added that, in both countries, there are extreme opinions on each side of the question."—R. G. Latham, *The Nationalities of Europe, v. 2, ch. 37.*—See, also, GOTHS, ORIGIN OF THE.

ALSO IN: A. Lefèvre, *Race and Language, p. 236.*

8-9th Centuries. — Explorations, ravages and conquests of the Vikings. See NORMANS. —NORTHMEN.

8-11th Centuries.— Formation of the Three Kingdoms.—"At the end of the 8th century, . . . within the two Scandinavian peninsulas, the three Scandinavian nations were fast forming. A number of kindred tribes were settling down into the kingdoms of Denmark, Norway and Sweden, which, sometimes separate, sometimes united, have existed ever since. Of these three, Denmark, the only one which had a frontier towards the Empire, was naturally the first to play a part in general European history. In the course of the 10th century, under the half-mythical Gorm, and his successors Harold and Sven, the Danish kingdom itself, as distinguished from other lands held in aftertimes by its kings, reached nearly its full historical extent in the two peninsulas and the islands between them. Halland and Skane or Scania, it must always be remembered, are from the beginning at least as Danish as Zealand and Jutland. The Eider remained the frontier towards the Empire, save during part of the 10th and 11th centuries, when the Danish frontier withdrew to the Dannewerk, and the land between the two boundaries formed the Danish March of the Empire. Under Cnut the old frontier was restored. The name of Northmen, which the Franks used in a laxer way for the Scandinavian nations generally, was confined to the people of Norway. These were formed into a single kingdom under Harold Harfraga late in the 9th century. The Norwegian realm of that day stretched far beyond the bounds of the later Norway, having an indefinite extension over tributary Finnish tribes as far as the White Sea. The central part of the eastern side of the northern peninsula, between Denmark to the south and the Finnish nations to the north, was held by two Scandinavian settlements which grew into the Swedish kingdom. These were those of the Swedes strictly so called, and of the Geatas or Gauts. This last name has naturally been confounded with that of the Goths, and has given the title of 'King of the Goths' to the princes of Sweden. Gothland, east and west, lay on each side of Lake Wettern. Swithiod or Svealand, Sweden proper, lay on both sides of the great arm of the sea whose entrance is guarded by the modern capital. The union of Svealand and Gothland made up the kingdom of Sweden. Its early boundaries towards both Denmark and Norway were fluctuating. Wermeland, immediately to the north of Lake Wenern, and Jamteland farther to the north, were long a debatable land. At the beginning of the 12th century Wermeland passed finally to Sweden, and Jamteland for several ages to Norway. Bleking again, at the south-east corner of the Peninsula, was a debatable land between Sweden and Denmark which passed to Denmark. For a land thus bounded the natural course of extension by land lay to the north, along the west coast of the Gulf of Bothnia. In the course of the 11th century at the latest, Sweden began to spread itself in that direction over Helsingland. Sweden had thus a better opportunity than Denmark and Norway for extension of her own borders by land. Meanwhile Denmark and Norway, looking to the west, had their great time of Oceanic conquest and colonization in the 9th and 10th centuries."

—E. A. Freeman, *Historical Geog. of Europe, ch.* 11, *sect.* 1.—"Till about the year of Grace 860 there were no kings in Norway, nothing but numerous jarls, — essentially kinglets, — each presiding over a kind of republican or parliamentary little territory; generally striving each to be on some terms of human neighbourhood with those about him, but, in spite of 'Fylke Things' (Folk Things)— little parish parliaments — and small combinations of these, which had gradually formed themselves, often reduced to the unhappy state of quarrel with them. Harald Haarfagr was the first to put an end to this state of things, and become memorable and profitable to his country by uniting it under one head and making a kingdom of it; which it has continued to be ever since. His father, Halfdan the Black, had already begun this rough but salutary process, . . . but it was Harald the Fairhaired, his son, who conspicuously carried it on and completed it. Harald's birth-year, death-year, and chronology in general, are known only by inference and computation; but, by the latest reckoning, he died about the year 933 of our era, a man of 83. The business of conquest lasted Harald about twelve years (A. D. 860–872 ?), in which he subdued also the Vikings of the out-islands, Orkneys, Shetlands, Hebrides, and Man. Sixty more years were given him to consolidate and regulate what he had conquered, which he did with great judgment, industry, and success. His reign altogether is counted to have been of over 70 years. . . . These were the times of Norse colonization; proud Norsemen flying into other lands, to freer scenes,— to Iceland, to the Faröe Islands, which were hitherto quite vacant (tenanted only by some mournful hermit, Irish Christian fakir, or so); still more copiously to the Orkney and Shetland Isles, the Hebrides and other countries where Norse squatters and settlers already were. Settlement of Iceland, we say, settlement of the Faröe Islands, and, by far the notablest of all, settlement of Normandy by Rolf the Ganger (A. D. 876 ?)."— T. Carlyle, *The Early Kings of Norway, ch.* 1.

9th Century.—Introduction of Christianity. See CHRISTIANITY: 9-11TH CENTURIES.

A. D. 1018-1397.—The empire of Canute and its dissolution.— Disturbed state of the Three Kingdoms.—The Folkungas in Sweden. —Rise of Denmark.— The reign of Queen Margaret and the Union of Calmar.—"A Northern Empire . . . for a time seemed possible when Canute the Great arose. King by inheritance of England [see ENGLAND: A. D. 979–1016, and 1016–1042] and of Denmark, he was able by successful war to add almost the whole of Norway to his dominions. The definite incorporation of Sleswig under treaty with the Emperor Conrad, and the submission of the Wendish tribes, appeared to open for him a way on to the continent. . . . Had men with like capacity succeeded to his throne, the world might have beheld an Empire of the North as well as of the East and West. But the kingdoms of the great Danish monarch fell asunder on his death and his successors sink again into insignificance. Another century passes before a bright page illumines their obscure annals. The names of Waldemar the Great [1157–1182], of Canute VI. [1182–1202] and Waldemar the Victorious [1202–1241] his sons, are then found attracting the attention of Europe. Again their kingdom seemed about to raise itself to be a continental power. They sallied forth from their peninsula, they again conquered the Wends; the southern shores of the Baltic, even as far as Courland and Esthonia, were made to tremble at the Danish arms. . . . But the greatness was again but temporary. Waldemar the Victorious, surprised and made a prisoner in Germany, beheld his empire returning to its fragments. Regaining his liberty he tried to regain his power, but a disastrous battle at Bornhoved in 1227 gave a deathblow to his ambition. An alliance of the petty princes who feared his greatness prevailed against him, and Denmark relapsed again into decline. Many causes now contributed to the downfall of the kingdom. By the fatal policy of Waldemar it was divided among his sons. . . . While anarchy increased within the country, new enemies arose around it. The Norwegians in a war that lasted for long years harassed it. The necessities of Christopher obliged him to pledge Scania, Halland, and Bleking to Sweden. A formidable foe too was now appearing in the Hanseatic League [see HANSA TOWNS], whose rise had followed upon the fall of Waldemar's power. The rich cities of Lubeck and Hamburg had seized the opportunity to assert their freedom. . . . Harassed by foreign enemies and by strife with his own nobles, Christopher [the Second, who came to the throne in 1319] at last was driven from his kingdom. A count of Holstein, known as the Black Geert, became for fourteen years the virtual sovereign, and imposed upon the country his nephew, Waldemar III., the heir of the rebellious house of Sleswig, as a titular King. Dismembered and in anarchy, the country had sunk low, and it was not until the assassination of Black Geert, in 1340, that any hope appeared of its recovery." In Sweden the national history had its real beginning, perhaps, in the days of St. Eric, who reigned from 1155 to 1160. "In this reign the spread of Christianity became the spread of power. Eric . . . earned his title from his definite establishment of the new faith. . . . The remaining sovereigns of his line can hardly be said to have contributed much towards the advancement of their country, and it was reserved for a new dynasty to carry on the work of the earlier kings. A powerful family had risen near the throne, and, retaining the old tribal rank of Jarls, had filled almost the position of mayors of the palace. The death of Eric Ericson without children removed the last obstacle to their ambition. The infant son of Birger Jarl was elected to the vacant throne, and the transfer of the royal title to the family [known as the Folkungas] that had long held royal power seemed as natural to the Swedes as it had done earlier to the Franks. As regent for his child, Birger upheld and added to the greatness of his country; he became the conspicuous figure of the 13th century in the North; he is the founder of Stockholm, the conqueror of the Finns, the protector of the exiled princes of Russia, the mediator in differences between Norway and Denmark. His sceptred descendants however did not equal their unsceptred sire. The conquest of Finland was indeed completed by Torkel Knutson at the close of the 13th century, and shed some lustre upon the reign of King Birger, but the quarrels of succeeding princes among themselves disgraced and distracted the country." In Norway, "the conquests of Harold

Harfager had secured the crown to a long line of his descendants; but the strife of these descendants among themselves, and the contests which were provoked by the attempts of successive sovereigns, with imprudent zeal, to enforce the doctrines of Christianity upon unwilling subjects, distracted and weakened the kingdom. A prey to anarchy, it fell also a prey to its neighbours. In the 10th century it belonged for a time to Denmark; Sweden joined later in dismembering it; and Canute the Great was able to call himself its King. These were times indeed in which conquests and annexations were often more rapid than lasting, and a King of Norway soon reigned in his turn over Denmark. Yet there is no doubt that the Norwegians suffered more than they inflicted, and were from the first the weakest of the three nations. . . . Wars, foreign and domestic, that have now no interest, exhausted the country; the plague of 1348 deprived it of at least one half its population. Its decline had been marked, upon the extinction of its royal dynasty in 1319, by the election of Swedish princes to fill its throne; and after the reign of two stranger Kings it sank for ever from the list of independent kingdoms. Drifting through anarchy and discord the three kingdoms had sunk low. Denmark was first to raise herself from the abasement, and the reign of a fourth Waldemar not only restored her strength but gave her a pre-eminence which she retained until the days of Gustavus Adolphus. The new sovereign, a younger son of Christopher II., was raised to the throne in 1340, and no competitor, now that Black Geert was dead, appeared to dispute it with him." Waldemar gave up, on the one hand, his claims to Scania, Halland, and Bleking (which he afterwards reclaimed and repossessed), as well as the distant possessions in Esthonia, while he bought back Jutland and the Isles, on the other. "The isle of Gothland, and Wisby its rich capital, the centre of the Hanseatic trade within the Baltic, were plundered and annexed [1361], giving the title thenceforward of King of the Goths to the Danish monarchs. This success indeed was paid for by the bitter enmity of the Hansa, and by a war in which the pride of Denmark was humbled to the dust beneath the power of the combined cities. Copenhagen was pillaged [1362]; and peace was only made by a treaty [1363] which confirmed all former privileges to the conquerors, which gave them for fifteen years possession of the better part of Scania and its revenues, and which humbly promised that the election of all sovereigns of Denmark should thenceforth be submitted for their approval. Yet Waldemar has left behind him the reputation of a prudent and successful prince, and his policy prepared the way for the greatness of his successors. At his death in 1375 two daughters, on behalf of their children, became claimants for his throne. The youngest, Margaret, had married Hako, King of Norway, the son of a deposed King of Sweden [the last of the Folkungas, or Folkungers]; and the attractive prospect of a union between the two kingdoms, supported by her own prudent and conciliatory measures, secured the election of her son Olaf. As regent for her child, who soon by the death of his father became King of Norway as well as of Denmark, she showed the wisdom of a ruler, and won the affections of her subjects; and when the death of Olaf himself occurred in 1387 she was rewarded in both kingdoms by the formal possession of the sceptres which she had already shown herself well able to hold. Mistress in Denmark and in Norway, she prepared to add Sweden to her dominions. Since the banishment of the Folkungas, Albert Duke of Mecklenburg had reigned as King." But Sweden preferred Margaret, and she easily expelled Albert from the throne, defeating him and making him a prisoner, in 1389. A few years later, "her nephew, Eric, long since accepted in Denmark and in Norway as her successor, and titularly King, was now [1397] at a solemn meeting of the states at Calmar crowned Sovereign of the Three Kingdoms. At a later meeting the Union, since known as that of Calmar, was formally voted, and the great work of her life was achieved."—C. F. Johnstone, *Historical Abstracts, ch.* 1.

Also in: E. G. Geijer, *Hist. of the Swedes, v.* 1, *ch.* 3–5.

14-15th Centuries.—Power and influence of the Hanseatic League. See Hansa Towns.

A. D. 1397-1527.—Under the Union of Calmar until its dissolution.—The brutality of Christian II. and his overthrow.—Gustavus Vasa and his elevation to the throne of Sweden.—The introduction of the Reformation.— The most noteworthy articles of the Union of Calmar, by which Norway, Sweden and Denmark were united together, in 1397, under the Danish queen Margaret, were the following: "That the right of electing a sovereign should be exercised in common by the three kingdoms; that a son of the reigning king, if there were any, should be preferred; that each kingdom should be governed by its own laws; and that all should combine for the common defence. But this confederacy, which seemed calculated to promote the power and tranquility of Scandinavia, proved the source of much discontent and jealousy and of several bloody wars. Margaret was succeeded on her death in 1412 by Eric of Pomerania, the son of her niece. . . . Eric's reign was turbulent. In 1438 the Danes, and in the following year the Swedes, renounced their allegiance; and Eric fled to the island of Gothland, where he exercised piracy till his death. The Danes elected in Eric's stead Christopher of Bavaria, son of his sister Catharine; . . . but after Christopher's death in 1448 the union was dissolved. The Danes now elected for their king Count Christian of Oldenburg; while the Swedes chose Charles Knutson. But in the following year Charles was compelled to resign Norway to Denmark, and in 1457 he lost Sweden itself through an insurrection led by the Archbishop of Upsala. Christian I. of Denmark was chosen in his place and crowned at Upsala, June 19th; and in the following year all the councillors of the three kingdoms, assembled at Skara, recognised Christian's son John as his successor. Christian I. became a powerful monarch by inheriting Schleswic and Holstein from his uncle. He had, however, to contend for a long period with Charles Knutson for the throne of Sweden, and after Charles's death in 1470, with Sten Sture, of a noble family in Dalecarlia, to whom Charles, with the approbation of the Swedes, had left the administration of the kingdom. In October 1471 a battle was fought on the Brunkeberg, a height now enclosed in the city of Stockholm, in which the Danish King was defeated, though he

continued to hold the southern provinces of Sweden. Christian died in 1481 and was succeeded by his son John. The Swedes in 1483 acknowledged the supremacy of Denmark by renewing the Union of Calmar; yet . . . John could never firmly establish himself in that country. . . . King John of Denmark died in 1513. . . . It was during the reign of Christian II. [his son and successor] that Denmark first began to have any extensive connections with the rest of Europe. In the year of his accession, he allied himself with the Wendish, or north-eastern towns of the Hanseatic League, whose metropolis was Lübeck; and he subsequently formed alliances with Russia, France, England, and Scotland, with the view of obtaining their aid in his contemplated reduction of Sweden. . . . In 1517 Trolle [Archbishop of Upsala] had levied open war against the administrator, Sten Sture, in which Christian supported him with his fleet; but Sten Sture succeeded in capturing Trolle. . . . In the next year (1518) Christian again appeared near Stockholm with a fleet and army, in which were 2,000 French sent by Francis I. Christian was defeated by Sten Sture in a battle near Bränkirka. . . . The Archbishop of Upsala having proceeded to Rome to complain of Sten Sture, the Pope erected in Denmark an ecclesiastical tribunal, which deposed the administrator and his party, and laid all Sweden under an interdict. This proceeding, however, served to pave the way for the acceptance in Sweden of the Lutheran reformation; though it afforded Christian II. a pretence for getting up a sort of crusade against that country. . . . Early in 1520 . . . Sture was defeated and wounded in a battle fought on the ice of Lake Asunden, near Bogesund in West Gothland. . . . Sten Sture, in spite of his wound, hastened to the defence of Stockholm, but expired on the way in his sledge on Malar Lake, February 3rd 1520. The Swedes were defeated in a second battle near Upsala, after which a treaty was concluded to the effect that Christian should reign in Sweden, agreeably to the Union of Calmar, but on condition of granting an entire amnesty. Christian now proceeded to Stockholm, and in October was admitted into that city by Sture's widow, who held the command. Christian at first behaved in the most friendly manner . . . ; yet he had no sooner received the crown than he took the most inhuman vengeance on his confiding subjects. . . . The city was abandoned to be plundered by the soldiers like a place taken by storm. Orders were despatched to Finland to proceed in a similar manner; while the King's progress through the southern provinces was everywhere marked by the erection of gallowses. These cruelties . . . occasioned insurrections in all his dominions. That in Sweden was led by Gustavus Ericson, . . . a young man remarkable alike by his origin, connections, talent and courage; whose family, for what reason is unknown, afterwards assumed the name of Vasa, which was borne neither by himself nor by his forefathers." Gustavus, who had been a hostage in Christian's hands, had escaped from his captivity, in 1519, taking refuge at Lübeck. In May, 1520, he secretly entered Sweden, remaining in concealment. A few months later his father perished, among the victims of the Danish tyrant, and Gustavus fled to Dalecarlia, "a district noted for its love of freedom and hatred of the Danes. Here he worked in peasant's clothes, for daily wages, in hourly danger from his pursuers, from whom he had many narrow escapes. . . . The news of Christian's inhumanity procured Gustavus Vasa many followers; he was elected as their leader by a great assembly of the people at Mora, and found himself at the head of 5,000 men," out of whom he made good soldiers, although they were wretchedly armed. "In June, 1521, he invested Stockholm; but the siege, for want of proper artillery and engineering skill, was protracted two years. During this period his command was legally confirmed in a Herrendag, or assembly of the nobles, at Wadstena, August 24th 1521; the crown was proffered to him, which he declined, but accepted the office of Regent. The Danes were now by degrees almost entirely expelled from Sweden; and Christian II., so far from being able to relieve Stockholm, found himself in danger of losing the Danish crown," which he did, in fact, in 1523, through a revolution that placed on the throne his uncle, Duke Frederick of Holstein. "The Union of Calmar was now entirely dissolved. The Norwegians claimed to exercise the right of election like the Danes; and when Frederick called upon the Swedish States to recognise his title in conformity with the Union, they replied that it was their intention to elect Gustavus Ericson for their king; which was accordingly done at the Diet of Strengnäs, June 7th 1523. Three weeks after Stockholm surrendered to Gustavus." The dethroned Christian II. escaped to the Netherlands, where he found means to equip an expedition with which he invaded Norway, in 1531. It left him a prisoner in the hands of the Danes, who locked him up in the castle of Sonderburg until his death, which did not occur until 1559. "Meanwhile, in Sweden, Gustavus was consolidating his power, partly by moderation and mildness, partly by examples of necessary severity. He put himself at the head of the Reformation, as Frederick I. also did in Denmark. . . . Luther's doctrines had been first introduced into Sweden in 1519, by two brothers, Olaus and Lawrence Petri, who had studied under the great apostle of reform at Wittenberg. The Petris soon attracted the attention of Gustavus, who gave them his protection, and entered himself into correspondence with Luther. . . . As in other parts of Europe, the nobles were induced to join the movement from the prospect of sharing the spoils of the church; and in a great Diet at Westerås in 1527, the Reformation was introduced."—T. H. Dyer, *Hist. of Modern Europe, bk.* 4, *ch.* 4 (*v.* 2).

Also in: P. B. Watson, *The Swedish Revolution under Gustavus Vasa.*—A. Alberg, *Gustavus Vasa and his Stirring Times.*

(Denmark and Norway): A. D. 1523.—Accession of Frederick I.

(Sweden): A. D. 1523-1604.—The reigns of Gustavus Vasa and his sons.—Wars with Russia and Denmark.—The Baltic question.—Prince Sigismund elected king of Poland and his consequent loss of the Swedish crown.—Resulting hostilities.—"Gustavus Vasa, the founder of his dynasty, was not a very religious man. He had determined to make Sweden a Lutheran country for two main reasons: first, because he wanted the lands of the Church, both in order to enrich the crown and also to attach the nobles to his cause; secondly, because, as he

SCANDINAVIAN STATES, 1523–1604.

said, the 'priests were all unionists in Sweden'—that is, they all wished to maintain the union of the three Scandinavian kingdoms which he had broken, and they were, therefore, irreconcilably hostile to his dynasty. Three other great services were rendered to Sweden by Gustavus I.: (1) at the Diet of Westerås, in 1544, the hereditary character of the monarchy was definitely declared. This was a great victory over the nobles, who in nearly all the Northern and Eastern Kingdoms of Europe—and in Sweden itself at a later time—succeeded in erecting an oligarchy, which oppressed the peasants and crippled the activity of the State. (2) Again, by his consistent favouring of the middle classes, and his conclusion of commercial treaties with Russia, France, and the Netherlands, he became the founder of Swedish commerce, and dealt a serious blow at the Baltic supremacy of the Hanseatic League. (3) And lastly, he appears as the founder of that policy of territorial aggression (toward the South and East), which, however we may judge of its morality in this age of peace, was certainly looked upon then as the prime duty of all Kings, and which in the case of Sweden was the direct path toward the great part which she was destined to play in the 17th century. His first enemy was Russia, a recently consolidated State, already bordering on the half-Polish province of Livonia and the Swedish province of Finland; already extending her flanks to the Caucasus and the Don on the south and to the White Sea on the north. . . . The wars of Ivan the Terrible (1534–84) for Finland and Livonia were unsuccessful, and the chief interest which they possess for us is that in 1561, the year after the death of Gustavus I., his son Eric acquired for Sweden the province of Esthonia, which appears to have previously fluctuated between dependence on Denmark and on Russia. This was the first of the so-called 'Baltic provinces' of Sweden; herewith began the exclusion of Russia from the 'Dominium Maris Baltici.' But this possession brought Eric face to face with Poland, a country which was disputing with Russia the possession of Livonia. Poland, under the last of the great Jaghellon line, was already displaying the fatal tendency to anarchy which at last devoured her. . . . Poland turned for help to the King of Denmark, in whom Eric, with keen insight, recognised the most dangerous foe for Sweden. In 1563 Eric concluded peace with Russia, and the nations of the North began to assume their natural relation to each other. The Baltic question rapidly became an European one. English sympathies were with Sweden and Russia; Spain and the Emperor as naturally took the other side, and suggested to the King of Denmark, Frederick II. (1559–1588), that he should ask for the hand of Mary Stuart; to counteract which King Eric indulged in an elaborate flirtation with Elizabeth. The powers of North Germany took sides in the war (1565), but the war itself produced but little result. The able Eric displayed symptoms of insanity and was extremely unpopular with the Swedish nobles, and Denmark was as yet too powerful an enemy for Sweden to overthrow. In 1567 Eric was deposed by a revolution, the fruit of which was reaped by his brother John. When the great Gustavus I. was dying, and could no longer speak, he made a sign that he wished to write, and wrote half a sentence of warning to his people: 'Rather die a hundred times than abandon the Gospel. . . .' Then his hand failed, and he dropped back dead. He was not, I have said, a particularly religious man, but he marked out the true path for Sweden. Now in 1567 a certain reaction set in: many of the nobles, who had felt the yoke of Gustavus heavy and of Eric heavier, seemed ready to drift back to Catholicism, and John's reign (1567–1590) was one of reaction in many ways. John never openly went over to Catholicism, but he cast off all the Lutheranism that he dared to cast off. He made peace with Denmark and war with Russia; thereby he allowed the former country to develop her trade and foreign relations enormously and rapidly, and made the task of his successors doubly hard. Above all, he originated, by his marriage with Catherine Jaghellon, the disastrous connexion with Poland. That unhappy country, 'the fatal byword for all years to come' of genuine anarchy, had just closed its period of prosperity. The last of the Jaghellon Kings died in 1572, and the elected King, Stephen Bathori, died in 1586. Ivan the Terrible sought the crown of Poland. . . . John of Sweden, on the other hand, saw an opening for the House of Vasa. His son Sigismund was, by dint of bribes and intrigue, elected King of Poland. But he had to become a Catholic. . . . The union of Sweden with Poland, which would necessarily follow, if Sigismund succeeded his father on the Swedish throne, would be almost certainly a Catholic union. . . . Sweden was still a free country, in the sense of being governed in a parliamentary way with the consent of the four estates, Nobles, Clergy, Citizens, and Peasants. Whatever the Riddarhus might think upon the subject, the three non-noble estates were red-hot Protestants and would have no Catholic king. Even the nobles were only induced to consent to Sigismund becoming King of Poland without forfeiting his right to succeed in Sweden, by the grant of extravagant privileges, practically so great, had they been observed, as to emasculate the Vasa monarchy. Luckily the people had a deliverer at hand. Charles, Duke of Sudermania, the youngest of the sons of Gustavus I., lived wholly in the best traditions of his father's policy. He might be relied upon to head an insurrection, if necessary. Even before John's death in 1590 murmurs began to be heard that he had been an usurper—was his son necessarily the heir? These murmurs increased, when in 1593, after waiting three years, Sigismund came home to claim his kingdom, with a present of 20,000 crowns from the Pope in his pocket, 'to defray the cost of the restoration of Catholicism in Sweden.' Duke Charles had already prepared his plans when the King arrived; there seems little doubt that he was playing a game, and for the crown. We are not concerned with his motives, it is sufficient to know that they corresponded with the interests of his country. In 1593, just before Sigismund had landed, Charles had been chosen Regent and President of the Council of State. . . . When Sigismund went back to Poland at the end of the year 1594, he could not prevent Charles being chosen to administer the kingdom in his absence, and Diet after Diet subsequently confirmed the power of the Regent. The peasants of Dalecarlia, the great province of the centre, which had first

come forward to the support of Gustavus I. in 1520, sent up a petition to the effect that there ought to be only one king in Sweden, and that Sigismund had forfeited the crown. Charles himself had been unwilling to lead a revolution, until it became apparent that Sigismund was massing troops and raising money in Poland for an attack upon his native land. In 1597 the civil war may be said to have begun; in the following year Sigismund landed (with only 5,000 Polish troops) and was utterly defeated near Linköping (on September 25, 1598). On the next day a treaty was concluded by which Sigismund was acknowledged as King, but promised to send away his foreign troops and maintain Protestantism. It was obviously a mere effort to gain time, and in the following year on failing to keep the condition, which he never had the remotest intention of keeping, he was formally deposed (July, 1599). The contest, however, was by no means over, and it led to that perpetual hostility between Sweden and Poland which played such an important part in the history of Northern Europe in the 17th century. . . . In 1604 Charles was solemnly crowned King; that was the second birthday of the Vasa monarchy; the crown was entailed upon his eldest son, Gustavus Adolphus, and his descendants, being Protestants, and the descendants of Sigismund were forever excluded. 'Every prince who should deviate from the Confession of Augsburg should ipso facto lose the crown. Anyone who should attempt to effect any change of religion should be declared an enemy and a traitor. Sweden should never be united with another kingdom under one crown; the King must live in Sweden.'"—C. R. L. Fletcher, *Gustavus Adolphus, introd.*

Also in: E. G. Geijer, *Hist. of the Swedes, v. 1, ch.* 9–14.

(Denmark and Norway): A. D. 1534.—Accession of Christian III.

(Denmark and Norway): A. D. 1559.—Accession of Frederick II.

(Denmark and Norway): A. D. 1588.—Accession of Christian IV.

(Sweden): A. D. 1611—Accession of Gustavus Adolphus.

(Sweden): A. D. 1611-1629.—The Danish, Russian and Polish wars of Gustavus Adolphus.— On the death of Charles in 1611 his son, Gustavus Adolphus, did not immediately assume the title of king. "Sweden remained without a sovereign for two months; for, according to the will of the deceased king, the queen and his nephew (Duke John), with six councillors of state, were to rule till the wishes of the people could be made known in the customary manner. After an interregnum of two months, the Diet opened at Nyköping. . . . Duke John was the son of Sigismund, King of Poland, had been brought up in Sweden, and might be considered as having some just claim to the throne. The queen-mother and Duke John laid down the tutelage and the regency. . . . Nine days later the young king, in the presence of the representatives of the estates of Sweden, received the reins of government. . . . He was then in the first month of his 18th year. He took charge of the kingdom when it was in a critical condition. Since the death of Gustavus Vasa, his grandfather, a period of more than 50 years, Sweden had not enjoyed a single year of peace. In that long space of time, there had been constant dissensions and violence. . . . Sweden was much constrained and embarrassed by her boundaries, and by the jealousies and hostile feelings of her neighbours on the north and the south. Denmark and Norway were united in a kind of dual government under the same king; and both alike were opposed to the growth of Swedish power, and were in continual dispute with her in respect to territory, as well as to the naval and commercial uses of the adjacent seas. Those provinces in the south which are now the most productive and valuable of Sweden, then belonged to Denmark, or were in dispute between the two countries. On the east, Russia and Poland embarrassed and threatened her." During the first year of his reign Gustavus devoted his energies to the war with Denmark. He fought at a disadvantage. His resources were unequal to those of the Danes. His capital, Stockholm, was once attacked by a Danish fleet and in serious peril. But he secured an advantageous peace in the spring of 1613. "Sweden renounced some of its conquests and pretensions, and the Danes gave up to Sweden the city of Calmar on the Baltic, and at the end of six years were to surrender to Sweden its city of Elfsborg on the North Sea; the latter agreeing to pay to the Danes 1,000,000 thalers for the surrender. . . . At the death of Charles IX., and the ascension of Gustavus to the throne, Sweden was in a state of war with Russia, and was so to continue for several years; though hostilities were not all the time prosecuted with vigor, and were some of the time practically suspended. . . . The Swedes held possession of a large area of what is now Russian territory, as well as important towns and fortresses. The extensive country of Finland, which makes to-day so important a province of Russia, had been united with Sweden nearly five centuries, as it continued to be nearly two hundred years longer. But towns and territory, also a long distance within the lines of the Russian population, were then in the power of the Swedish forces. The troubles and dissensions relative to the succession, and extreme dislike to the Poles, had caused a numerous party to seek a Swedish prince for its sovereign, and to this end had sent an embassy to Stockholm near the date of the death of Charles IX. Finding that the young Gustavus had acceded to the crown of his father, this Russian party desired to secure for the Russian throne Charles Philip, a younger brother of Gustavus. The Swedish king did not show eagerness to bring this plan to success; but, the war being terminated with Denmark, he was resolved to draw what advantage he could from the weakened condition of Russia, to the advancement and security of the interests of Sweden. In July, 1613, the Russians chose for czar Michael Romanoff, then sixteen years of age. . . . Gustavus proceeded to push military operations with as much vigor as possible. . . . For four years more the war between these two countries continued; . . . the advantages being generally on the side of the Swedes, though they were not always successful in important sieges." Finally, through the mediation of English agents, terms of peace were agreed upon. "The treaty was signed February, 1617. Russia yielded to Sweden a large breadth of territory, shutting herself out from the Baltic; the land where St.

Petersburg now stands becoming Swedish territory. . . . The next important work in hand was to deal with Poland. . . . At the death of Charles IX. an armistice had been signed, which was to continue until July, 1612. This was thrice extended, the last time to January, 1616. The latter date had not been reached when the Polish partisans began to intrigue actively in Sweden, and those Swedes who still adhered to the religion and the dynastic rights of Sigismund could not be otherwise than secretly or openly stirred. Sigismund was not only supported by the power of Poland, and by his strong show of legal title to the Swedish crown, but there were strong influences on his side in European high political and religious quarters. He was united to the house of Hapsburg by the bonds of relationship as well as of theology. Philip III. of Spain, and he who afterwards became Ferdinand II. of Austria, were his brothers-in-law. . . . Sigismund came then to the resolution to make war for the possession of Sweden. He was promised enrolment of troops in Germany, the Spaniards had engaged to arm a fleet in his support, and the estates of Poland were to furnish their quota. . . . Efforts were made to stir up revolt against Gustavus in his own kingdom," and he promptly declared war. "During the year 1617 hostilities were prosecuted on both sides with much vigor, and loss of life. Towns and strong positions were taken, and invasions and sudden attacks were made on both sides; the advantages being generally with the Swedes, though not decisive. During the winter of 1618 the Poles invaded Livonia and Esthonia, carrying pillage and fire in their march, and then retiring." Gustavus would not allow his generals to retaliate. "'We wish not,' he said, 'to war against the peasant, whom we had rather protect than ruin.'" In 1618 there was an armistice, with peace negotiations which failed, and the war began anew. In August, 1621, Gustavus laid siege to Riga with a strong fleet and army, and met with an obstinate resistance; but the place was surrendered to him at the end of nearly six weeks. Again the belligerents agreed to an armistice, and "the year 1624 is declared by the Swedish historians to have been the only one in which Gustavus Adolphus was able to devote all his labors and cares to the interior administration of his country. In the following year the war was renewed. The third campaign of the Swedish king against Poland was terminated by the completion of the conquest of Livonia; and the possession of Courland assured to him Riga, the object of his special care." The decisive battle of the campaign was fought at Wallhof, January 7, 1626. The king of Sweden then "resolved to transport the theatre of war from the banks of the Duna to those of the Vistula, to attack Poland at the heart, and approach Germany. Here commences that part of the war of Poland which is called also the war of Prussia. . . . He [Gustavus] realized the need of a port in Eastern Prussia; and the elector of Brandenburg, his brother-in-law, was invested with that duchy under the suzerainty of Poland. Gustavus did not allow these considerations to arrest his course. . . . June 26 the king arrived before Pillau, and possessed himself of that city without much resistance, the garrison being small. . . . Braunsberg capitulated June 30. July 1, Flanenberg surrendered, and Elbing on the 6th, which was followed by Marienberg on the 8th; the last a well-fortified city. Many towns of less importance were likewise soon captured. Gustavus rapidly pushed aside all resistance, and soon reached the frontiers of Pomerania." In the engagements of the campaign of 1627 the king was twice wounded — once by a musket-ball in the groin, and the second time by a ball that entered near the neck and lodged at the upper corner of the right shoulder-blade. In June, 1629, "there was a heated engagement at Stum, in which Gustavus ran great danger, his force being inferior to the enemy." In September of that year "an armistice was concluded for six years between the belligerent kingdoms. Five cities which had been conquered by Swedish arms were given up to Poland, and three others delivered to the elector of Brandenburg, to be held during the armistice. Gustavus was to continue to occupy Pillau and three other towns of some importance. Liberty of conscience was to be accorded to Protestants and Catholics, and commerce was declared free between the two nations."—J. L. Stevens, *Hist. of Gustavus Adolphus, ch.* 3 *and* 7.

Also in: B. Chapman, *Hist. of Gustavus Adolphus, ch.* 2–4.—See, also, Poland: A. D. 1590–1648.

(Denmark): A. D. 1625-1630.—The Protestant Alliance.—Engagement of King Christian IV. in the Thirty Years War.—The Treaty of Lübeck. See Germany: A. D. 1624–1626; and 1627–1629.

(Denmark): A. D. 1627.—The country overrun by Wallenstein. See Germany: A. D. 1627–1629.

(Sweden): A. D. 1628.—Gustavus Adolphus' first interference in the war in Germany.—The relief of Stralsund. See Germany: A. D. 1627–1629.

(Sweden): A. D. 1630-1632.—The campaigns of Gustavus Adolphus in Germany.—His death. See Germany: A. D. 1630–1631, to 1631–1632.

(Sweden): A. D. 1631.—Treaty of Bärwalde with France. See Germany: A. D. 1631 (January).

(Sweden): A. D. 1632.—Full powers given to Oxenstiern in Germany. See Germany: A. D. 1632–1634.

(Sweden): A. D. 1638-1640.—The planting of a colony in America, on the Delaware. See Delaware: A. D. 1638–1640.

(Sweden): A. D. 1640-1645.—Campaigns of Baner and Torstenson in Germany. See Germany: A. D. 1640–1645.

A. D. 1643-1645.—War between Sweden and Denmark.—Torstenson's conquest of Holstein and Schleswig.—The Peace of Bromsebro. See Germany: A. D. 1640–1645.

(Sweden): A. D. 1644-1697.—Reign and abdication of Queen Christina.—Wars of Charles X. and Charles XI. with Poland and Denmark and in Germany.—Establishment of absolutism.—"Christina, the only child and successor of Gustavus Adolphus, had been brought up by her aunt, Katerina, the Princess Palatine, until the death of the latter in 1639, and in the year 1644, when she reached the age of eighteen, the regency was absolved, and she began to rule in her own name. She had inherited much of her father's talent, and was perhaps the most learned and accomplished woman of her time. She had

SCANDINAVIAN STATES, 1644–1697.

received the education of a man. . . . She had great taste for the fine arts and for the pursuits of science; but while she encouraged scientific men at her court, she also spent money too recklessly in rewarding artistic merit of all kinds. . . . As a dangerous drawback to her many splendid qualities, she had all the waywardness, caprice, restlessness of mind, fickleness and love of display for which her beautiful mother, Maria Eleanora of Brandenburg, had been noted. She lavished crown lands and the money of the state upon favourites. . . . In the meanwhile the national Estates had been split up into parties, the aristocrats being led by Axel Oxenstjerna, and the democrats, with whom the queen sided, by Johan Skytte. The clergy struggled to maintain their independence under the oppressive patronage of the nobles, and the peasants agitated to recover some of the power which the great Gustavus Vasa had granted them, but which his successors had by degrees taken from them. The kingdom was in a ferment, and a civil war seemed to be unavoidable. The council urged upon the queen to marry, and her cousin, Karl Gustaf of the Palatinate, entreated her to fulfil the promise which she had given him in earlier years of choosing him for her husband. At length . . . she proposed him for her successor. . . . After much opposition, Karl Gustaf was declared successor to the throne in the event of the queen having no children of her own. . . . The few years of Christina's reign after her solemn coronation were disquieted by continued dissensions in the diet, attempts at revolts, and by a general distress, which was greatly increased by her profuse wastefulness and her reckless squandering of the property of the crown. As early as the year 1648 she had conceived the idea of abdicating, but, being hindered by her old friends and councillors, she deferred carrying out her wishes till 1654." In that year the abdication was formally accomplished, and she left the country at once, travelling through Europe. In 1655 she renounced Protestantism and entered the Roman Catholic Church. "At the death [1660] of her cousin and successor, Karl X. Gustaf, as he was called by the Swedes, and who is known to us as Charles X., she returned to Sweden and claimed the crown for herself; but neither then, nor in 1667, when she renewed her pretensions, would the council encourage her hopes, and, after a final attempt to gain the vacant throne of Poland in 1668, she gave up all schemes of ever reigning again, and retired to Rome, where she died in 1689 at the age of sixty-three. . . . The short reign of Charles X., from 1655 to 1660, was a time of great disorder and unquiet in Sweden. . . . He resolved to engage the people in active war. . . . The ill-timed demand of the Polish king, Johan Kasimir, to be proclaimed the true heir to Christina's throne, drew the first attack upon Poland. Charles X. was born to be a soldier and a conqueror, and the success and rapidity with which he overran all Poland, and crushed the Polish army in a three days' engagement at Warsaw in 1656, showed that he was a worthy pupil and successor of his uncle, the great Gustavus Adolphus. But it was easier for him to make conquests than to keep them, and when the Russians, in their jealousy of the increasing power of Sweden, took part in the war, and began to attack Livonia and Esthonia, while an imperial army advanced into Poland to assist the Poles, who, infuriated at the excesses of the Swedish soldiers, had risen en masse against them, Charles saw the expediency of retreating; and, leaving only a few detachments of troops to watch his enemies, he turned upon Denmark. This war, which was closed by the peace signed at Roeskilde in 1658, enriched Sweden at the expense of Denmark, and gave to the former the old provinces of Skaania, Halland and Bleking, by which the Swedish monarchy obtained natural and well-defined boundaries. The success of this first Danish war, in which Denmark for a time lay crushed under the power of the Swedish king, emboldened him to renew his attacks, and between 1658 and 1660 Charles X. made war five times on the Danish monarch; more than once laid siege to Copenhagen; and, under his able captain, Wrangel, nearly destroyed the Danish fleet. At the close of 1659, when it seemed as if Denmark must be wholly subjugated by Sweden, the English and Dutch, alarmed at the ambition of the Swedish king, sent an allied fleet into the Cattegat to operate with the Danes." Charles, checked in his operations, was preparing to carry the war into Norway, when he died suddenly, in the winter of 1660, and peace was made by the treaty of Oliva. "By the early death of Charles X., Sweden was again brought under the rule of a regency, for his son and successor, Charles XI., was only four years old when he became king. . . . Every department of the government was left to suffer from mismanagement, the army and navy were neglected, the defences of the frontiers fell into decay, and the public servants were unable to procure their pay. To relieve the great want of money, the regency accepted subsidies, or payments of money from foreign states to maintain peace towards them, and hired out troops to serve in other countries. In this state of things the young king grew up without receiving any very careful education. . . . Charles was declared of age in his 18th year. . . . He was not left long in the enjoyment of mere exercises of amusement, for in 1674 Louis XIV. of France, in conformity with the treaty which the regents had concluded with him, called upon the young Swedish king to help him in the war which he was carrying on against the German princes [see NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1674–1678]. Charles sent an army into Germany, which advanced without opposition into the heart of Brandenburg, but before these forces could form a junction with the French troops then encamped in the Rhinelands, the Elector came upon them unawares at Fehrbellin [June 18, 1675] and defeated them. The losses of the Swedes on this occasion were not great, but the result of their defeat was to give encouragement to the old rivals of Sweden; and early in 1675 both Holland and Denmark declared war against the Swedish king, who, finding that he had been left by the regency almost without army, navy, or money, resolved for the future to take the management of public affairs entirely into his own hands." When he "began the war by a sea engagement with the enemy off Oeland, he found that his ships of war had suffered as much as the land-defences from the long-continued neglect of his regents. The Danes, under their great admiral, Niels Juel, and supported by a Dutch squadron, beat the Swedish fleet, many of whose ships were burnt or sunk. This defeat was atoned for by a victory on land,

gained by Charles himself in 1676, over the Danes on the snow-covered hills around the town of Lund. Success was not won without heavy cost, for after a most sanguinary fight, continued from daybreak till night, King Charles, although master of the field, found that more than half his men had been killed. The Danes, who had suffered fully as much, were forced to retreat, leaving Lund in the hands of the Swedes; and although they several times repeated the attempt, they failed in recovering the province of Skaania, which was the great object of their ambition. In Germany the fortune of war did not favor the Swedes, although they fought gallantly under their general, Otto Königsmark; [Stettin was surrendered after a long siege in 1677, and Stralsund in 1678] and Charles XI. was glad to enter into negotiations for taking part in the general peace which France was urging upon all the leading powers of Europe, and which was signed at the palace of St. Germains, in 1679, by the representatives of the respective princes. Sweden recovered the whole of Pomerania, which had been occupied during the war by Austria and Brandenburg, and all Swedish and Danish conquests were mutually renounced. . . . At the close of this war Charles XI. began in good earnest to put his kingdom in order." By sternly reclaiming crown-lands which had been wantonly alienated by former rulers, and by compelling other restitutions, Charles broke the power of the nobles, and so humbled the National Estates that they "proclaimed him, in a diet held in 1693, to be an absolute sovereign king, 'who had the power and right to rule his kingdom as he pleased.'" He attained an absolutism, in fact, which was practically unlimited. He died in 1697, leaving three children, the eldest of whom, who succeeded him, was the extraordinary Charles XII.—E. C. Otté, *Scandinavian History, ch.* 21.

Also in: H. Tuttle, *Hist. of Prussia to* 1740, *ch.* 5.—T. H. Dyer, *Hist. of Modern Europe, bk.* 5, *ch.* 2 *and* 4 (*v.* 3).—G. B. Malleson, *Battle-Fields of Germany, ch.* 8.—See, also, Brandenburg: A. D. 1640–1688.

(Sweden): A. D. 1646-1648.—Last campaigns of the Thirty Years War in Germany. See Germany: A. D. 1646–1648.

(Denmark and Norway): A. D. 1648.—Accession of Frederick III.

(Sweden): A. D. 1648.—The Peace of Westphalia.—Acquisition of part of Pomerania and other German territory. See Germany: A. D. 1648.

(Sweden): A. D. 1655.—Conquest of the Delaware colony by the Dutch. See Delaware: A. D. 1640–1656.

(Sweden): A. D. 1668.—Triple Alliance with Holland and England against Louis XIV. See Netherlands (Holland): A. D. 1668.

(Denmark and Norway): A. D. 1670.—Accession of Christian V.

(Denmark): A. D. 1674-1679.—In the coalition to resist Louis XIV. See Netherlands (Holland): A. D. 1672–1674, and 1674–1678; also, Nimeguen, Peace of.

(Sweden): A. D. 1686.—The League of Augsburg against Louis XIV. See Germany: A. D. 1686.

(Sweden): A. D. 1697.—Accession of Charles XII.

A. D. 1697.—The Peace of Ryswick. See France: A. D. 1697.

(Sweden): A. D. 1697-1700.—The conspiracy of three sovereigns against Charles XII. and how he met it.—First campaigns of the young king, in Denmark and Russia.—"Charles XII, at his accession to the throne, found himself the absolute and undisturbed master, not only of Sweden and Finland, but also of Livonia, Carelia, Ingria, Wismar, Viborg, the Islands of Rügen and Oesel, and the finest part of Pomerania, together with the duchy of Bremen and Verden,—all of them the conquests of his ancestors. . . . The beginning of the king's reign gave no very favorable idea of his character. It was imagined that he had been more ambitious of obtaining the supreme power than worthy of possessing it. True it is, he had no dangerous passion; but his conduct discovered nothing but the sallies of youth and the freaks of obstinacy. He seemed to be equally proud and lazy. The ambassadors who resided at his court took him even for a person of mean capacity, and represented him as such to their respective masters. The Swedes entertained the same opinion of him: nobody knew his real character: he did not even know it himself, until the storm that suddenly arose in the North gave him an opportunity of displaying his great talents, which had hitherto lain concealed. Three powerful princes, taking the advantage of his youth, conspired his ruin almost at the same time. The first was his own cousin, Frederick IV, king of Denmark: the second, Augustus, elector of Saxony and King of Poland; Peter the Great, czar of Muscovy, was the third, and most dangerous. . . . The founder of the Russian empire was ambitious of being a conqueror. . . . Besides, he wanted a port on the east side of the Baltic, to facilitate the execution of all his schemes. He wanted the province of Ingria, which lies to the northeast of Livonia. The Swedes were in possession of it, and from them he resolved to take it by force. His predecessors had had claims upon Ingria, Esthonia, and Livonia; and the present seemed a favorable opportunity for reviving these claims, which had lain buried for a hundred years, and had been cancelled by the sanction of treaties. He therefore made a league with the King of Poland, to wrest from young Charles XII all the territories that are bounded by the Gulf of Finland, the Baltic Sea, Poland, and Muscovy. The news of these preparations struck the Swedes with consternation, and alarmed the council." But the effect on the young King was instantly and strangely sobering. He assumed the responsibilities of the situation at once, and took into his own hands the preparations for war. From that moment "he entered on a new course of life, from which he never afterwards deviated in one single instance. Full of the idea of Alexander and Cæsar, he proposed to imitate those two conquerors in every thing but their vices. No longer did he indulge himself in magnificence, sports, and recreations: he reduced his table to the most rigid frugality. He had formerly been fond of gayety and dress; but from that time he was never clad otherwise than as a common soldier. He was supposed to have entertained a passion for a lady of his court: whether there was any foundation for this supposition does not appear; certain it is, he ever

after renounced all commerce with women, not only for fear of being governed by them, but likewise to set an example of continence to his soldiers. . . . He likewise determined to abstain from wine during the rest of his life. . . . He began by assuring the Duke of Holstein, his brother-in-law, of a speedy assistance. Eight thousand men were immediately sent into Pomerania, a province bordering upon Holstein, in order to enable the duke to make head against the Danes. The duke indeed had need of them. His dominions were already laid waste, the castle of Gottorp taken, and the city of Tönningen pressed by an obstinate siege, to which the King of Denmark had come in person. . . . This spark began to throw the empire into a flame. On the one side, the Saxon troops of the King of Poland, those of Brandenburg Wolfenbüttel, and Hesse Cassel, advanced to join the Danes. On the other, the King of Sweden's 8,000 men, the troops of Hanover and Zell, and three Dutch regiments, came to the assistance of the duke. While the little country of Holstein was thus the theatre of war, two squadrons, the one from England and the other from Holland, appeared in the Baltic. . . . They joined the young King of Sweden, who seemed to be in danger of being crushed. . . . Charles set out for his first campaign on the 8th day of May, new style, in the year 1700, and left Stockholm, whither he never returned. . . . His fleet consisted of three-and-forty vessels. . . . He joined the squadrons of the allies," and made a descent upon Copenhagen. The city surrendered to escape bombardment, and in less than six weeks Charles had extorted from the Danish King a treaty of peace, negotiated at Travendahl, which indemnified the Duke of Holstein for all the expenses of the war and delivered him from oppression. For himself, Charles asked nothing. "Exactly at the same time, the King of Poland invested Riga, the capital of Livonia; and the czar was advancing on the east at the head of nearly 100,000 men." Riga was defended with great skill and determination, and Augustus was easily persuaded to abandon the siege on the remonstrance of the Dutch, who had much merchandise in the town. "The only thing that Charles had now to do towards the finishing of his first campaign, was to march against his rival in glory, Peter Alexiovitch." Peter had appeared before Narva on the 1st of October, at the head of 80,000 men, mostly undisciplined barbarians, "some armed with arrows, and others with clubs. Few of them had guns; none of them had ever seen a regular siege; and there was not one good cannoneer in the whole army. . . . Narva was almost without fortifications: Baron Horn, who commanded there, had not 1,000 regular troops; and yet this immense army could not reduce it in six weeks. It was now the 15th of November, when the czar learned that the King of Sweden had crossed the sea with 200 transports, and was advancing to the relief of Narva. The Swedes were not above 20,000 strong." But the czar was not confident. He had another army marching to his support, and he left the camp at Narva to hasten its movements. Charles' motions were too quick for him. He reached Narva on the 30th of November, after a forced march, with a vanguard of only 8,000 men, and at once, without waiting for the remainder of his army to come up, he stormed the Russian intrenchments. "The Swedes advanced with fixed bayonets, having a furious shower of snow on their backs, which drove full in the face of the enemy." The victory was complete. "The Swedes had not lost above 600 men. Eight thousand Muscovites had been killed in their intrenchments; many were drowned; many had crossed the river," and 30,000 who held a part of the camp at nightfall, surrendered next morning. When czar Peter, who was pressing the march of his 40,000 men, received news of the disaster at Narva, he turned homeward, and set himself seriously to the work of drilling and disciplining his troops. "The Swedes," he said phlegmatically, "will teach us to beat them."—Voltaire, *Hist. of Charles XII., King of Sweden, bk.* 1-2.

(Denmark and Norway): A. D. 1699.—Accession of Frederick IV.

(Sweden): A. D. 1701-1707.—Invasion and subjugation of Poland and Saxony by Charles XII.—Deposition of Augustus from the Polish throne.—Charles at the summit of his career.—"Whilst Peter, abandoning all the provinces he had invaded, retreated to his own dominions, and employed himself in training his undisciplined serfs, Charles prepared to take the field against his only remaining adversary, the King of Poland. Leaving Narva, where he passed the winter, he entered Livonia, and appeared in the neighbourhood of Riga, the very place which the Poles and Saxons had in vain besieged. Dreading the storm that now approached, Augustus had entered into a closer alliance with the czar; and at an interview which took place at Birsen, a small town in Lithuania, it was agreed that each should furnish the other with a body of 50,000 mercenaries, to be paid by Russia. . . . The Saxon army, having failed in their attempt on Riga, endeavoured to prevent the Swedes from crossing the Dwina; but the passage was effected under cover of a thick cloud of smoke from the burning of wet straw, and by means of large boats with high wooden parapets along the sides, to protect the soldiers from the fire of the enemy, who were driven from their intrenchments with the loss of 2,000 killed and 1,500 prisoners. Charles immediately advanced to Mittau, the capital of Courland, the garrison of which, with all the other towns and forts in the duchy, surrendered at discretion. He next passed into Lithuania, conquering wherever he came, and driving 20,000 Russians before him with the utmost precipitation. On reaching Birsen, it gave him no little satisfaction, as he himself confessed, to enter in triumph the very town where, only a few months before, Augustus and the czar had plotted his destruction. It was here that he formed the daring project of dethroning the King of Poland by means of his own subjects, whose notions of liberty could not tolerate the measures of a despotic government. . . . The fate of Augustus, already desperate, was here consummated by the treachery of the primate Radziewiski, who caused it to be immediately notified to all the palatines, that no alternative remained but to submit to the will of the conqueror. The deserted monarch resolved to defend his crown by force of arms; the two kings met near Clissau (July 13, 1702), where after a bloody battle fortune again declared for the Swedes. Charles halted not a moment on the field of victory, but marched rapidly to Cracow

in pursuit of his antagonist. That city was taken without firing a shot, and taxed with a contribution of 100,000 rix-dollars. The fugitive prince obtained an unexpected respite of six weeks, his indefatigable rival having had his thigh-bone fractured by an accidental fall from his horse. The interval was spent in hostile preparations, but the recovery of Charles overturned all the schemes of his enemies, and the decisive battle of Pultusk (May 1, 1703) completed the humiliation of the unfortunate Augustus. At the instigation of the faithless cardinal, the diet at Warsaw declared (February 14, 1704) that the Elector of Saxony was incapable of wearing the crown, which was soon after bestowed on Stanislaus Leczinski, the young palatine of Posnania. Count Piper strongly urged his royal master to assume the sovereignty himself. . . . But the splendours of a diadem had few charms in the eyes of a conqueror who confessed that he felt much more pleasure in bestowing thrones upon others than in winning them for himself. Having thus succeeded in his favourite project, Charles resumed his march to complete the entire conquest of the kingdom. Every where had fortune crowned the bold expeditions of this adventurous prince. Whilst his generals and armies were pursuing their career from province to province, he had himself opened a passage for his victorious troops into Saxony and the imperial dominions. His ships, now masters of the Baltic, were employed in transporting to Sweden the prisoners taken in the wars. Denmark, bound up by the treaty of Travendhal, was prevented from offering any active interference; the Russians were kept in check towards the east by a detachment of 30,000 Swedes; so that the whole region was kept in awe by the sword of the conqueror, from the German Ocean almost to the mouth of the Borysthenes, and even to the gates of Moscow. The Czar Peter in the mean time, having carried Narva by assault, and captured several towns and fortresses in Livonia, held a conference with Augustus at Grodno, where the two sovereigns concerted their plans for attacking the Scandinavian invaders in their new conquests, with a combined army of 60,000 men, under Prince Menzikoff and General Schullemberg. Had the fate of the contest depended on numerical superiority alone, Charles must have been crushed before the overwhelming power of his enemies; but his courage and good fortune prevailed over every disadvantage. The scattered hordes of Muscovy were overthrown with so great celerity, that one detachment after another was routed before they learned the defeat of their companions. Schullemberg, with all his experience and reputation, was not more successful, having been completely beaten by Renschild, the Parmenio of the northern Alexander, in a sanguinary action (Feb. 12, 1706), at the small town of Travenstadt, near Punitz, a place already fatal to the cause of Augustus. . . . The reduction of Saxony, which Charles next invaded, obliged Augustus to implore peace on any terms. The conditions exacted by the victor were, that he should renounce for ever the crown of Poland; acknowledge Stanislaus as lawful king; and dissolve his treaty of alliance with Russia. The inflexible temper of Charles was not likely to mitigate the severity of these demands, but their rigour was increased in consequence of the defeat of General Meyerfeld, near Kalisch, by Prince Menzikoff — the first advantage which the Muscovites had gained over the Swedes in a pitched battle. . . . The numerous victories of Charles, and the arbitrary manner in which he had deposed the King of Poland, filled all Europe with astonishment. Some states entertained apprehensions of his power, while others prepared to solicit his friendship. France, harassed by expensive wars in Spain, Italy, and the Netherlands, courted his alliance with an ardour proportioned to the distressing state of her affairs. Offended at the declaration issued against him by the diet of Ratisbon, and resenting an indignity offered to Baron de Stralheim, his envoy at Vienna, he magnified these trivial affronts into an occasion of quarrelling with the emperor, who was obliged to succumb, and among other mortifying concessions, to grant his Lutheran subjects in Silesia the free exercise of their religious liberties as secured by the treaties of Westphalia. . . . The ambitious prince was now in the zenith of his glory; he had experienced no reverse, nor met with any interruption to his victories. The romantic extravagance of his views increased with his success. One year, he thought, will suffice for the conquest of Russia. The court of Rome was next to feel his vengeance, as the pope had dared to oppose the concession of religious liberty to the Silesian Protestants. No enterprise at that time appeared impossible to him."—A. Crichton, *Scandinavia, Ancient and Modern, v. 2, ch. 3.*

Also in: S. A. Dunham, *Hist. of Poland, pp. 219-221.*— T. H. Dyer, *Hist. of Modern Europe, bk. 5, ch. 5 (v. 3).*

(Sweden): A. D. 1707-1718.—Charles XII. in Russia.—His ruinous defeat at Pultowa.—His refuge among the Turks.—His fruitless intrigues.—His return to Sweden.—His death.

—"From Saxony, Charles marched back into Poland [September, 1707], where Peter was making some ineffectual efforts to revive the party of Augustus. Peter retired before his rival, who had, however, the satisfaction of defeating an army of 20,000 Russians [at Golowstschin, in the spring of 1708], strongly intrenched. Intoxicated by success, he rejected the czar's offers of peace, declaring that he would treat at Moscow; and without forming any systematic plan of operations, he crossed the frontiers, resolved on the destruction of that ancient city. Peter prevented the advance of the Swedes, on the direct line, by destroying the roads and desolating the country; Charles, after having endured great privations, turned off towards the Ukraine, whither he had been invited by Mazeppa, the chief of the Cossacks, who, disgusted by the conduct of the czar, had resolved to throw off his allegiance. In spite of all the obstacles that nature and the enemy could throw in his way, Charles reached the place of rendezvous; but he had the mortification to find Mazeppa appear in his camp as a fugitive rather than an ally, for the czar had discovered his treason, and disconcerted his schemes by the punishment of his associates. A still greater misfortune to the Swedes was the loss of the convoy and the ruin of the reinforcement they had expected from Livonia. General Lewenhaupt, to whose care it was entrusted, had been forced into three general engagements by the Russians; and though he had eminently distinguished himself by his courage and conduct, he was forced to set fire to his

SCANDINAVIAN STATES, 1707–1718.

wagons to prevent their falling into the hands of the enemy. Undaunted by these misfortunes, Charles continued the campaign even in the depth of a winter so severe that 2,000 men were at once frozen to death almost in his presence. At length he laid siege to Pultowa, a fortified city on the frontiers of the Ukraine, which contained one of the czar's principal magazines. The garrison was numerous and the resistance obstinate; Charles himself was dangerously wounded in the heel whilst viewing the works; and while he was still confined to his tent he learned that Peter was advancing with a numerous army to raise the siege. Leaving 7,000 men to guard the works, Charles ordered his soldiers to march and meet the enemy, while he accompanied them in a litter (July 8, 1709). The desperate charge of the Swedes broke the Russian cavalry, but the infantry stood firm, and gave the horse an opportunity of rallying in the rear. In the meantime the czar's artillery made dreadful havoc in the Swedish line; and Charles, who had been forced to abandon his cannon in his forced marches, in vain contended against this formidable disadvantage. After a dreadful combat of more than two hours' duration, the Swedish army was irretrievably ruined; 8,000 of their best troops were left dead on the field, 6,000 were taken prisoners, and about 12,000 of the fugitives were soon after forced to surrender on the banks of the Dnieper, from want of boats to cross the river. Charles, accompanied by about 300 of his guards, escaped to Bender, a Turkish town in Bessarabia, abandoning all his treasures to his rival, including the rich spoils of Poland and Saxony. Few victories have ever had such important consequences as that which the czar won at Pultowa; in one fatal day Charles lost the fruits of nine years' victories; the veteran army that had been the terror of Europe was completely ruined; those who escaped from the fatal field were taken prisoners, but they found a fate scarcely better than death; for they were transported by the czar to colonize the wilds of Siberia; the elector of Saxony re-entered Poland and drove Stanislaus from the throne; the kings of Denmark and Prussia revived old claims on the Swedish provinces, while the victorious Peter invaded not only Livonia and Ingria, but a great part of Finland. Indeed, but for the interference of the German emperor and the maritime powers, the Swedish monarchy would have been rent in pieces. Charles, in his exile, formed a new plan for the destruction of his hated rival; he instigated the Turks to attempt the conquest of Russia, and flattered himself that he might yet enter Moscow at the head of a Mohammedan army. The bribes which Peter lavishly bestowed on the counsellors of the sultan, for a time frustrated these intrigues; but Charles, through his friend Poniatowski, informed the sultan of his vizier's corruption, and procured the deposition of that minister. . . . The czar made the most vigorous preparations for the new war by which he was menaced (A. D. 1711). The Turkish vizier, on the other hand, assembled all the forces of the Ottoman Empire in the plains of Adrianople. Demetrius Cantemir, the hospodar of Moldavia, believing that a favourable opportunity presented itself for delivering his country from the Mohammedan yoke, invited the czar to his aid; and the Russians, rapidly advancing, reached the northern banks of the Pruth, near Yassi, the Moldavian capital. Here the Russians found that the promises of Prince Cantemir were illusory," and they were soon so enveloped by the forces of the Turks that there seemed to be no escape for them. But the czarina, Catherine — the Livonian peasant woman whom Peter had made his wife — gathered up her jewels and all the money she could find in camp, and sent them as a gift to the vizier, whereby he was induced to open negotiations. "A treaty [known as the Treaty of the Pruth] was concluded on terms which, though severe [requiring the Russians to give up Azof], were more favourable than Peter, under the circumstances, could reasonably have hoped; the Russians retired in safety, and Charles reached the Turkish camp, only to learn the downfall of all his expectations. A new series of intrigues in the court of Constantinople led to the appointment of a new vizier; but this minister was little inclined to gratify the king of Sweden; on the contrary, warned by the fate of his predecessors, he resolved to remove him from the Ottoman empire (A. D. 1713). Charles continued to linger; even after he had received a letter of dismissal from the sultan's own hand, he resolved to remain, and when a resolution was taken to send him away by force, he determined, with his few attendants, to dare the whole strength of the Turkish empire. After a fierce resistance, he was captured and conveyed a prisoner to Adrianople. . . . Another revolution in the divan revived the hopes of Charles, and induced him to remain in Turkey, when his return to the North would probably have restored him to his former eminence. The Swedes, under General Steenbock, gained one of the most brilliant victories that had been obtained during the war, over the united forces of the Danes and Saxons, at Gadebusch [November 20, 1712], in the duchy of Mecklenburg; but the conqueror sullied his fame by burning the defenceless town of Altona [January 19, 1713] an outrage which excited the indignation of all Europe." He soon after met with reverses and was compelled to surrender his whole army. "The czar in the meantime pushed forward his conquests on the side of Finland; and the glory of his reign appeared to be consummated by a naval victory obtained over the Swedes near the island of Oeland. . . . Charles heard of his rival's progress unmoved; but when he learned that the Swedish senate intended to make his sister regent and to make peace with Russia and Denmark, he announced his intention of returning home." He traversed Europe incognito, making the journey of 1,100 miles, mostly on horseback, in seventeen days, "and towards the close of the year [1714] reached Stralsund, the capital of Swedish Pomerania. Charles, at the opening of the next campaign, found himself surrounded with enemies (A. D. 1715). Stralsund itself was besieged by the united armies of the Prussians, Danes, and Saxons, while the Russian fleet, which now rode triumphant in the Baltic, threatened a descent upon Sweden. After an obstinate defence, in which the Swedish monarch displayed all his accustomed bravery, Stralsund was forced to capitulate, Charles having previously escaped in a small vessel to his native shores. All Europe believed the Swedish monarch undone; it was supposed he could no longer defend his own dominions, when, to the inexpressible astonishment of every one, it

was announced that he had invaded Norway. His attention, however, was less engaged by the war than by the gigantic intrigues of his new favourite, Goertz, who, taking advantage of a coolness between the Russians and the other enemies of Sweden, proposed that Peter and Charles should unite in strict amity, and dictate the law to Europe. . . . While the negotiations were yet in progress, Charles invaded Norway a second time, and invested the castle of Fredericks-hall in the very depth of winter. But while engaged in viewing the works he was struck by a cannon-ball, and was dead before any of his attendants came to his assistance [December 11, 1718]. The Swedish senate showed little grief for the loss of the warlike king. . . . The crown was conferred upon the late king's sister, but she soon resigned it to her husband, the prince of Hesse."—W. C. Taylor, *Student's Manual of Modern History, ch.* 7, *sect.* 6.

Also in: E. Schuyler, *Peter the Great, ch.* 53–56 *and* 61–66 (*v.* 2).—Sir E. S. Creasy, *Hist. of the Ottoman Turks, ch.* 18.

(Sweden): A. D. 1719.—Accession of Ulrica Eleonora.

(Sweden): A. D. 1719-1721.—Constitutional changes.—Treaties of Peace ending the Great Northern War.—Swedish cessions of Territory.—"An assembly of the States was summoned in February [1719], and completely altered the constitution. Sweden was declared an elective kingdom, and the government was vested in a council of 24 members, divided into eight colleges, who were invested with a power so absolute that their elected queen was reduced to a mere shadow. In short, the ancient oligarchy was restored, and Sweden became the prey of a few noble families. . . . In November a treaty was signed at Stockholm between Sweden and Great Britain, by which the Duchies of Bremen and Verden were ceded to George I. [as Elector of Hanover] in consideration of a payment of one million rix-dollars. By another treaty in January 1720, George engaged to support Sweden against Denmark and Russia, and to pay a yearly subsidy of $300,000 during the war. About the same time an armistice was concluded with Poland till a definitive treaty should be arranged on the basis of the Peace of Oliva. Augustus was to be recognised as King of Poland; but Stanislaus was to retain the royal title during his life, and to receive from Augustus a million rix-dollars. Both parties were to unite to check the preponderance of the Czar, whose troops excited great discontent and suspicion by their continued presence in Poland. On February 1st a peace was concluded with Prussia under the mediation of France and Great Britain. The principal articles of this treaty were that Sweden ceded to Prussia, Stettin, the Islands of Wollin and Usedom, and all the tract between the Oder and Peene, together with the towns of Damm and Golnau beyond the Oder. The King of Prussia, on his side, engaged not to assist the Czar, and to pay two million rix-dollars to the Queen of Sweden. The terms of a peace between Sweden and Denmark were more difficult of arrangement. . . . By the Treaty of Stockholm, June 12th 1720, the King of Denmark restored to Sweden, Wismar, Stralsund, Rügen, and all that he held in Pomerania; Sweden paying 600,000 rix-dollars and renouncing the freedom of the Sound. Thus the only territorial acquisition that Denmark made by the war was the greater part of the Duchy of Schleswig, the possession of which was guaranteed to her by England and France. Sweden and Russia were now the only Powers that remained at war. . . . At length, through the mediation of France, conferences were opened in May 1721, and the Peace of Nystad was signed, September 10th. . . . The only portion of his conquests that [Peter] relinquished was Finnland, with the exception of a part of Carelia; but as, by his treaty with Augustus II., at the beginning of the war, he had promised to restore Livonia to Poland if he conquered it, he paid the Crown of Sweden $2,000,000 in order to evade this engagement by alleging that he had purchased that province."—T. H. Dyer, *Hist. of Modern Europe, bk.* 5, *ch.* 7 (*v.* 3).

Also in: F. C. Schlosser, *Hist. of the 18th Century, period* 1, *div.* 1, *ch.* 2, *sect.* 3.

(Sweden): A. D. 1720.—Accession of Frederick of Hesse-Cassel, husband of Ulrica Eleonora.

(Sweden): A. D. 1720-1792.—Wars with Russia and Prussia.—Humiliating powerlessness of the king.—The parties of the Hats and the Caps.—A constitutional Revolution.—Assassination of Gustavus III.—Ulrica Eleonora, the sister of Charles XII., resigned the crown in 1720, in favor of her husband, Prince of Hesse, who became king under the title of Frederick I. His reign witnessed the conquest of Finland and the cession (1743) of a part of that province to Russia (see Russia: A. D. 1740–1762). On his death in 1751, Adolphus Frederick, bishop of Lubeck, and administrator of Holstein, was raised to the throne. "Though his personal qualities commanded respect, his reign was a disastrous one. He had the folly to join the coalition of Russia, Poland, Austria, and France against the king of Prussia. Twenty thousand Swedes were marched into Pomerania, on the pretext of enforcing the conditions of the treaty of Westphalia, but with the view of recovering the districts which had been ceded to Prussia after the death of Charles XII. They reduced Usedom and Wollin, with the fortresses on the coast; but this success was owing to the absence of the Prussians. When, in 1758, Schwald, the general of Frederic the Great, was at liberty to march with 30,000 men into Pomerania, he recovered the places which had been lost, and forced the invaders to retire under the cannon of Stralsund. The accession of the tsar Peter was still more favourable to Frederic. An enthusiastic admirer of that prince, he soon concluded a treaty with him. Sweden was forced to follow the example; and things remained, at the peace of Hubertsburg, in the same condition as before the war. Scarcely was Sweden at harmony with her formidable enemy, when she became agitated by internal commotions. We have alluded to the limitations set to the royal authority after the death of Charles XII., and to the discontent it engendered in the breasts of the Swedish monarchs. While they strove to emancipate themselves from the shackles imposed upon them, the diet was no less anxious to render them more enslaved. That diet, consisting of four orders, the nobles, the clergy, the burghers, and the peasants, was often the scene of tumultuous proceedings: it was rarely tranquil; yet it enjoyed the supreme legislative authority. It was also cor-

rupt; for impoverished nobles and needy tradesmen had a voice, no less than the wealthiest members. All new laws, all ordinances, were signed by the king; yet he had no power of refusal; he was the mere registrar-general. . . . The king had sometimes refused to sign ordinances which he judged dangerous to the common weal: in 1756 an act was passed, that in future a stamp might be used in lieu of the sign-manual, whenever he should again refuse. More intolerable than all this was the manner in which the diet insisted on regulating the most trifling details of the royal household. This interference was resented by some of the members, belonging to what was called the 'Hat' party, who may be termed the tories of Sweden. Opposed to these were the 'Caps,' who were for shackling the crown with new restrictions, and of whom the leaders were undoubtedly in the pay of Russia. . . . As Russia was the secret soul of the Caps, so France endeavoured to support the Hats, whenever the courts of St. Petersburgh and St. Germains were hostile to each other. Stockholm therefore was an arena in which the two powers struggled for the ascendancy." Gustavus III., who succeeded his father Adolphus Frederic in 1771, was able with the help of French money and influence, and by winning to his support the burgher cavalry of the capital, to overawe the party of the Caps, and to impose a new constitution upon the country. The new constitution "conferred considerable powers on the sovereign; enabled him to make peace, or declare war, without the consent of the diet; but he could make no new law, or alter any already made, without its concurrence; and he was bound to ask, though not always to follow, the advice of his senate in matters of graver import. The form of the constitution was not much altered; and the four orders of deputies still remained. On the whole, it was a liberal constitution. If this revolution was agreeable to the Swedes themselves, it was odious to Catherine II., who saw Russian influence annihilated by it." The bad feeling between the two governments which followed led to war, in 1787, when Russia was engaged at the same time in hostilities with the Turks. The war was unpopular in Sweden, and Gustavus was frustrated in his ambitious designs on Finland. Peace was made in 1790, each party restoring its conquests, "so that things remained exactly as they were before the war." On the 16th March, 1792, Gustavus III. was assassinated, being shot at a masquerade ball, by one Ankerstrom, whose motives have remained always a mystery. Suspicion attached to others, the king's brother included, but nothing to justify it is proved. The murdered king was succeeded by his son Gustavus IV., who had but just passed the age of three years.—S. A. Dunham, *Hist. of Denmark, Sweden and Norway, bk. 3, ch. 4 (v. 3).*

(Denmark and Norway): A. D. 1730.—Accession of Christian VI.

(Denmark and Norway): A. D. 1746.—Accession of Frederick V.

(Sweden): A. D. 1751.—Accession of Adolphus Frederick.

(Denmark and Norway): A. D. 1766.—Accession of Christian VII.

(Sweden): A. D. 1771.—Accession of Gustavus III.

(Sweden): A. D. 1792.—Accession of Gustavus Adolphus.

(Sweden): A. D. 1795.—Peace with France. See FRANCE: A. D. 1794–1795 (OCTOBER—MAY).

A. D. 1801-1802.—The Northern Maritime League.—English bombardment of Copenhagen and summary extortion of peace. See FRANCE: A. D. 1801–1802.

(Sweden): A. D. 1805.—Joined in the Third Coalition against France. See FRANCE: A. D. 1805 (JANUARY—APRIL).

(Sweden): A. D. 1806.—In the Russo-Prussian alliance against Napoleon. See GERMANY: A. D. 1806–1807.

A. D. 1807-1810.—Northern fruits of the conspiracy of the two Emperors at Tilsit.—Bombardment of Copenhagen and seizure of the Danish Fleet by the English.—War of Russia and Denmark with Sweden, and conquest of Finland.—Deposition of the Swedish king.—On the 7th of July, 1807, Napoleon and Alexander I. of Russia, meeting on a raft, moored in the river Nieman, arranged the terms of the famous Treaty of Tilsit—see GERMANY: A. D. 1807 (JUNE—JULY). "There were Secret Articles in this Treaty of Tilsit in which England had a vital interest. These secret articles are not to be found in any collection of State Papers; but Napoleon's diplomatists have given a sufficient account of them to enable us to speak of them with assurance. Napoleon would not part with Constantinople; but he not only gave up Turkey as a whole to be dealt with as Alexander pleased, but agreed to unite his efforts with Alexander to wrest from the Porte all its provinces but Roumelia, if within three months she had not made terms satisfactory to Alexander. In requital for this, if England did not before the 1st of November make terms satisfactory to Napoleon, on the requisition of Russia, the two Emperors were to require of Sweden, Denmark, and Portugal, to close their ports against the English, and were to unite their forces in war against Great Britain. . . . In the month of May, the Duke of Portland had had an audience of the Prince of Wales at Carlton House, at which he had heard a piece of news from the Prince which it deeply concerned him, as Prime Minister, to know. The Prince Regent of Portugal had sent secret information that Napoleon wanted to invade our shores with the Portuguese and Danish fleets. The Portuguese had been refused. It was for us to see to the Danish. Mr. Canning lost no time in seeing to it: and while the Emperors were consulting at Tilsit, he was actively engaged in disabling Denmark from injuring us. When he had confidential information of the secret articles of the Tilsit Treaty, his proceedings were hastened, and they were made as peremptory as the occasion required. He endured great blame for a long time on account of this peremptoriness; and he could not justify himself because the government were pledged to secrecy. . . . Mr. Jackson, who had been for some years our envoy at the Court of Berlin, was sent to Kiel, to require of the Crown Prince (then at Kiel), who was known to be under intimidation by Napoleon, that the Danish navy should be delivered over to England, to be taken care of in British ports, and restored at the end of the war. The Crown Prince refused, with the indignation which was to be expected. . . . Mr. Jackson had been escorted, when he went forth on his mission, by 20 ships of the line, 40

SCANDINAVIAN STATES, 1807–1810.

frigates and other assistant vessels, and a fleet of transports, conveying 27,000 land troops. Admiral Gambier commanded the naval, and Lord Cathcart the military expedition. These forces had been got ready within a month, with great ability, and under perfect secrecy; and before the final orders were given, ministers had such information of the secret articles of the Treaty of Tilsit as left them no hesitation whatever about seizing the Danish fleet, if it was not lent quietly. . . . When, therefore, Mr. Jackson was indignantly dismissed by the Crown Prince, no time was to be lost in seizing the fleet. . . . On the 15th [of August] the forces were landed at Wedbeck, for their march upon Copenhagen, and the fleet worked up before the city. Once more, an attempt was made to avoid extremities. . . . The Crown Prince replied by a proclamation, amounting to a declaration of war. . . . And now the affair was decided. There could be no doubt as to what the end must be. . . . By the 1st of September, however, Stralsund was occupied by the French; and part of the British force was detached to watch them; and this proved that it would have been fatal to lose time. By the 8th of September, all was over; the Danish navy and arsenal were surrendered. One fourth of the buildings of the city were by that time destroyed; and in one street 500 persons were killed by the bombardment. . . . Efforts were made to conciliate the Danes after all was over; but, as was very natural, in vain. . . . Almost as soon as the news of the achievement reached England, the victors brought the Danish fleet into Portsmouth harbour. One of the most painful features of the case is the confiscation which ensued, because the surrender was not made quietly. At the moment of the attack, there were Danish merchantmen in our waters, with cargoes worth £2,000,000. These we took possession of; and, of course, of the navy which we had carried off."—H. Martineau, *Hist. of Eng.*, 1800–1815, *bk.* 2, *ch.* 1. — In fulfilment of the agreements of the Treaty of Tilsit, early in August, 1807, "a show was made by Russia of offering her mediation to Great Britain for the conclusion of a general peace; but as Mr. Canning required, as a pledge of the sincerity of the Czar, a frank communication of the secret articles at Tilsit, the proposal fell to the ground." Its failure was made certain by the action of England in taking possession by force of the Danish fleet. On the 5th of November, upon the peremptory demand of Napoleon, war was accordingly declared against Great Britain by the Czar. "Denmark had concluded (Oct. 16) an alliance, offensive and defensive, with France, and Sweden was now summoned by Russia to join the Continental League. But the King, faithful to his engagements [with England], resolutely refused submission; on which war was declared against him early in 1808, and an overwhelming force poured into Finland, the seizure of which by Russia had been agreed on at Tilsit."—*Epitome of Alison's Hist. of Europe, sects.* 455–456 (*ch.* 51, *v.* 11, *of complete work*).—"In November, 1808, Finland was virtually given up to Alexander; and Sweden was thus deprived of her great granary, and destined to ruin. England had of late aided her vigourously, driving the Russian navy into port, and blockading them there; and sending Sir John Moore, with 10,000 men, in May, when France, Russia, and Denmark, were all advancing to crush the gallant Swedes. Sir John Moore found the King in what he thought a very wild state of mind, proposing conquests, when he had not forces enough for defensive operations. All agreement in their views was found to be impossible: the King resented the Englishman's caution; Sir John Moore thought the King so nearly mad that he made off in disguise from Stockholm, and brought back his troops, which had never been landed. . . . After the relinquishment of Finland, the Swedish people found they could endure no more. Besides Finland, they had lost Pomerania: they were reduced to want; they were thinned by pestilence as well as by war; but the King's ruling idea was to continue the conflict to the last. . . . As the only way to preserve their existence, his subjects gently deposed him, and put the administration of affairs into the hands of his aged uncle, the Duke of Sudermania. The poor King was arrested on the 13th of March, 1809, as he was setting out for his country seat, . . . and placed in imprisonment for a short time. His uncle, at first called Regent, was soon made King. . . . Peace was made with Russia in September, 1809, and with France in the following January. Pomerania was restored to Sweden, but not Finland; and she had to make great sacrifices. . . . She was compelled to bear her part in the Continental System of Napoleon, and to shut her ports against all communications with England."—H. Martineau, *Hist. of Eng.*, 1800–1815, *bk.* 2, *ch.* 1. —"The invasion by the Tzar Alexander I. in 1808 led to the complete separation of Finland and the other Swedish lands east of the gulf of Bothnia from the Swedish crown. Finland was conquered and annexed by the conqueror; but it was annexed after a fashion in which one may suppose that no other conquered land ever was annexed. In fact one may doubt whether 'annexed' is the right word. Since 1809 the crowns of Russia and Finland are necessarily worn by the same person; the Russian and the Finnish nation have necessarily the same sovereign. But Finland is not incorporated with Russia; in everything but the common sovereign Russia and Finland are countries foreign to one another. And when we speak of the crown and the nation of Finland, we speak of a crown and a nation which were called into being by the will of the conqueror himself. . . . The conqueror had possession of part of the Swedish dominions, and he called on the people of that part to meet him in a separate Parliament, but one chosen in exactly the same way as the existing law prescribed for the common Parliament of the whole. . . . In his new character of Grand Duke of Finland, the Tzar Alexander came to Borga, and there on March 27th, 1809, fully confirmed the existing constitution, laws, and religion of his new State. The position of that State is best described in his own words. Speaking neither Swedish nor Finnish, and speaking to hearers who understood no Russian, the new Grand Duke used the French tongue. Finland was 'Placé désormais au rang des nations'; it was a 'Nation, tranquille au dehors, libre dans l'intérieur.' [Finland was 'Placed henceforth in the rank of the nations; it was a Nation tranquil without, free within.'] And it was a nation of his own founding. The people of Finland had ceased to be a part of the Swedish nation; they

had not become a part of the Russian nation; they had become a nation by themselves. All this, be it remembered, happened before the formal cession of the lost lands by Sweden to Russia. This was not made till the Peace of Frederikshamn on September 17th of the same year. The treaty contained no stipulation for the political rights of Finland; their full confirmation by the new sovereign was held to be enough. Two years later, in 1811, the boundary of the new State was enlarged. Alexander, Emperor of all the Russias and Grand Duke of Finland, cut off from his empire, and added to his grand duchy, the Finnish districts which had been ceded by Sweden to Russia sixty years before. The boundary of his constitutional grand duchy was brought very near indeed to the capital of his despotic empire."— E. A. Freeman, *Finland* (*Macmillan's Mag., March*, 1892).

ALSO IN: Gen. Monteith, ed., *Narrative of the Conquest of Finland, by a Russian Officer* (*with appended doc's*).— C. Joyneville, *Life and Times of Alexander I., v. 2, ch. 2.*

(Denmark and Norway): A. D. 1808.—Accession of Frederick VI.

(Sweden): A. D. 1809.—Accession of Charles XIII.

(Sweden): A. D. 1809.—Granting of the Constitution. See CONSTITUTION OF SWEDEN.

(Sweden): A. D. 1810.—Election of Bernadotte to be Crown Prince and successor to the throne.— The new king, lately called to the throne, being aged, "the eyes of the people were fixed on the successor, or Crown Prince, who took upon himself the chief labour of the government, and appears to have given satisfaction to the nation. But his government was of short duration. On the 28th of May 1810, while reviewing some troops, he suddenly fell from his horse and expired on the spot, leaving Sweden again without any head excepting the old King. This event agitated the whole nation, and various candidates were proposed for the succession of the kingdom. Among these was the King of Denmark, who, after the sacrifices he had made for Buonaparte, had some right to expect his support. The son of the late unfortunate monarch, rightful heir of the crown, and named like him Gustavus, was also proposed as a candidate. The Duke of Oldenburg, brother-in-law of the Emperor of Russia, had partizans. To each of these candidates there lay practical objections. To have followed the line of lawful succession, and called Gustavus to the throne, (which could not be forfeited by his father's infirmity, so far as he was concerned,) would have been to place a child at the head of the state, and must have inferred, amid this most arduous crisis, all the doubts and difficulties of choosing a regent. Such choice might, too, be the means, at a future time, of reviving his father's claim to the crown. The countries of Denmark and Sweden had been too long rivals, for the Swedes to subject themselves to the yoke of the King of Denmark; and to choose the Duke of Oldenburg would have been, in effect, to submit themselves to Russia, of whose last behaviour towards her Sweden had considerable reason to complain. In this embarrassment they were thought to start a happy idea, who proposed to conciliate Napoleon by bestowing the ancient crown of the Goths upon one of his own Field Marshals, and a high noble of his empire, namely, John Julian Baptiste Bernadotte, Prince of Ponte Corvo. This distinguished officer was married to a sister of Joseph Buonaparte's wife, (daughter of a wealthy and respectable individual, named Clary,) through whom he had the advantage of an alliance with the Imperial family of Napoleon, and he had acquired a high reputation in the north of Europe, both when governor of Hanover, and administrator of Swedish Pomerania. On the latter occasion, Bernadotte was said to have shown himself in a particular manner the friend and protector of the Swedish nation; and it was even insinuated that he would not be averse to exchange the errors of Popery for the reformed tenets of Luther. The Swedish nation fell very generally into the line of policy which prompted this choice. . . . It was a choice, sure, as they thought, to be agreeable to him upon whose nod the world seemed to depend. Yet, there is the best reason to doubt, whether, in preferring Bernadotte to their vacant throne, the Swedes did a thing which was gratifying to Napoleon. The name of the Crown Prince of Sweden elect, had been known in the wars of the Revolution, before that of Buonaparte had been heard of. Bernadotte had been the older, therefore, though certainly not the better soldier. On the 18th Brumaire, he was so far from joining Buonaparte in his enterprise against the Council of Five Hundred, notwithstanding all advances made to him, that he was on the spot at St. Cloud armed and prepared, had circumstances permitted, to place himself at the head of any part of the military, who might be brought to declare for the Directory. And although, like every one else, Bernadotte submitted to the Consular system, and held the government of Holland under Buonaparte, yet then, as well as under the empire, he was always understood to belong to a class of officers, whom Napoleon employed indeed, and rewarded, but without loving them, or perhaps relying on them more than he was compelled to do, although their character was in most instances a warrant for their fidelity. These officers formed a comparatively small class, yet comprehending some of the most distinguished names in the French army. . . . Reconciled by necessity to a state of servitude which they could not avoid, this party considered themselves as the soldiers of France, not of Napoleon, and followed the banner of their country rather than the fortunes of the Emperor. Without being personally Napoleon's enemies, they were not the friends of his despotic power. . . . Besides the suspicion entertained by Napoleon of Bernadotte's political opinions, subjects of positive discord had recently arisen between them. . . . But while such were the bad terms betwixt the Emperor and his general, the Swedes, unsuspicious of the true state of the case, imagined, that in choosing Bernadotte for successor to their throne, they were paying to Buonaparte the most acceptable tribute. And, notwithstanding that Napoleon was actually at variance with Bernadotte, and although, in a political view, he would much rather have given his aid to the pretensions of the King of Denmark, he was under the necessity of reflecting, that Sweden retained a certain degree of independence; that the sea separated her shores from his armies; and that, however willing to conciliate him, the Swedes were not in a condition absolutely to be compelled to receive laws at his hand. It was necessary to

acquiesce in their choice, since he could not dictate to them; and by doing so he might at the same time exhibit another splendid example of the height to which his service conducted his generals. . . . We have, however, been favoured with some manuscript observations . . . which prove distinctly, that while Napoleon treated the Crown Prince Elect of Sweden with fair language, he endeavoured by underhand intrigues to prevent the accomplishment of his hopes. The Swedes, however, remained fixed in their choice, notwithstanding the insinuations of Desaugier, the French envoy, whom Napoleon afterwards affected to disown and recall, for supporting in the diet of Orebro the interest of the King of Denmark, instead of that of Bernadotte. Napoleon's cold assent, or rather an assurance that he would not dissent, being thus wrung reluctantly from him, Bernadotte, owing to his excellent character among the Swedes, and their opinion of his interest with Napoleon, was chosen Crown Prince of Sweden by the States of that kingdom, 21st August 1810."—Sir W. Scott, *Life of Napoleon, v.* 2, *ch.* 12.

ALSO IN: M. de Bourrienne, *Private Memoirs of Napoleon, v.* 4, *ch.* 7.—Lady Bloomfield, *Memoirs of Lord Bloomfield, v.* 1, *pp.* 17-34.—W. G. Meredith, *Memorials of Charles John, King of Sweden and Norway.*

(Sweden): A. D. 1810.—Alliance with Russia against France. See FRANCE: A. D. 1810-1812.

(Sweden): A. D. 1813.—Joined with the new Coalition against Napoleon.—Participation in the War of Liberation. See GERMANY: A. D. 1812-1813 to 1813 (OCTOBER—DECEMBER).

A. D. 1813-1814.—The Peace of Kiel.—Cession of Norway to Sweden and of Swedish Pomerania to Denmark.—"The Danes, having been driven out of Holstein by Bernadotte [see GERMANY: A. D. 1813 (OCTOBER—DECEMBER)], concluded an armistice December 18th, and, finally, the Peace of Kiel, January 14th 1814, by which Frederick VI. ceded Norway to Sweden; reserving, however, Greenland, the Ferroe Isles, and Iceland, which were regarded as dependencies of Norway. Norway, which was anciently governed by its own kings, had remained united with Denmark ever since the death of Olaf V. in 1387. Charles XIII., on his side, ceded to Denmark Swedish Pomerania and the Isle of Rugen. This treaty founded the present system of the North. Sweden withdrew entirely from her connection with Germany, and became a purely Scandinavian Power. The Norwegians, who detested the Swedes, made an attempt to assert their independence under the conduct of Prince Christian Frederick, cousin-german and heir of Frederick VI. of Denmark. Christian Frederick was proclaimed King of Norway; but the movement was opposed by Great Britain and the Allied Powers from considerations of policy rather than justice; and the Norwegians found themselves compelled to decree the union of Norway and Sweden in a storting, or Diet, assembled at Christiania, November 4th 1814. Frederick VI. also signed a peace with Great Britain at Kiel, January 14th 1814. All the Danish colonies, except Heligoland, which had been taken by the English, were restored."—T. H. Dyer, *Hist. of Modern Europe, bk.* 7, *ch.* 16 (*v.* 4).

(Sweden): A. D. 1814.—The Allies in France and in possession of Paris.—Fall of Napoleon. See FRANCE: A. D. 1814 (JANUARY—MARCH), and (MARCH—APRIL).

(Norway): A. D. 1814-1815.—The Norwegian constitution under the union with Sweden.—"When, by the treaty of Kiel in 1814, Norway was taken from Denmark, and handed over to Sweden, the Norwegians roused themselves to once more assert their nationality. The Swedes appeared in force, by land and sea, upon the frontiers of Norway. It was not, however, until the latter country had been guaranteed complete national independence that she consented to a union of the countries under the one crown. The agreement was made, and the constitution of Norway granted on the 17th of May 1814, at which date the contemporary history of Norway begins. . . . The Fundamental Law of the constitution (Grundlöv), which almost every peasant farmer now-a-days has framed and hung up in the chief room of his house, bears the date the 4th of November 1814. The Act of Union with Sweden is dated the 6th of August 1815. The union of the two states is a union of the crown alone. . . . Sweden and Norway form, like Great Britain, a hereditary limited monarchy. One of the clauses in the Act of Union provides that the king of the joint countries must reside for a certain part of the year in Norway. But, as a matter of fact, this period is a short one. In his absence, the king is represented by the Council of State (Statsraad), which must be composed entirely of Norwegians, and consist of two Ministers of State (Cabinet Ministers), and nine other Councillors of State. As with us, the king personally can do no wrong; the responsibility for his acts rests with his ministers. Of the State Council, or Privy Council (above spoken of), three members, one a Cabinet Minister, and two ordinary members of the Privy Council, are always in attendance upon the king, whether he is residing in Norway or Sweden. The rest of the Council forms the Norwegian Government resident in the country. All functionaries are appointed by the king, with the advice of this Council of State. The officials, who form what we should call the Government (as distinguished from what we should call the Civil Service), together with the préfets (Amtmen) and the higher grades of the army are, nominally, removable by the king; but, if removed, they continue to draw two-thirds of their salary until their case has come before Parliament (the Stor-thing, Great Thing), which decides upon their pensions. . . . In 1876 the number of electors to the Storthing were under 140,000, not more than 7.7 per cent. of the whole population. So that the franchise was by no means a very wide one. . . . In foreign affairs only does Norway not act as an independent nation. There is a single foreign minister for the two countries and he is usually a Swede. For the purposes of internal administration, Norway is divided into twenty districts, called Amter—which we may best translate 'Prefectures.' Of these, the two chief towns of the country, Christiania (with its population of 150,000) and Bergen (population about 50,000) form each a separate Amt."—C. F. Keary, *Norway and the Norwegians, ch.* 13.—See CONSTITUTION OF NORWAY.

(Denmark): A. D. 1815.—Swedish Pomerania sold to Prussia. See VIENNA, CONGRESS.

(Sweden and Norway): A. D. 1818.—Accession of Charles XIV. (Bernadotte).

(Denmark): A. D. 1839.—Accession of Christian VIII.

(Sweden and Norway): A. D. 1844.—Accession of Oscar I.

(Denmark): A. D. 1848.—Accession of Frederick VII.

(Denmark): A. D. 1848-1862.—The Schleswig-Holstein question.—First war with Prussia.—"The two Duchies of Schleswig and Holstein lie to the south of modern Denmark. Holstein, the more southern of the two, is exclusively German in its population. Schleswig, the more northern, contains a mixed population of Danes and Germans. In the course of the 14th century Schleswig was conquered by Denmark, but ceded to Count Gerard of Holstein—the Constitution of Waldemar providing that the two Duchies should be under one Lord, but that they should never be united to Denmark. This is the first fact to realise in the complex history of the Schleswig-Holstein question. The line of Gerard of Holstein expired in 1375. It was succeeded by a branch of the house of Oldenburg. In 1448 a member of this house, the nephew of the reigning Duke, was elected to the throne of Denmark. The reigning Duke procured in that year a confirmation of the compact that Schleswig should never be united with Denmark. Dying without issue in 1459, the Duke was succeeded, by the election of the Estates, by his nephew Christian I. of Denmark. In electing Christian, however, the Estates compelled him in 1460 to renew the compact confirmed in 1448. And, though Duchies and Crown were thenceforward united, the only link between them was the sovereign. Even this link could possibly be severed. For the succession in the Duchy was secured to the male heir in direct contradiction of the law of Denmark. . . . It would complicate this narrative if stress were laid on the various changes in the relations between Kingdom and Duchies which were consequent on the unsettled state of Europe during the three succeeding centuries. It is sufficient to say that, by a treaty made in 1773, the arrangements concluded more than 300 years before were confirmed. Schleswig-Holstein reverted once more to the King of Denmark under exactly the same conditions as in the time of Christian I., who had expressly recognised that he governed them as Duke, that is, by virtue of their own law of succession. Such an arrangement was not likely to be respected amidst the convulsions which affected Europe in the commencement of the present century. In 1806 Christian VII. took advantage of the disruption of the German Empire formally to incorporate the Duchies into his Kingdom. No one was in a position to dispute the act of the monarch. In 1815, however, the King of Denmark, by virtue of his rights in Holstein and Lauenburg, joined the Confederation of the Rhine; and the nobility of Holstein, brought in this way into fresh connection with Germany, appealed to the German Diet. But the Diet, in the first quarter of the 19th century, was subject to influences opposed to the rights of nationalities. It declined to interfere, and the union of Duchies and Kingdom was maintained. Christian VII. was succeeded in 1808 by his son Frederick VI., who was followed in 1839 by his cousin Christian VIII. The latter

monarch had only one son, afterwards Frederick VII., who, though twice married, had no children. On his death, if no alteration had been made, the crown of Denmark would have passed to the female line—the present reigning dynasty—while the Duchies, by the old undisputed law, would have reverted to a younger branch, which descended through males to the house of Augustenburg. With this prospect before them it became very desirable for the Danes to amalgamate the Duchies; and in the year 1844 the Danish Estates almost unanimously adopted a motion that the King should proclaim Denmark, Schleswig, Holstein, and Lauenburg one indivisible State. In 1846 the King put forth a declaration that there was no doubt that the Danish law of succession prevailed in Schleswig. He admitted that there was more doubt respecting Holstein. But he promised to use his endeavours to obtain the recognition of the integrity of Denmark as a collective State. Powerless alone against the Danes and their sovereign, Holstein appealed to the Diet; and the Diet took up the quarrel, and reserved the right of enforcing its legitimate authority in case of need. Christian VIII. died in January 1848. His son, Frederick VII., the last of his line, grasped the tiller of the State at a critical moment. Crowns, before a month was over, were tumbling off the heads of half the sovereigns of Europe; and Denmark, shaken by these events, felt the full force of the revolutionary movement. Face to face with revolution at home and Germany across the frontier, the new King tried to cut instead of untying the Gordian knot. He separated Holstein from Schleswig, incorporating the latter in Denmark but allowing the former under its own constitution to form part of the German Confederation. Frederick VII. probably hoped that the German Diet would be content with the half-loaf which he offered it. The Diet, however, replied to the challenge by formally incorporating Schleswig in Germany, and by committing to Prussia the office of mediation [see GERMANY: A. D. 1848 (MARCH—SEPTEMBER)]. War broke out, but the arms of Prussia were crippled by the revolution which shook her throne. The sword of Denmark, under these circumstances, proved victorious; and the Duchies were ultimately compelled to submit to the decision which force had pronounced. These events gave rise to the famous protocol which was signed in London, in August 1850, by England, France, Austria, Russia, Sweden, and Denmark. This document settled the question, so far as diplomacy could determine it, in the interests of Denmark. The unity of Denmark, Schleswig, Holstein and Lauenburg was secured by a uniform law of succession, and their internal affairs were placed, as far as practicable, under a common administration. The protocol of 1850 was signed by Lord Palmerston during the Russell Administration. It was succeeded by the treaty of 1852, which was concluded by Lord Malmesbury. This treaty, to which all the great powers were parties, was the logical consequence of the protocol. Under it the succession to Kingdom and Duchies was assigned to Prince Christian of Glücksburg, the present reigning King of Denmark. The integrity of the whole Danish Monarchy was declared permanent; but the rights of the German Confederation with respect to Holstein and Schleswig were reserved. The declar-

ation was made in accordance with the views of Russia, England, and France; the reservation was inserted in the interests of the German powers; and in a manifesto, which was communicated to the German Courts, the King of Denmark laid down elaborate rules for the treatment and government of the Duchies. Thus, while the succession to the Danish throne and the integrity of Denmark had been secured by the protocol of 1850 and the treaty of 1852, the elaborate promises of the Danish King, formally communicated to the German powers, had given the latter a pretext for contending that these pledges were at least as sacred as the treaty. And the next ten years made the pretext much more formidable than it seemed in 1852. . . . The Danes endeavoured to extricate themselves from a constantly growing embarrassment by repeating the policy of 1848, by granting, under what was known as the Constitution of 1855, autonomous institutions to Holstein, by consolidating the purely Danish portions of the Monarchy, and by incorporating Schleswig, which was partly Danish and partly German, in Denmark. But the German inhabitants of Schleswig resented this arrangement. They complained of the suppression of their language and the employment of Danish functionaries, and they argued that, under the engagements which had been contracted between 1851 and 1852, Holstein had a voice in constitutional changes of this character. This argument added heat to a dispute already acute. For it was now plain that, while the German Diet claimed the right to interfere in Holstein, Holstein asserted her claim to be heard on the affairs of the entire Kingdom."—S. Walpole, *Life of Lord John Russell, ch.* 30 (*v.* 2).—In the first period of the war of 1848–9, the only important battle was fought at Duppeln, June 5, 1848. The Prussians were superior in land forces, but the Danes were able to make use of a flotilla of gunboats in defending their strong position. "After a useless slaughter, both parties remained nearly in the same position as they had occupied at the commencement of the conflict." The war was suspended in August by an armistice—that of Malmö—but was renewed in the April following. "On the 20th April [1849] the Prussians invaded Jutland with 48 battalions, 48 guns, and 2,000 horse; and the Danish generals, unable to make head against such a crusade, retired through the town of Kolding, which was fortified and commanded an important bridge that was abandoned to the invaders. The Danes, however, returned, and after a bloody combat dislodged the Prussians, but were finally obliged to evacuate it by the fire of the German mortars, which reduced the town to ashes. On the 3d May the Danes had their revenge, in the defeat of a large body of the Schleswig insurgents by a Danish corps near the fortress of Fredericia, with the loss of 340 men. A more important advantage was gained by them on the 6th July," over the Germans who were besieging Fredericia. "The loss of the Germans in this disastrous affair was 96 officers and 3,250 men killed and wounded, with their whole siege-artillery and stores. . . . This brilliant victory was immediately followed by the retreat of the Germans from nearly the whole of Jutland. A convention was soon after concluded at Berlin, which established an armistice for six months," and which was followed by the negotiations and

treaties described above. But hostilities were not yet at an end; for the insurgents of Schleswig and Holstein remained in arms, and were said to receive almost open encouragement and aid from Prussia. Their army, 32,000 strong, occupied Idstedt and Wedelspang. They were attacked at the former place, on the 25th of July, 1850, by the Danes, and defeated after a bloody conflict. "The loss on both sides amounted to nearly 8,000 men, or about one in eight of the troops engaged; a prodigious slaughter, unexampled in European war since the battle of Waterloo. Of these, nearly 3,000, including 85 officers, were killed or wounded on the side of the Danes, and 5,000 on that of the insurgents, whose loss in officers was peculiarly severe."—Sir A. Alison, *Hist. of Europe*, 1815–1852, *ch.* 53.—From 1855 to 1862 the history of Denmark was uneventful. But in the next year King Frederick VII. died, and the Treaty of London, which had settled the succession upon Prince Christian of Glücksburg, failed to prevent the reopening of the Schleswig-Holstein question.

Also in: C. A. Gosch, *Denmark and Germany since* 1815, *ch.* 3–9.—*A Forgotten War* (*Spectator, Sept.* 22, 1894, *reviewing Count von Moltke's "Geschichte des Krieges gegen Dänemark*, 1848–49").

(Denmark—Iceland): A. D. 1849-1874.—The Danish constitution.—Relations of Iceland to Denmark.—"Denmark became a constitutional monarchy in 1849. The principal provisions of the Constitution are these: Every king of Denmark, before he can assume the government of the monarchy, must deliver a written oath that he will observe the constitution. He alone is invested with the executive power, but the legislative he exercises conjointly with the Assembly (Rigsdag). He can declare war and make peace, enter and renounce alliances. But he cannot, without the consent of the Assembly, sign away any of the possessions of the kingdom or encumber it with any State obligations. . . . The king's person is sacred and inviolable; he is exempt from all responsibility. The ministers form the Council of State, of which the king is the president, and where, by right, the heir-apparent has a seat. The king has an absolute veto. The Rigsdag (Assembly) meets every year, and cannot be prorogued till the session has lasted for two months at least. It consists of two Chambers—the Upper Chamber, 'Landsting,' and the Lower Chamber, 'Folketing.' The Upper Chamber consists of 66 members, twelve of which are Crown-elects for life, seven chosen by Copenhagen, and one by the so-called Lagting of Farö. The 46 remaining members are voted in by ten electoral districts, each of which comprises from one to three Amts, or rural governorships, with the towns situated within each of them included. The elections are arranged on the proportional or minority system. In Copenhagen and in the other towns one moiety of electors is chosen out of those who possess the franchise for the Lower House, the other moiety is selected from among those who pay the highest municipal rates. In every rural commune one elector is chosen by all the enfranchised members of the community. . . . The Lower House is elected for three years, and consists of 102 members; consequently there are 102 electorates or electoral districts. . . . The Lower House is elected by manhood suffrage. Every man thirty years old has a vote, provided there

be no stain on his character, and that he possesses the birthright of a citizen within his district, and has been domiciled for a year within it before exercising his right of voting, and does not stand in such a subordinate relation of service to private persons as not to have a home of his own. . . . The two Chambers of the Rigsdag stand, as legislative bodies, on an equal footing, both having the right to propose and to alter laws. . . . At present [1891] this very Liberal Constitution is not working smoothly. As was to be expected, two parties have gradually come into existence — a Conservative and a Liberal, or, as they are termed after French fashion, the Right and the Left. The country is governed at present arbitrarily against an opposition in overwhelming majority in the Lower House. The dispute between the Left and the Ministry does not really turn so much upon conflicting views with regard to great public interests, as upon the question whether Denmark has, or has not, to have parliamentary government. . . . The Right represents chiefly the educated and the wealthy classes; the Left the mass of the people, and is looked down upon by the Right. . . . I said in the beginning that I would tell you how the constitutional principle has been applied to Iceland. I have only time briefly to touch upon that matter. In 1800 the old Althing (All Men's Assembly, General Diet), which had existed from 930, came to an end. Forty-five years later it was re-established by King Christian VIII. in the character of a consultative assembly. . . . The Althing at once began to direct its attention to the question — What Iceland's proper position should be in the Danish monarchy when eventually its anticipated constitution should be carried out. The country had always been governed by its special laws; it had a code of laws of its own, and it had never been ruled, in administrative sense, as a province of Denmark. Every successive king had, on his accession to the throne, issued a proclamation guaranteeing to Iceland due observance of the country's laws and traditional privileges. Hence it was found entirely impracticable to include Iceland under the provisions of the charter for Denmark; and a royal rescript of September 23, 1848, announced that with regard to Iceland no measures for settling the constitutional relation of that part of the monarchy would be adopted until a constitutive assembly in the country itself 'had been heard' on the subject. Unfortunately, the revolt of the duchies intervened between this declaration and the date of the constitutive assembly which was fixed for 1851. The Government took fright, being unfortunately quite in the dark about the real state of public opinion in the distant dependency. . . . The Icelanders only wanted to abide by their laws, and to have the management of their own home affairs, but the so-called National-Liberal Government wanted to incorporate the country as a province in the kingdom of Denmark proper. This idea the Icelanders really never could understand as seriously meant. . . . The constitutive assembly was brusquely dissolved by the Royal Commissary when he saw that it meant to insist on autonomy for the Icelanders in their own home affairs. And from 1851 to 1874 every successive Althing (but one) persisted in calling on the Government to fulfil the royal promise of 1848. It was no doubt due to the very loyal, quiet, and able manner in which the Icelanders pursued their case, under the leadership of the trusted patriot, Jon Sigurdsson, that in 1874 the Government at last agreed to give Iceland the constitution it demanded. But instead of frankly meeting the Icelandic demands in full, they were only partially complied with, and from the first the charter met with but scanty popularity."— E. Magnusson, *Denmark and Iceland* (*National Life and Thought, ch.* 12).

(Sweden): A. D. 1855.— In the alliance against Russia. See RUSSIA: A. D. 1854–1856.

(Sweden and Norway): A. D. 1859.—Accession of Charles XV.

(Denmark): A. D. 1863.—Accession of Christian IX.

(Denmark): A. D. 1864.— Reopening of the Schleswig-Holstein question.— Austro-Prussian invasion and conquest of the duchies. See GERMANY: A. D. 1861–1866.

(Sweden and Norway): A. D. 1872.—Accession of Oscar II.

A. D. 1890.—Population.—By a census taken at the close of 1890, the population of Sweden was found to be 4,784,981, and that of Norway 2,000,917. The population of Denmark, according to a census taken in February, 1890, was 2,185,335.—*Statesman's Year-Book*, 1894.

SCANZIA, Island of.— The peninsula of Sweden and Norway was so called by some ancient writers. See GOTHS, ORIGIN OF THE.

SCHAH, OR SHAH. See BEY.

SCHAMYL'S WAR WITH THE RUSSIANS. See CAUCASUS.

SCHARNHORST'S MILITARY REFORMS IN PRUSSIA. See GERMANY: A. D. 1807–1808.

SCHELLENBERG, OR HERMANSTADT, Battle of (1599). See BALKAN AND DANUBIAN STATES: 14–18TH CENTURIES (ROUMANIA, ETC.).

SCHENECTADY: A. D. 1690.—Massacre and Destruction by French and Indians. See CANADA: A. D. 1689–1690; also UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1690.

SCHEPENS. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1584–1585.

SCHILL'S RISING. See GERMANY: A. D. 1809 (APRIL—JULY).

SCHISM, The Great. See PAPACY: A. D. 1377–1417, and 1414–1418; also, ITALY: A. D. 1343–1389, and 1386–1414.

SCHISM ACT. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1711–1714.

SCHKIPETARS, Albanian. See ILLYRIANS.

SCHLESWIG, and the Schleswig-Holstein question. See SCANDINAVIAN STATES (DENMARK): A. D. 1848–1862, and GERMANY: A. D. 1861–1866, and 1866.

SCHMALKALDIC LEAGUE, The. See GERMANY: A. D. 1530–1532.

SCHŒNE, The.— An ancient Egyptian measure of length which is supposed, as in the case of the Persian parasang, to have been fixed by no standard, but to have been merely a rude estimate of distance. See PARASANG.

SCHOFIELD, General J. M.— Campaign in Missouri and Arkansas. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1862 (JULY—SEPTEMBER: MISSOURI—ARKANSAS), and (SEPTEMBER—DECEM-

BER: MISSOURI—ARKANSAS).....**The Atlanta Campaign.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1864 (MAY: GEORGIA), to (SEPTEMBER—OCTOBER: GEORGIA). . . . . **Campaign against Hood.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1864 (NOVEMBER: TENNESSEE), and (DECEMBER: TENNESSEE).

SCHOLARII.—The household troops or imperial life-guards of the Eastern Roman Empire. —T. Hodgkin, *Italy and Her Invaders, bk.* 5, *ch.* 20.

SCHOLASTICISM.—SCHOOLMEN. See EDUCATION, MEDIÆVAL: SCHOLASTICISM.

SCHOOL OF THE PALACE, Charlemagne's.—"Charlemagne took great care to attract distinguished foreigners into his states, and . . . among those who helped to second intellectual development in Frankish Gaul, many came from abroad. . . . He not only strove to attract distinguished men into his states, but he protected and encouraged them wherever he discovered them. More than one Anglo-Saxon abbey shared his liberality; and learned men who, after following him into Gaul, wished to return to their country, in no way became strangers to him. . . . Alcuin fixed himself there permanently. He was born in England, at York, about 735. The intellectual state of Ireland and England was then superior to that of the continent; letters and schools prospered there more than anywhere else. . . . The schools of England, and particularly that of York, were superior to those of the continent. That of York possessed a rich library, where many of the works of pagan antiquity were found; among others, those of Aristotle, which it is a mistake to say were first introduced to the knowledge of modern Europe by the Arabians, and the Arabians only; for from the fifth to the tenth century, there is no epoch in which we do not find them mentioned in some library, in which they were not known and studied by some men of letters. . . . In 780, on the death of archbishop Ælbert, and the accession of his successor, Eanbald, Alcuin received from him the mission to proceed to Rome for the purpose of obtaining from the pope and bringing to him the 'pallium.' In returning from Rome, he came to Parma, where he found Charlemagne. . . . The emperor at once pressed him to take up his abode in France. After some hesitation, Alcuin accepted the invitation, subject to the permission of his bishop, and of his own sovereign. The permission was obtained, and in 782 we find him established in the court of Charlemagne, who at once gave him three abbeys, those of Ferrieres in Gatanois, of St. Loup at Troyes, and of St. Josse in the county of Ponthieu. From this time forth, Alcuin was the confidant, the councillor, the intellectual prime minister, so to speak, of Charlemagne. . . . From 782 to 796, the period of his residence in the court of Charlemagne, Alcuin presided over a private school, called 'The School of the Palace,' which accompanied Charlemagne wherever he went, and at which were regularly present all those who were with the emperor. . . . It is difficult to say what could have been the course of instruction pursued in this school; I am disposed to believe that to such auditors Alcuin addressed himself generally upon all sorts of topics as they occurred; that in the 'Ecole du Palais,' in fact, it was conversation rather than teaching, especially so called, that went on; that movement given to mind, curiosity constantly excited and satisfied, was its chief merit." —F. Guizot, *Hist. of Civilization, lect.* 22 (*v.* 3).—See, also, EDUCATION, MEDIÆVAL.

ALSO IN: A. F. West, *Alcuin and the Rise of the Christian Schools.*

SCHOOLS. See EDUCATION.

SCHÖNBRUNN, Treaty of (1806). See GERMANY: A. D. 1806 (JANUARY—AUGUST). . . . .**Treaty of (1809).** See GERMANY: A. D. 1809 (JULY—SEPTEMBER).

SCHOUT AND SCHEPENS.—The chief magistrate and aldermen of the chartered towns of Holland were called the Schout and the Schepens.—J. L. Motley, *Rise of the Dutch Republic, introd., sect.* 6.—"In every tribunal there is a Schout or sheriff, who convenes the judges, and demands from them justice for the litigating parties; for the word 'schout' is derived from 'schuld,' debt, and he is so denominated because he is the person who recovers or demands common debts, according to Grotius."—Van Leeuwen, *Commentaries on Roman Dutch Law*, quoted in O'Callaghan's *Hist. of New Netherland, v.* 1, *p.* 101, *foot-note, and v.* 2, *p.* 212.—See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1584–1585.

SCHUMLA, Siege of (1828). See TURKS: A. D. 1826–1829.

SCHUYLER, General Philip, and the American Revolution. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1775 (MAY—AUGUST); 1777 (JULY—OCTOBER).

SCHUYLER, Fort (Late Fort Stanwix): A. D. 1777.—Defense against the British and Indians under St. Leger. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1777 (JULY—OCTOBER).

SCHWECHAT, Battle of (1848). See AUSTRIA: A. D. 1848–1849.

SCHWEIDNITZ, Battle of (1642). See GERMANY: A. D. 1640–1645.

Captured and recaptured. See GERMANY: A. D. 1761–1762.

SCINDE, OR SINDH.—"Sindh is the Sanskrit word Sindh or Sindhu, a river or ocean. It was applied to the river Indus, the first great body of water encountered by the Aryan invaders. . . . Sindh, which is part of the Bombay Presidency, is bounded on the north and west by the territories of the khan of Khelat, in Beluchistan; the Punjab and the Bahawalpur State lie on the north-east. . . . Three-fourths of the people are Muhammadans and the remainder Hindus." Sindh was included in the Indian conquests of Mahmud of Ghazni, Akbar, and Nadir Shah (see INDIA: A. D. 977–1290; 1399–1605; and 1662–1748). "In 1748 the country became an appanage of Kabul, as part of the dowry bestowed by the reigning emperor upon Timur, son of Ahmed Shah Durani, who founded the kingdom of Afghanistan. . . . The connection of the British government with Sindh had its origin in A. D. 1758, when Ghulam Shah Kalhora . . . granted a 'purwanah,' or permit, to an officer in the East India Company's service for the establishment of a factory in the province. . . . In their relations with the British government the Amirs throughout displayed much jealousy of foreign interference. Several treaties were made with them from time to time. In 1836, owing to the designs of Ranjit Singh on

Sindh, which, however, were not carried out because of the interposition of the British government, more intimate connection with the Amirs was sought. Colonel Pottinger visited them to negotiate for this purpose. It was not, however, till 1838 that a short treaty was concluded, in which it was stipulated that a British minister should reside at Haidarabad. At this time the friendly alliance of the Amirs was deemed necessary in the contemplated war with Afghanistan which the British government was about to undertake, to place a friendly ruler on the Afghan throne. The events that followed led to the occupation of Karachi by the British, and placed the Amirs in subsidiary dependence on the British government. New treaties became necessary, and Sir Charles Napier was sent to Haidarabad to negotiate. The Beluchis were infuriated at this proceeding, and openly insulted the officer, Sir James Outram, at the Residency at Haidarabad. Sir Charles Napier thereupon attacked the Amir's forces at Meanee, on 17th February, 1843, with 2,800 men, and twelve pieces of artillery, and succeeded in gaining a complete victory over 22,000 Beluchis, with the result that the whole of Sindh was annexed to British India."—D. Ross, *The Land of the Five Rivers and Sindh, pp.* 1–6.

Also in: Mohan Lal, *Life of Amir Dost Mohammed Khan, ch.* 14 (*v.* 2).—See India: A. D. 1836–1845.

SCIO. See Chios.

SCIPIO AFRICANUS, The Campaigns of. See Punic War, The Second.

SCIPIO AFRICANUS MINOR, Destruction of Carthage by. See Carthage: B. C. 146.

SCIR-GEREFA. See Sheriff; Shire; and Ealdorman.

SCIRONIAN WAY, The.—"The Scironian Way led from Megara to Corinth, along the eastern shore of the isthmus. At a short distance from Megara it passed along the Scironian rocks, a long range of precipices overhanging the sea, forming the extremity of a spur which descends from Mount Geranium. This portion of the road is now known as the 'Kaki Scala,' and is passed with some difficulty. The way seems to have been no more than a footpath until the time of Adrian, who made a good carriage road throughout the whole distance. There is but one other route by which the isthmus can be traversed. It runs inland, and passes over a higher portion of Mount Geranium, presenting to the traveller equal or greater difficulties."—G. Rawlinson, *Hist. of Herodotus, bk.* 8, *sect.* 71, *foot-note.*

SCLAVENES.—SCLAVONIC PEOPLES. See Slavonic peoples.

SCLAVONIC. See Slavonic.

SCODRA, OR SKODRA. See Illyrians.

SCONE, Kingdom of. See Scotland: 8–9th Centuries.

SCORDISCANS, The.—The Scordiscans, called by some Roman writers a Thracian people, but supposed to have been Celtic, were settled in the south of Pannonia in the second century, B. C. In B. C. 114 they destroyed a Roman army under consul C. Portius Cato. Two years later consul M. Livius Drusus drove them across the Danube.—E. H. Bunbury, *Hist. of Ancient Geog., ch.* 18, *sect.* 1 (*v.* 2).

SCOT AND LOT.—"Paying scot and lot; that is, bearing their rateable proportion in the payments levied from the town for local or national purposes."—W. Stubbs, *Const. Hist. of Eng., ch.* 20, *sect.* 745 (*v.* 3).

SCOTCH HIGHLAND AND LOWLAND.—"If a line is drawn from a point on the eastern bank of Loch Lomond, somewhat south of Ben Lomond, following in the main the line of the Grampians, and crossing the Forth at Aberfoil, the Teith at Callander, the Almond at Crieff, the Tay at Dunkeld, the Ericht at Blairgowrie, and proceeding through the hills of Brae Angus till it reaches the great range of the Mounth, then crossing the Dee at Ballater, the Spey at lower Craigellachie, till it reaches the Moray Firth at Nairn—this forms what was called the Highland Line and separated the Celtic from the Teutonic-speaking people. Within this line, with the exception of the county of Caithness which belongs to the Teutonic division, the Gaelic language forms the vernacular of the inhabitants."—W. F. Skene, *Celtic Scotland, v.* 2, *p.* 453.

SCOTCH-IRISH, The.—In 1607, six counties in the Irish province of Ulster, formerly belonging to the earls of Tyrone and Tyrconnel, were confiscated by the English crown. The two earls, who had submitted and had been pardoned, after a long rebellion during the reign of queen Elizabeth, had now fled from new charges of treason, and their great estates were forfeited (see Ireland: A. D. 1559–1603, and 1607–1611). These estates, thus acquired by King James, the first of the Stuarts, were "parcelled out among a body of Scotch and English, brought over for the purpose. The far greater number of these plantations were from the lower part of Scotland, and became known as 'Scotch-Irish.' Thus a new population was given to the north of Ireland, which has changed its history. The province of Ulster, with fewer natural advantages than either Munster, Leinster, or Connaught, became the most prosperous, industrious and law-abiding of all Ireland. . . . But the Protestant population thus transplanted to the north of Ireland was destined to suffer many . . . persecutions. . . . In 1704, the test-oath was imposed, by which every one in public employment was required to profess English prelacy. It was intended to suppress Popery, but was used by the Episcopal bishops to check Presbyterianism. To this was added burdensome restraints on their commerce, and extortionate rents from their landlords, resulting in what is known as the Antrim evictions. There had been occasional emigrations from the north of Ireland from the plantation of the Scotch, and one of the ministers sent over in 1683, Francis Makemie, had organized on the eastern shore of Maryland and in the adjoining counties of Virginia the first Presbyterian churches in America. But in the early part of the eighteenth century the great movement began which transported so large a portion of the Scotch-Irish into the American colonies, and, through their influence, shaped in a great measure the destinies of America. Says the historian Froude: 'In the two years which followed the Antrim evictions, thirty-thousand Protestants left Ulster for a land where there was no legal robbery, and where those who sowed the seed could reap the harvest.' Alarmed by the depletion of the Protestant population, the Toleration Act was passed, and by it, and further promises of relief, the tide of emigration was checked for

a brief period. In 1728, however, it began anew, and from 1729 to 1750, it was estimated that 'about twelve thousand came annually from Ulster to America.' So many had settled in Pennsylvania before 1729 that James Logan, the Quaker president of that colony, expressed his fear that they would become proprietors of the province. . . . This bold stream of emigrants struck the American continent mainly on the eastern border of Pennsylvania, and was, in great measure, turned southward through Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, and South Carolina, reaching and crossing the Savannah river. It was met at various points by counter streams of the same race, which had entered the continent through the seaports of the Carolinas and Georgia. Turning westward the combined flood overflowed the mountains and covered the rich valley of the Mississippi beyond. As the Puritans or Round-heads of the south, but freed from fanaticism, they gave tone to its people and direction to its history. . . . The task would be almost endless to simply call the names of this people [the Scotch-Irish] in the South who have distinguished themselves in the annals of their country. Yet some rise before me, whose names demand utterance in any mention of their people — names which the world will not willingly let die. Among the statesmen they have given to the world are Jefferson, Madison, Calhoun, Benton. Among the orators, Henry, Rutledge, Preston, McDuffie, Yancy. Among the poets, the peerless Poe. Among the jurists, Marshall, Campbell, Robertson. Among the divines, Waddell, the Alexanders, Breckinridge, Robinson, Plummer, Hoge, Hawks, Fuller, McKendree. Among the physicians, McDowell, Sims, McGuire. Among the inventors, McCormick. Among the soldiers, Lee, the Jacksons, the Johnstons, Stuart. Among the sailors, Paul Jones, Buchanan. Presidents from the South, seven — Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, Jackson, Taylor, Polk, Johnson." —W. W. Henry, *The Scotch Irish of the South (Proceedings of the Scotch-Irish Congress*, 1889).— "Full credit has been awarded the Roundhead and the Cavalier for their leadership in our history; nor have we been altogether blind to the deeds of the Hollander and the Huguenot; but it is doubtful if we have wholly realized the importance of the part played by that stern and virile people, the Irish whose preachers taught the creed of Knox and Calvin. These Irish representatives of the Covenanters were in the west almost what the Puritans were in the north-east, and more than the Cavaliers were in the south. Mingled with the descendants of many other races, they nevertheless formed the kernel of the distinctively and intensely American stock who were the pioneers of our people in their march westward, the vanguard of the army of fighting settlers, who with axe and rifle won their way from the Alleghanies to the Rio Grande and the Pacific. . . . They . . . made their abode at the foot of the mountains, and became the outposts of civilization. . . . In this land of hills, covered by unbroken forest, they took root and flourished, stretching in a broad belt from north to south, a shield of sinewy men thrust in between the people of the seaboard and the red warriors of the wilderness. All through this region they were alike; they had as little kinship with the Cavalier as with the Quaker; the west was won by those who have been rightly called the Roundheads of the south, the same men who, before any others, declared for American independence. The two facts of most importance to remember in dealing with our pioneer history are, first, that the western portions of Virginia and the Carolinas were peopled by an entirely different stock from that which had long existed in the tide-water regions of those colonies; and, secondly, that, except for those in the Carolinas who came from Charleston, the immigrants of this stock were mostly from the north, from their great breeding ground and nursery in western Pennsylvania. That these Irish Presbyterians were a bold and hardy race is proved by their at once pushing past the settled regions, and plunging into the wilderness as the leaders of the white advance. They were the first and last set of immigrants to do this; all others have merely followed in the wake of their predecessors. But, indeed, they were fitted to be Americans from the very start; they were kinsfolk of the Covenanters; they deemed it a religious duty to interpret their own Bible, and held for a divine right the election of their own clergy. For generations, their whole ecclesiastic and scholastic systems had been fundamentally democratic."—T. Roosevelt, *The Winning of the West, v.* 1, *ch.* 5.

Also in: J. Phelan, *Hist. of Tennessee, ch.* 23.

SCOTCH MILE ACT. See Scotland: A. D. 1660–1666.

SCOTIA, The name. See Scotland, The Name.

SCOTLAND.

The name.— "The name of Scotia, or Scotland, whether in its Latin or its Saxon form, was not applied to any part of the territory forming the modern kingdom of Scotland till towards the end of the tenth century. Prior to that period it was comprised in the general appellation of Britannia, or Britain, by which the whole island was designated in contradistinction from that of Hibernia, or Ireland. That part of the island of Britain which is situated to the north of the Firths of Forth and Clyde seems indeed to have been known to the Romans as early as the first century by the distinctive name of Caledonia, and it also appears to have borne from an early period another appellation, the Celtic form of which was Albu, Alba, or Alban, and its Latin form Albania. The name of Scotia, however, was exclusively appropriated to the island of Ireland. Ireland was emphatically Scotia, the 'patria,' or mother-country of the Scots; and although a colony of that people had established themselves as early as the beginning of the sixth century in the western districts of Scotland, it was not till the tenth century that any part of the present country of Scotland came to be known under that name. . . . From the tenth to the twelfth or thirteenth centuries the name of Scotia, gradually superseding the older name of Alban, or Albania, was confined to a district nearly corresponding with that part of the Lowlands of Scot-

land which is situated on the north of the Firth of Forth. . . . The three propositions — 1st, That Scotia, prior to the tenth century, was Ireland, and Ireland alone; 2d, That when applied to Scotland it was considered a new name superinduced upon the older designation of Alban or Albania; and, 3d, That the Scotia of the three succeeding centuries was limited to the districts between the Forth, the Spey, and Drumalban,—lie at the very threshold of Scottish history."—W. F. Skene, *Celtic Scotland, v.* 1, *introd.*

The Picts and Scots.—"Cæsar tells us that the inhabitants of Britain in his day painted themselves with a dye extracted from woad; by the time, however, of British independence under Carausius and Allectus, in the latter part of the third century, the fashion had so far fallen off in Roman Britain that the word 'Picti,' Picts, or painted men, had got to mean the peoples beyond the Northern wall. . . . Now, all these Picts were natives of Britain, and the word Picti is found applied to them for the first time, in a panegyric by Eumenius, in the year 296; but in the year 360 another painted people appeared on the scene. They came from Ireland, and, to distinguish these two sets of painted foes from one another, Latin historians left the painted natives to be called Picti, as had been done before, and for the painted invaders from Ireland they retained, untranslated, a Celtic word of the same (or nearly the same) meaning, namely 'Scotti.' Neither the Picts nor the Scotti probably owned these names, the former of which is to be traced to Roman authors, while the latter was probably given the invaders from Ireland by the Brythons, whose country they crossed the sea to ravage. The Scots, however, did recognize a national name, which described them as painted or tattooed men. . . . This word was Cruithnig, which is found applied equally to the painted people of both islands. . . . The eponymus of all the Picts was Cruithne, or Cruithnechan, and we have a kindred Brythonic form in Prydyn, the name by which Scotland once used to be known to the Kymry."—J. Rhys, *Celtic Britain, ch.* 7.—A different view of the origin and signification of these names is maintained by Dr. Guest.—E. Guest, *Origines Celticae, v.* 2, *pt.* 1, *ch.* 1.—Prof. Freeman looks upon the question as unsettled. He says: "The proper Scots, as no one denies, were a Gaelic colony from Ireland. The only question is as to the Picts or Caledonians. Were they another Gaelic tribe, the vestige of a Gaelic occupation of the island earlier than the British occupation, or were they simply Britons who had never been brought under the Roman dominion? The geographical aspect of the case favours the former belief, but the weight of philological evidence seems to be on the side of the latter."—E. A. Freeman, *Hist. of the Norman Conq. of Eng., ch.* 2, *sect.* 1, *foot-note.*

Also in: W. F. Skene, *Celtic Scotland, bk.* 1, *ch.* 5

A. D. 78-84.—Roman conquests under Agricola. See Britain: A. D. 78–84.

A. D. 208-211.—Campaigns of Severus against the Caledonians. See Britain: A. D. 208–211.

A. D. 367-370.—The repulse of the Picts and Scots by Theodosius. See Britain: A. D. 367–370.

6th Century.—The Mission of St. Columba. See Columban Church.

6-7th Centuries.—Part included in the English Kingdom of Northumberland. See England: A. D. 547–633.

7th Century.—The Four Kingdoms.—"Out of these Celtic and Teutonic races [Picts, Scots, Britons of Strathclyde, and Angles] there emerged in that northern part of Britain which eventually became the territory of the subsequent monarchy of Scotland, four kingdoms within definite limits and under settled forms of government; and as such we find them in the beginning of the 7th century, when the conflict among these races, which succeeded the departure of the Romans from the island, and the termination of their power in Britain, may be held to have ceased and the limits of these kingdoms to have become settled. North of the Firths of Forth and Clyde were the two kingdoms of the Scots of Dalriada on the west and of the Picts on the east. They were separated from each other by a range of mountains termed by Adamnan the Dorsal ridge of Britain, and generally known by the name of Drumalban. . . . The colony [of Dalriada] was originally founded by Fergus Mor, son of Erc, who came with his two brothers Loarn and Angus from Irish Dalriada in the end of the 5th century [see Dalriada], but the true founder of the Dalriadic kingdom was his great grandson Aedan, son of Gabran. . . . The remaining districts north of the Firths of Forth and Clyde formed the kingdom of the Picts. . . . The districts south of the Firths of Forth and Clyde, and extending to the Solway Firth on the west and to the Tyne on the east, were possessed by the two kingdoms of the Britons [afterwards Strathclyde], on the west and of the Angles of Bernicia on the east. The former extended from the river Derwent in Cumberland in the south to the Firth of Clyde in the north, which separated the Britons from the Scots of Dalriada. . . . The Angles of Bernicia . . . were now in firm possession of the districts extending along the east coast as far as the Firth of Forth, originally occupied by the British tribe of the Ottadeni and afterwards by the Picts, and including the counties of Berwick and Roxburgh and that of East Lothian or Haddington, the rivers Esk and Gala forming here their western boundary. . . . In the centre of Scotland, where it is intersected by the two arms of the sea, the Forth and the Clyde, and where the boundaries of these four kingdoms approach one another, is a territory extending from the Esk to the Tay, which possessed a very mixed population and was the scene of most of the conflicts between these four states." About the middle of the 7th century, Osuiu or Oswiu, king of Northumberland (which then included Bernicia), having overcome the Mercians, "extended his sway not only over the Britons but over the Picts and Scots; and thus commenced the dominion of the Angles over the Britons of Alclyde, the Scots of Dalriada, and the southern Picts, which was destined to last for thirty years. . . . In the meantime the little kingdom of Dalriada was in a state of complete disorganisation. We find no record of any real king over the whole nation of the Scots, but each separate tribe seems to have remained isolated from the rest under its own chief, while the Britons exercised a kind of sway over them, and along with the Britons they were under subjection to the Angles." In 685, on an attempt

being made to throw off the yoke of the Angles of Northumbria, King Ecgfrid or Ecgfrith, son of Oswiu, led an army into the country of the Picts and was there defeated crushingly and slain in a conflict styled variously the battle of Dunnichen, Duin Nechtain, and Nechtan's Mere. The effect of the defeat is thus described by Bede: "'From that time the hopes and strength of the Anglic kingdom began to fluctuate and to retrograde, for the Picts recovered the territory belonging to them which the Angles had held, and the Scots who were in Britain and a certain part of the Britons regained their liberty, which they have now enjoyed for about forty-six years.'"—W. F. Skene, *Celtic Scotland, bk.* 1, *ch.* 5 (*v.* 1).

8-9th Centuries.—The kingdom of Scone and the kingdom of Alban.—"The Pictish kingdom had risen fast to greatness after the victory of Nectansmere in 685. In the century which followed Ecgfrith's defeat, its kings reduced the Scots of Dalriada from nominal dependence to actual subjection, the annexation of Angus and Fife carried their eastern border to the sea, while to the south their alliance with the Northumbrians in the warfare which both waged on the Welsh extended their bounds on the side of Cumbria or Strath-Clyde. But the hour of Pictish greatness was marked by the extinction of the Pictish name. In the midst of the 9th century the direct line of their royal house came to an end, and the under-king of the Scots of Dalriada, Kenneth Mac Alpin, ascended the Pictish throne in right of his maternal descent. For fifty years more Kenneth and his successors remained kings of the Picts. At the moment we have reached, however [the close of the 9th century], the title passed suddenly away, the tribe which had given its chief to the throne gave its name to the realm, and 'Pict-land' disappeared from history to make room first for Alban or Albania, and then for 'the land of the Scots.'"—J. R. Green, *The Conquest of England, ch.* 4.—It appears however that, before the kingdom of Alban was known, there was a period during which the realm established by the successors of Kenneth Mac Alpin, the Scot, occupying the throne of the Picts, was called the kingdom of Scone, from the town which became its capital. "It was at Scone too that the Coronation Stone was 'reverently kept for the consecration of the kings of Alban,' and of this stone it was believed that 'no king was ever wont to reign in Scotland unless he had first, on receiving the royal name, sat upon this stone at Scone.' . . . Of its identity with the stone now preserved in the coronation chair at Westminster there can be no doubt. It is an oblong block of red sandstone, some 26 inches long by 16 inches broad, and 10½ inches deep. . . . Its mythic origin identifies it with the stone which Jacob used as a pillow at Bethel, . . . but history knows of it only at Scone." Some time near the close of the 9th century "the kingdom ceased to be called that of Scone and its territory Cruithentuath, or Pictavia its Latin equivalent, and now became known as the kingdom of Alban or Albania, and we find its kings no longer called kings of the Picts but kings of Alban."—W. F. Skene, *Celtic Scotland, bk.* 1, *ch.* 6–7 (*v.* 1).

9th Century.—The Northmen on the coasts and in the Islands. See NORMANS.—NORTHMEN: 8–9TH CENTURIES.

10-11th Centuries.—The forming of the modern kingdom and its relations to England.—"The fact that the West-Saxon or English Kings, from Eadward the Elder [son of Alfred the Great] onwards, did exercise an external supremacy over the Celtic princes of the island is a fact too clear to be misunderstood by any one who looks the evidence on the matter fairly in the face. I date their supremacy over Scotland from the reign of Eadward the Elder, because there is no certain earlier instance of submission on the part of the Scots to any West-Saxon King. . . . The submission of Wales [A. D. 828] dates from the time of Ecgberht; but it evidently received a more distinct and formal acknowledgement [A. D. 922] in the reign of Eadward. Two years after followed the Commendation of Scotland and Strathclyde. . . . I use the feudal word Commendation, because that word seems to me better than any other to express the real state of the case. The transaction between Eadward and the Celtic princes was simply an application, on an international scale, of the general principle of the Comitatus. . . . A man 'chose his Lord'; he sought some one more powerful than himself, with whom he entered into the relation of Comitatus; as feudal ideas strengthened, he commonly surrendered his allodial land to the Lord so chosen, and received it back again from him on a feudal tenure. This was the process of Commendation, a process of everyday occurrence in the case of private men choosing their Lords, whether those Lords were simple gentlemen or Kings. And the process was equally familiar among sovereign princes themselves. . . . There was nothing unusual or degrading in the relation; if Scotland, Wales, Strathclyde, commended themselves to the West-Saxon King, they only put themselves in the same relation to their powerful neighbour in which every continental prince stood in theory, and most of them in actual fact, to the Emperor, Lord of the World. . . . The original Commendation to the Eadward of the tenth century, confirmed by a series of acts of submission spread over the whole of the intermediate time, is the true justification for the acts of his glorious namesake [Edward I.] in the thirteenth century. The only difference was that, during that time, feudal notions had greatly developed on both sides; the original Commendation of the Scottish King and people to a Lord had changed, in the ideas of both sides, into a feudal tenure of the land of the Scottish Kingdom. But this change was simply the universal change which had come over all such relations everywhere. . . . But it is here needful to point out two other distinct events which have often been confounded with the Commendation of Scotland, a confusion through which the real state of the case has often been misunderstood. . . . It is hard to make people understand that there have not always been Kingdoms of England and Scotland, with the Tweed and the Cheviot Hills as the boundaries between them. It must be borne in mind that in the tenth century no such boundaries existed, and that the names of England and Scotland were only just beginning to be known. At the time of the Commendation the country which is now called Scotland was divided among three quite distinct sovereignties. North of the Forth and Clyde reigned the King of Scots, an independent Celtic prince reigning over a Celtic people, the

Picts and Scots, the exact relation between which two tribes is a matter of perfect indifference to my present purpose. South of the two great firths the Scottish name and the Scottish dominion were unknown. The south-west part of modern Scotland formed part of the Kingdom of the Strathclyde Welsh, which up to 924 was, like the Kingdom of the Scots, an independent Celtic principality. The south-eastern part of modern Scotland, Lothian in the wide sense of the word, was purely English or Danish, as in language it remains to this day. It was part of the Kingdom of Northumberland, and it had its share in all the revolutions of that Kingdom. In the year 924 Lothian was ruled by the Danish Kings of Northumberland, subject only to that precarious superiority on the part of Wessex which had been handed on from Ecgberht and Ælfred. In the year 924, when the three Kingdoms, Scotland, Strathclyde and Northumberland, all commended themselves to Eadward, the relation was something new on the part of Scotland and Strathclyde; but on the part of Lothian, as an integral part of Northumberland, it was only a renewal of the relation which had been formerly entered into with Ecgberht and Ælfred. . . . The transactions which brought Scotland, Strathclyde, and Lothian into their relations to one another and to the English Crown were quite distinct from each other. They were as follows:—First, the Commendation of the King and people of the Scots to Eadward in 924. Secondly, the grant of Cumberland by Eadmund to Malcolm in 945. . . . In 945 the reigning King [of Cumberland, or Strathclyde] revolted against his over-lord Eadmund; he was overthrown and his Kingdom ravaged; it was then granted on tenure of military service to his kinsman Malcolm King of Scots. . . . The southern part of this territory was afterwards . . . annexed to England; the northern part was retained by the Scottish Kings, and was gradually, though very gradually, incorporated with their own Kingdom. The distinction between the two states seems to have been quite forgotten in the 13th century." The third transaction was "the grant of Lothian to the Scottish kings, either under Eadgar or under Cnut. . . . The date of the grant of Lothian is not perfectly clear. But whatever was the date of the grant, there can be no doubt at all as to its nature. Lothian, an integral part of England, could be granted only as any other part of England could be granted, namely to be held as part of England, its ruler being in the position of an English Earl. . . . But in such a grant the seeds of separation were sown. A part of the Kingdom which was governed by a foreign sovereign, on whatever terms of dependence, could not long remain in the position of a province governed by an ordinary Earl. . . . That the possession of Lothian would under all ordinary circumstances remain hereditary, must have been looked for from the beginning. This alone would distinguish Lothian from all other Earldoms. . . . It was then to be expected that Lothian, when once granted to the King of Scots, should gradually be merged in the Kingdom of Scotland. But the peculiar and singular destiny of this country could hardly have been looked for. Neither Eadgar nor Kenneth could dream that this purely English or Danish province would become the historical Scotland. The different tenures of Scotland and Lothian got confounded; the Kings of Scots, from the end of the eleventh century, became English in manners and language; they were not without some pretensions to the Crown of England, and not without some hopes of winning it. They thus learned to attach more and more value to the English part of their dominions, and they laboured to spread its language and manners over their original Celtic territory. They retained their ancient title of Kings of Scots, but they became in truth Kings of English Lothian and of Anglicized Fife. A state was thus formed, politically distinct from England, and which political circumstances gradually made bitterly hostile to England, a state which indeed retained a dark and mysterious Celtic background, but which, as it appears in history, is English in laws, language and manners, more truly English indeed, in many respects, than England itself remained after the Norman Conquest."—E. A. Freeman, *Hist. of the Norman Conquest of Eng., ch.* 3, *sect.* 4.

A. D. 1005-1034.—The kingdom acquires its final name.—"The mixed population of Picts and Scots had now become to a great extent amalgamated, and under the influence of the dominant race of the Scots were identified with them in name. Their power was now to be further consolidated, and their influence extended during the thirty years' reign of a king who proved to be the last of his race, and who was to bequeath the kingdom, under the name of Scotia, to a new line of kings. This was Malcolm, the son of Kenneth, who slew his predecessor, Kenneth, the son of Dubh, at Monzievaird. . . . With Malcolm the descendants of Kenneth mac Alpin, the founder of the Scottish dynasty, became extinct in the male line."—W. F. Skene, *Celtic Scotland, bk.* 1, *ch.* 8.

A. D. 1039-1054.—The reign of Macbeth or Macbeda.—Malcolm was succeeded by his daughter's son, Duncan. "There is little noticeable in his [Duncan's] life but its conclusion. He had made vain efforts to extend his frontiers southward through Northumberland, and was engaged in a war with the holders of the northern independent states at his death in the year 1039. . . . He was slain in 'Bothgowan,' which is held to be Gaelic for 'a smith's hut.' The person who slew him, whether with his own hand or not, was Macbeda, the Maarmor of Ross, or of Ross and Moray; the ruler, in short, of the district stretching from the Moray Frith and Loch Ness northwards. The place where the smith's hut stood is said to have been near Elgin. This has not been very distinctly established; but at all events it was near if not actually within the territory ruled by Macbeda, and Duncan was there with aggressive designs. The maarmor's wife was Gruach, a granddaughter of Kenneth IV. If there was a grandson of Kenneth killed by Malcolm, this was his sister. But whether or not she had this inheritance of revenge, she was, according to the Scots authorities, the representative of the Kenneth whom the grandfather of Duncan had deprived of his throne and his life. . . . The deeds which raised Macbeda and his wife to power were not to appearance much worse than others of their day done for similar ends. However he may have gained his power, he exercised it with good repute, according to the reports nearest to his time. It is among the

most curious of the antagonisms that sometimes separate the popular opinion of people of mark from anything positively known about them, that this man, in a manner sacred to splendid infamy, is the first whose name appears in the ecclesiastical records both as a king of Scotland and a benefactor of the Church; and is also the first who, as king of Scotland, is said by the chroniclers to have offered his services to the Bishop of Rome. The ecclesiastical records of St. Andrews tell how he and his queen made over certain lands to the Culdees of Lochleven, and there is no such fact on record of any earlier king of Scotland. Of his connection with Rome, it is a question whether he went there himself. . . . That he sent money there, however, was so very notorious as not only to be recorded by the insular authorities, but to be noticed on the Continent as a significant event. . . . The reign of this Macbeda or Macbeth forms a noticeable period in our history. He had a wider dominion than any previous ruler, having command over all the country now known as Scotland, except the Isles and a portion of the Western Highlands. . . . With him, too, ended that mixed or alternative regal succession which, whether it was systematic or followed the law of force, is exceedingly troublesome to the inquirer. . . . From Macbeth downwards . . . the rule of hereditary succession holds, at all events to the extent that a son, where there is one, succeeds to his father. Hence this reign is a sort of turning-point in the constitutional history of the Scottish crown."—J. H. Burton, *Hist. of Scotland, v.* 1, *ch.* 10.

A. D. 1066-1093. — Effects of the Norman Conquest of England. — Civilization and growth of the Northern Kingdom. — Reign of Malcolm III.— "The Norman Conquest of England produced a great effect upon their neighbours. In the first place, a very great number of the Saxons who fled from the cruelty of William the Conqueror, retired into Scotland, and this had a considerable effect in civilizing the southern parts of that country; for if the Saxons were inferior to the Normans in arts and in learning, they were, on the other hand, much superior to the Scots, who were a rude and very ignorant people. These exiles were headed and accompanied by what remained of the Saxon royal family, and particularly by a young prince named Edgar Etheling, who was a near kinsman of Edward the Confessor, and the heir of his throne, but dispossessed by the Norman Conqueror. This prince brought with him to Scotland two sisters, named Margaret and Christian. They were received with much kindness by Malcolm III., called Canmore [Ceanmore] (or Great Head), who remembered the assistance which he had received from Edward the Confessor. . . . He himself married the Princess Margaret (1068), and made her the Queen of Scotland. . . . When Malcolm, King of Scotland, was thus connected with the Saxon royal family of England, he began to think of chasing away the Normans, and of restoring Edgar Etheling to the English throne. This was an enterprise for which he had not sufficient strength; but he made deep and bloody inroads into the northern parts of England, and brought away so many captives, that they were to be found for many years afterwards in every Scottish village, nay, in every Scottish hovel. No doubt, the number of Saxons thus introduced into Scotland tended much to improve and civilize the manners of the people. . . . Not only the Saxons, but afterwards a number of the Normans themselves, came to settle in Scotland, . . . and were welcomed by King Malcolm. He was desirous to retain these brave men in his service, and for that purpose he gave them great grants of land, to be held for military services; and most of the Scottish nobility are of Norman descent. And thus the Feudal System was introduced into Scotland as well as England, and went on gradually gaining strength, till it became the general law of the country, as indeed it was that of Europe at large. Malcolm Canmore, thus increasing in power, and obtaining re-enforcements of warlike and civilized subjects, began greatly to enlarge his dominions. At first he had resided almost entirely in the province of Fife, and at the town of Dunfermline, where there are still the ruins of a small tower which served him for a palace. But as he found his power increase, he ventured across the Frith of Forth, and took possession of Edinburgh and the surrounding country, which had hitherto been accounted part of England. The great strength of the castle of Edinburgh, situated upon a lofty rock, led him to choose that town frequently for his residence, so that in time it became the metropolis, or chief city of Scotland. This king Malcolm was a brave and wise prince, though without education. He often made war upon King William the Conqueror of England, and upon his son and successor, William, who, from his complexion, was called William Rufus, that is, Red William. Malcolm was sometimes beaten in these wars, but he was more frequently successful; and not only made a complete conquest of Lothian, but threatened also to possess himself of the great English province of Northumberland, which he frequently invaded." Malcolm Canmore was killed in battle at Alnwick Castle (1093), during one of his invasions of English territory. — Sir W. Scott, *Tales of a Grandfather (Scotland); abridged by E. Ginn, ch.* 4.

Also in: J. H. Burton, *Hist. of Scotland, v.* 1, *ch.* 11.

A. D. 1093-1153.—Successors of Malcolm III.—The reign of David I.—His civilizing work and influence.— "Six sons and two daughters were the offspring of the marriage between Malcolm and Margaret. Edward, the eldest, perished with his father, and Ethelred, created Abbot of Dunkeld and Earl of Fife, appears to have survived his parents for a very short time: Edmund died in an English cloister, a penitent and mysterious recluse; Edgar, Alexander, and David, lived to wear, in succession, the crown of Scotland. Of the two daughters, Editha . . . became the queen of Henry of England. . . . Three parties may be said to have divided Scotland at the period of Malcolm's death." One of these parties, inspired with jealousy of the English influence which had come into the kingdom with queen Margaret, succeeded in raising Donald Bane, a brother of the late king Malcolm, to the throne. Donald was soon displaced by Edmund, who is sometimes said to have been an illegitimate son of Malcolm; and in 1097 Edmund was dethroned by Edgar, the son of Malcolm and Margaret. Edgar, dying in 1107, was succeeded by Alexander I., and he, in 1124, by David I. The reign of David was contemporary

with the dark and troubled time of Stephen in England, and he took an unfortunate part in the struggle between Stephen and the Empress Matilda, suffering a dreadful defeat in the famous Battle of the Standard (see STANDARD, BATTLE OF). But "the whole of the north of England beyond the Tees" was "for several years . . . under the influence, if not under the direct authority, of the Scottish king, and the comparative prosperity of this part of the kingdom, contrasting strongly with the anarchy prevailing in every other quarter, naturally inclined the population of the northern counties to look with favour upon a continuance of the Scottish connection. . . . Pursuing the policy inaugurated by his mother [the English princess Margaret] . . . , he encouraged the resort of foreign merchants to the ports of Scotland, insuring to native traders the same advantages which they had enjoyed during the reign of his father; whilst he familiarized his Gaelic nobles, in their attendance upon the royal court, with habits of luxury and magnificence, remitting three years' rent and tribute — according to the account of his contemporary Malmesbury — to all his people who were willing to improve their dwellings, to dress with greater elegance, and to adopt increased refinement in their general manner of living. Even in the occupations of his leisure moments he seems to have wished to exercise a softening influence over his countrymen, for, like many men of his character, he was fond of gardening, and he delighted in indoctrinating his people in the peaceful arts of horticulture, and in the mysteries of planting and of grafting. For similar reasons he sedulously promoted the improvement of agriculture, or rather, perhaps, directed increased attention to it; for the Scots of that period were still a pastoral, and, in some respects, a migratory people. . . . David hoped to convert the lower orders into a more settled and industrious population; whilst he enjoined the higher classes to 'live like noblemen' upon their own estates, and not to waste the property of their neighbours. . . . In consequence of these measures feudal castles began, ere long, to replace the earlier buildings of wood and wattles rudely fortified by earthworks; and towns rapidly grew up around the royal castles and about the principal localities of commerce. . . . The prosperity of the country during the last fifteen years of his reign [he died in 1153] contrasted strongly with the miseries of England under the disastrous rule of Stephen; Scotland became the granary from which her neighbour's wants were supplied; and to the court of Scotland's king resorted the knights and nobles of foreign origin, whom the commotions of the Continent had hitherto driven to take refuge in England."—E. W. Robertson, *Scotland under her Early Kings, v.* 1, *ch.* 6–8.

A. D. 1153.—Accession of Malcolm IV.

A. D. 1165. — Accession of William IV. (called The Lion).

A. D. 1174-1189.—Captivity of William the Lion, his oath of fealty to the English king, and his release from it.— In 1174, on the occasion of a general conspiracy of rebellion against Henry II., contrived at Paris, headed by his wife and sons, and joined by great numbers of the nobles throughout his dominions, both in England and in France, William the Lion, king of Scotland, was induced to assist the rebellion by the promise of Northumberland for himself. Henry was in France until July, 1174, when he was warned that "only his own presence could retrieve England, where a Scotch army was pouring in from the north, while David of Huntingdon headed an army in the midland counties, and the young prince was preparing to bring over fresh forces from Gravelines. Henry crossed the channel in a storm, and, by advice of a Norman bishop, proceeded at once to do penance at Becket's shrine. On the day of his humiliation, the Scotch king, William the Lion, was surprised at Alnwick and captured. This, in fact, ended the war, for David of Huntingdon was forced to return into Scotland, where the old feud of Gael and Saxon had broken out. The English rebels purchased peace by a prompt submission. In less than a month Henry was able to leave England to itself." The king of Scotland was taken as a prisoner to Falaise, in Normandy, where he was detained for several months. "By advice of a deputation of Scotch prelates and barons he at last consented to swear fealty to Henry as his liege lord, and to do provisional homage for his son. His chief vassals guaranteed this engagement; hostages were given; and English garrisons received into three Scotch towns, Roxburgh, Berwick, and Edinburgh. Next year [1175] the treaty was solemnly ratified at York."— C. H. Pearson, *Hist. of Eng. during the Early and Middle Ages, v.* 1, *ch.* 31.— This engagement of fealty on the part of William the Lion is often referred to as the Treaty of Falaise. Fourteen years afterwards, when Henry's son, Richard, Cœur de Lion, had succeeded to the throne, the Scotch king was absolved from it. "Early in December [1189], while Richard was at Canterbury on his way to the sea [preparing to embark upon his crusade], William the Lion came to visit him, and a bargain was struck to the satisfaction of both parties. Richard received from William a sum of 10,000 marks, and his homage for his English estates, as they had been held by his brother Malcolm; in return, he restored to him the castles of Roxburgh and Berwick, and released him and his heirs for ever from the homage for Scotland itself, enforced by Henry in 1175."— K. Norgate, *England under the Angevin Kings, v.* 2, *ch.* 7.

ALSO IN: W. Burns, *Scottish War of Independence, v.* 1, *ch.* 12.

A. D. 1214.—Accession of Alexander II.

A. D. 1249.—Accession of Alexander III.

A. D. 1263.—The Norwegian invasion and the Battle of Largs.—"The western Highlands and Islands formed the original territory of the Scots. But we have seen how the Norwegians and Danes, seizing Shetland and Orkney, spread themselves over the western Archipelago, even as far south as Man, thereby putting an end, for 300 years, to the intercommunication between the mainlands of Scotland and Ireland. These islands long formed a sort of maritime community, sometimes under the active authority of the kings of Norway, sometimes connected with the Norwegian settlers in Ireland — Ostmen, as they were called; sometimes partially ruled by kings of Man, but more generally subject to chieftains more or less powerful, who, when opportunity offered, made encroachments even on the mainland. . . . Alexander II. seems to have determined to bring this sort of interregnum to

a close, and he was engaged in an expedition for that purpose when he died at the little island of Kerrera, near Oban. His son, as he advanced to manhood, appears to have revived the idea of completely re-annexing the Islands. Complaints were made by the islanders to Haco, king of Norway, of aggressions by the earl of Ross and other mainland magnates, in the interest of the king of Scots; and Haco, who was at once a powerful and a despotic monarch, resolved to vindicate his claims as suzerain of the isles. . . . Haco accordingly fitted out a splendid fleet, consisting of 100 vessels, mostly of large size, fully equipped, and crowded with gallant soldiers and seamen. . . . On the 10th of July, 1263, 'the mightiest armament that ever left the shores of Norway sailed from the haven of Herlover.' . . . The island chieftains, Magnus of the Orkneys, Magnus, king of Man, Dougal MacRoderic, and others, met the triumphant fleet, swelling its numbers as it advanced amongst the islands. Most of the chiefs made their peace with Haco; though there were exceptions. . . . The invading fleet entered the Clyde, numbering by this time as many as 160 ships. A squadron of 60 sail proceeded up Loch-long; the crews drew their boats across the narrow isthmus at Tarbet, launched on Loch-lomond, and spread their ravages, by fire and sword, over the Lennox and Stirlingshire. . . . The alarm spread over the surrounding country, and gradually a Scottish army began to gather on the Ayrshire side of the firth. . . . Whether voluntarily, or from stress of weather, some portion of the Norwegians made a landing near Largs, on the Ayrshire coast, opposite to Bute. These being attacked by the Scots, reinforcements were landed, and a fierce but desultory struggle was kept up, with varying success, from morning till night. Many of the ships were driven ashore. Most of the Norwegians who had landed were slain. The remainder of the fleet was seriously damaged. . . . Retracing its course among the islands, on the 29th of October it reached Kirkwall in Orkney, where king Haco expired on 15th December. Such was the result of an expedition which had set out with such fair promises of success."—W. Burns, *The Scottish War of Independence, ch.* 13 (*v.* 1).—"In the Norse annals our famous Battle of Largs makes small figure, or almost none at all, among Hakon's battles and feats. . . . Of Largs there is no mention whatever in Norse books. But beyond any doubt, such is the other evidence, Hakon did land there; land and fight, not conquering, probably rather beaten; and very certainly 'retiring to his ships,' as in either case he behooved to do! It is further certain he was dreadfully maltreated by the weather on those wild coasts; and altogether credible, as the Scotch records bear, that he was so at Largs very specially. The Norse Records or Sagas say merely he lost many of his ships by the tempests, and many of his men by land fighting in various parts, — tacitly including Largs, no doubt, which was the last of these misfortunes to him. . . . To this day, on a little plain to the south of the village, now town, of Largs, in Ayrshire, there are seen stone cairns and monumental heaps, and, until within a century ago, one huge, solitary, upright stone; still mutely testifying to a battle there — altogether clearly to this battle of King Hakon's; who by the Norse records, too, was in these neighbourhoods at that same date, and evidently in an aggressive, high kind of humour."—T. Carlyle, *Early Kings of Norway, ch.* 15.

Also in: J. H. Burton, *Hist. of Scotland, ch.* 15 (*v.* 2).—See, also, Normans.—Northmen: 8–9th Centuries, and 10–13th Centuries.

A. D. 1266.—Acquisition of the Western Islands.—Three years after the battle of Largs, "in 1266, Magnus IV., the new King [of Norway], by formal treaty ceded to the King of Scots Man and all the Western Isles, specially reserving Orkney and Shetland to the crown of Norway. On the other hand, the King of Scots agreed to pay down a ransom for them of a thousand marks, and an annual rent of a hundred marks."—J. H. Burton, *Hist. of Scotland, ch.* 15 (*v.* 2).

A. D. 1286.—Accession of Queen Margaret (called The Maid of Norway) who died on her way to Scotland in 1290.

A. D. 1290-1305.—Death of the Maid of Norway.—Reign of John Balliol.—English conquest by Edward I.—Exploits of Wallace.—Alexander III. of Scotland, dying in 1286, left only an infant granddaughter to inherit his crown. This was the child of his daughter Margaret, married to the king of Norway and dead after her first confinement. The baby queen, known in Scottish history as the Maid of Norway, was betrothed in her sixth year to Prince Edward of England, son of Edward I., and all looked promising for an early union of the Scottish and English crowns. "But this project was abruptly frustrated by the child's death on her voyage to Scotland, and with the rise of claimant after claimant of the vacant throne Edward was drawn into far other relations to the Scottish realm. Of the thirteen pretenders to the throne of Scotland, only three could be regarded as serious claimants. By the extinction of the line of William the Lion, the right of succession passed to the daughters of his brother David. The claim of John Balliol, Lord of Galloway, rested on his descent from the eldest of these; that of Robert Bruce, Lord of Annandale, on his descent from the second; that of John Hastings, Lord of Abergavenny, on his descent from the third. . . . All the rights of a feudal suzerain were at once assumed by the English King; he entered into the possession of the country as into that of a disputed fief to be held by its overlord till the dispute was settled. . . . Scotland was thus reduced to the subjection which she had experienced under Henry II. . . . The commissioners whom he named to report on the claims to the throne were mainly Scotch; a proposal for the partition of the realm among the claimants was rejected as contrary to Scotch law, and the claim of Balliol as representative of the elder branch was finally preferred to that of his rivals. The castles were at once delivered to the new monarch, and Balliol did homage to Edward with full acknowledgment of the services due to him from the realm of Scotland. For a time there was peace." But, presently, Edward made claims upon the Scotch nobles for service in his foreign wars which were resented and disregarded. He also asserted for his courts a right of hearing appeals from the Scottish tribunals, which was angrily denied. Barons and people were provoked to a hostility that forced Balliol to challenge war. He obtained from the pope absolution from his oath of fealty and he entered

into a secret alliance with the king of France. In the spring of 1296 Edward invaded Scotland, carried Berwick by storm, slaughtered 8,000 of its citizens, defeated the Scots with great slaughter at Dunbar, occupied Edinburgh, Stirling and Perth, and received, in July, the surrender of Balliol, who was sent to imprisonment in the Tower of London. "No further punishment, however, was exacted from the prostrate realm. Edward simply treated it as a fief, and declared its forfeiture to be the legal consequence of Balliol's treason. It lapsed in fact to the overlord, and its earls, barons and gentry swore homage in Parliament at Berwick to Edward as their king. . . . The government of the new dependency was intrusted to Warenne, Earl of Surrey, at the head of an English Council of Regency. . . . The disgraceful submission of their leaders brought the people themselves to the front. . . . The genius of an outlaw knight, William Wallace, saw in their smouldering discontent a hope of freedom for his country, and his daring raids on outlying parties of the English soldiery roused the country at last into revolt. Of Wallace himself, of his life or temper, we know little or nothing; the very traditions of his gigantic stature and enormous strength are dim and unhistorical. But the instinct of the Scotch people has guided it aright in choosing Wallace for its national hero. He . . . called the people itself to arms." At Stirling, in September, 1297, Wallace caught the English army in the midst of its passage of the Forth, cut half of it in pieces and put the remainder to flight. At Falkirk, in the following July, Edward avenged himself upon the forces of Wallace with terrible slaughter, and the Scottish leader narrowly escaped. In the struggle which the Scots still maintained for several years, he seems to have borne no longer a prominent part. But when they submitted, in 1303, Wallace refused Edward's offered amnesty; he was afterwards captured, sent to London for trial, and executed, his head being placed on London Bridge, according to the barbarous custom of the time.—J. R. Green, *Short Hist. of the English People, ch.* 4, *sect.* 3.

Also in: J. H. Burton, *Hist. of Scotland, ch.* 15 *and* 18–22.—C. H. Pearson, *Hist. of Eng. during the Early and Middle Ages, v.* 2, *ch.* 12–13.

A. D. 1305-1307.—The rising under Robert Bruce.—After the submission of Scotland in 1303, King Edward of England "set to work to complete the union of the two kingdoms. In the meantime Scotland was to be governed by a Lieutenant aided by a council of barons and churchmen. It was to be represented in the English parliament by ten deputies, — four churchmen, four barons, and two members of the commons, one for the country north of the Firths, one for the south. These members attended one parliament at Westminster, and an ordinance was issued for the government of Scotland. . . . But the great difficulty in dealing with the Scots was that they never knew when they were conquered, and, just when Edward hoped that his scheme for union was carried out, they rose in arms once more. The leader this time was Robert Bruce, Lord of Annandale, Earl of Carrick in right of his mother, and the grandson and heir of the rival of Balliol. He had joined Wallace, but had again sworn fealty to Edward at the Convention of Irvine, and had since then received many favours from the English king. Bruce signed a bond with William Lamberton, Bishop of St. Andrews, who had also been one of Wallace's supporters. In this bond each party swore to stand by the other in all his undertakings, no matter what, and not to act without the knowledge of the other. . . . This bond became known to Edward; and Bruce, afraid of his anger, fled from London to Dumfries. There in the Church of the Grey Friars he had an interview with John Comyn of Badenoch, called the Red Comyn, who, after Balliol and his sons, was the next heir to the throne. . . . What passed between them cannot be certainly known, as they met alone"— but Comyn was slain. "By this murder and sacrilege Bruce put himself at once out of the pale of the law and of the Church, but by it he became the nearest heir to the crown, after the Balliols. This gave him a great hold on the people, whose faith in the virtue of hereditary succession was strong, and on whom the English yoke weighed heavily. On March 27, 1306, Bruce was crowned [at Scone] with as near an imitation of the old ceremonies as could be compassed on such short notice. The actual crowning was done by Isabella, Countess of Buchan, who, though her husband was a Comyn, and, as such, a sworn foe of Bruce, came secretly to uphold the right of her own family, the Macduffs, to place the crown on the head of the King of Scots. Edward determined this time to put down the Scots with rigour. . . . All who had taken any part in the murder of the Red Comyn were denounced as traitors, and death was to be the fate of all persons taken in arms. Bruce was excommunicated by a special bull from the Pope. The Countess of Buchan was confined in a room, made like a cage, in one of the towers of Berwick Castle. One of King Robert's sisters was condemned to a like punishment. His brother Nigel, his brother-in-law Christopher Seaton, and three other nobles were taken prisoners, and were put to death as traitors. . . . Edward this time made greater preparations than ever. All classes of his subjects from all parts of his dominions were invited to join the army, and he exhorted his son, Edward Prince of Wales, and 300 newly-created knights, to win their spurs worthily in the reduction of contumacious Scotland. It was well for Scotland that he did not live to carry out his vows of vengeance. He died at Burgh-on-the-Sands, July 30th. His death proved a turning-point in the history of Scotland, for, though the English still remained in possession of the strongholds, Edward II. took no effective steps to crush the rebels. He only brought the army raised by his father as far as Cumnock in Ayrshire, and retreated without doing anything."— M. MacArthur, *Hist. of Scotland, ch.* 3.

Also in: Sir W. Scott, *Hist. of Scotland, v.* 1, *ch.* 8–9.—W. Burns, *Scottish War of Independence, v.* 2, *ch.* 21–22.

A. D. 1314.—The Battle of Bannockburn.—"It is extremely difficult to give distinctness and chronological sequence to the events in Scotland from 1306 to 1310: the conditions are indeed antagonistic to distinctness. We have a people restless and feverishly excited to efforts for their liberty when opportunity should come, but not yet embodied in open war against their invaders, and therefore doing nothing distinct enough to hold a place in history. . . . The

other prominent feature in the historical conditions was the new-made king [Robert Bruce], . . . a tall strong man, of comely, attractive, and commanding countenance. . . . He is steady and sanguine of temperament; his good spirits and good-humour never fail, and in the midst of misery and peril he can keep up the spirits of his followers by chivalrous stories and pleasant banter. . . . The English were driven out of the strong places one by one — sometimes by the people of the district. We hear of the fall of Edinburgh, Roxburgh, Linlithgow, Perth, Dundee, Rutherglen, and Dumfries. . . . In the beginning of the year 1309 Scotland was so far consolidated as to be getting into a place in European diplomacy. The King of France advised his son-in-law, Edward II., to agree to a soufrance or truce with the Scots. . . . While the negotiations with France went on, countenance still more important was given to the new order of things at home. The clergy in council set forth their adherence to King Robert, with the reasons for it. . . . This was an extremely important matter, for it meant, of course, that the Church would do its best to protect him from all ecclesiastical risk arising from the death of Comyn. . . . A crisis came at last which roused the Government of England to a great effort. After the fortresses had fallen one by one, Stirling Castle still held out. It was besieged by Edward Bruce [brother of Robert] before the end of the year 1313. Mowbray, the governor, stipulated that he would surrender if not relieved before the Feast of St. John the Baptist in the following year, or the 24th of June. The taking of this fortress was an achievement of which King Edward [I.] was prouder than of anything else he had done in the invasions of Scotland. . . . That the crowning acquisition of their mighty king should thus be allowed to pass away, and stamp emphatically the utter loss of the great conquest he had made for the English crown, was a consummation too humiliating for the chivalry of England to endure without an effort. Stirling Castle must be relieved before St. John's Day, and the relieving of Stirling Castle meant a thorough invasion and resubjection of Scotland." On both sides the utmost efforts were made, — the one to relieve the Castle, the other to strengthen its besiegers. "On the 23d of June [1314] the two armies were visible to each other. If the Scots had, as it was said, between 30,000 and 40,000 men, it was a great force for the country at that time to furnish. Looking at the urgency of the measures taken to draw out the feudal array of England, to the presence of the Welsh and Irish, and to a large body of Gascons and other foreigners, it is easy to be believed that the army carried into Scotland might be, as it was said to be, 100,000 in all. The efficient force, however, was in the mounted men, and these were supposed to be about equal in number to the whole Scottish army." The Scots occupied a position of great strength and advantage (on the banks of the Bannock Burn), which they had skilfully improved by honeycombing all the flat ground with hidden pits, to make it impassable for cavalry. The English attacked them at daybreak on the 24th of June, and suffered a most ignominious and awful defeat. "The end was rout, confused and hopeless. The pitted field added to the disasters; for though they avoided it in their advance, many horsemen were pressed into it in the retreat, and floundered among the pitfalls. Through all the history of her great wars before and since, never did England suffer a humiliation deep enough to approach even comparison with this. Besides the inferiority of the victorious army, Bannockburn is exceptional among battles by the utter helplessness of the defeated. There seems to have been no rallying point anywhere. . . . None of the parts of that mighty host could keep together, and the very chaos among the multitudes around seems to have perplexed the orderly army of the Scots. The footsoldiers of the English army seem simply to have dispersed at all points, and the little said of them is painfully suggestive of the poor wanderers having to face the two alternatives — starvation in the wilds, or death at the hands of the peasantry. The cavalry fled right out towards England. . . . Stirling Castle was delivered up in terms of the stipulation."—J. H. Burton, *Hist. of Scotland, v.* 2, *ch.* 23.—"The defeated army . . . left dead upon the field about 30,000 men, including 200 knights and 700 esquires."—W. Burns, *Scottish War of Independence, ch.* 23 (*v.* 2).

Also in: P. F. Tytler, *Hist. of Scotland, v.* 1, *ch.* 3.

A. D. 1314-1328. — After Bannockburn. — The consequences of the battle in different views. — "A very general impression exists, especially among Englishmen, that the defeat at Bannockburn put an end to the attempted subjugation of Scotland. This is a mistake. . . . No doubt the defeat was of so decisive a character as to render the final result all but certain. But it required many others, though of a minor kind, to bring about the conviction described by Mr. Froude [that the Scotch would never stoop to the supremacy inflicted upon Wales]; and it was yet fourteen long years till the treaty of Northampton."— W. Burns, *The Scottish War of Independence, ch.* 24 (*v.* 2).—"No defeat, however crushing, ever proved half so injurious to any country as the victory of Bannockburn did to Scotland. This is the testimony borne by men whose patriotism cannot be called in question. . . . It drove from Scotland the very elements of its growing civilization and its material wealth. The artisans of North Britain were at that time mostly English. These retired or were driven from Scotland, and with them the commercial importance of the Scottish towns was lost. The estates held by Englishmen in Scotland were confiscated, and the wealth which through the hands of these proprietors had found its way from the southern parts of the kingdom and fertilized the more barren soil of the north, at once ceased. The higher and more cultured clergy were English; these retired when the severance of Scotland from England was effected, and with them Scottish scholarship was almost extinguished, and the budding literature of the north disappeared. How calamitous was the period which followed upon Bannockburn may be partially estimated by two significant facts. Of the six princes who had nominal rule in Scotland from the death of Robert III. to James VI., not one died a natural death. Of the ten kings whose names are entered on the roll of Scottish history from the death of Robert Bruce, seven came to the throne whilst minors, and James I. was detained in England for nineteen years. The country during these long minorities, and

the time of the captivity of James, was exposed to the strife commonly attendant on minorities. . . . The war commenced by Bruce lingered for almost three centuries, either in the shape of formal warfare proclaimed by heralds and by the ceremonials usually observed at the beginning of national strife, or in the informal but equally destructive hostilities which neighbours indulge in, and which partake of the bitterness of civil war. . . . For three centuries the lands south of the Tweed, and almost as far as the Tyne at its mouth, were exposed to the ceaseless ravages of moss-troopers. . . . For a while men were killed, and women outraged and murdered, and children slain without pity, and houses plundered and then burnt, and cattle swept off the grazing lands between Tweed and Tyne, until none cared, unless they were outlaws, to occupy any part of the country within a night's ride of the borders of Scotland. The sufferers in their turn soon learned to recognize no law save that of might, and avenged their wrongs by inflicting like wrongs upon others; and thus there grew up along the frontiers of either country a savage population, whose occupation was murder and plunder, and whose sole wealth was what they had obtained by violence. . . . The war, indeed, which has been called a war of independence, and fills so large a part of the annals of England and Scotland during the Middle Ages, was successful so far as its main object was concerned, the preservation of power in the hands of 'barbarous chieftains who neither feared the king nor pitied the people'; the war was a miserable failure if we regard the well-being of the people themselves and the progress of the nation."—W. Denton, *England in the Fifteenth Century, pp.* 68–78.—On the other side: "It [the battle of Bannockburn] put an end for ever to all hopes upon the part of England of accomplishing the conquest of her sister country. . . . Nor have the consequences of this victory been partial or confined. Their duration throughout succeeding centuries of Scottish history and Scottish liberty, down to the hour in which this is written, cannot be questioned; and without launching out into any inappropriate field of historical speculation, we have only to think of the most obvious consequences which must have resulted from Scotland becoming a conquered province of England; and if we wish for proof, to fix our eyes on the present condition of Ireland, in order to feel the reality of all that we owe to the victory at Bannockburn, and to the memory of such men as Bruce, Randolph, and Douglas."—P. F. Tytler, *Hist. of Scotland, v.* 1, *ch.* 3.—"It is impossible, even now, after the lapse of more than 570 years, to read any account of that battle—or still more to visit the field—without emotion. For we must remember all the political and social questions which depended on it. For good or for evil, tremendous issues follow on the gain or on the loss of national independence. . . . Where the seeds of a strong national civilisation, of a strong national character, and of intellectual wealth have been deeply sown in any human soil, the preservation of it from conquest, and from invasion, and from foreign rule, is the essential condition of its yielding its due contribution to the progress of the world. Who, then, can compute or reckon up the debt which Scotland owes to the few and gallant men who, inspired by a splendid courage and a noble faith, stood by The Bruce in the War of Independence, and on June 24, 1314, saw the armies of the invader flying down the Carse of Stirling?"—The Duke of Argyll, *Scotland as it was and as it is, v.* 1, *ch.* 2.

A. D. 1326-1603.—The formation of the Scottish Parliament.—"As many causes contributed to bring government earlier to perfection in England than in Scotland; as the rigour of the feudal institutions abated sooner, and its defects were supplied with greater facility in the one kingdom than in the other; England led the way in all these changes, and burgesses and knights of the shire appeared in the parliaments of that nation, before they were heard of in ours. Burgesses were first admitted into the Scottish parliaments by Robert Bruce [A. D. 1326]; and in the preamble to the laws of Robert III. they are ranked among the constituent members of that assembly. The lesser barons were indebted to James I. [A. D. 1427] for a statute exempting them from personal attendance, and permitting them to elect representatives: the exemption was eagerly laid hold on, but the privilege was so little valued that, except one or two instances, it lay neglected during one hundred and sixty years; and James VI. first obliged them to send representatives regularly to parliament. A Scottish parliament, then, consisted anciently of great barons, of ecclesiastics, and a few representatives of boroughs. Nor were these divided, as in England, into two houses, but composed one assembly, in which the lord chancellor presided. . . . The great barons, or lords of parliament, were extremely few; even so late as the beginning of the reign of James VI. they amounted only to 53. The ecclesiastics equalled them in number, and, being devoted implicitly to the crown, . . . rendered all hopes of victory in any struggle desperate. . . . As far back as our records enable us to trace the constitution of our parliaments, we find a committee distinguished by the name of lords of articles. It was their business to prepare and to digest all matters which were to be laid before the parliament. There was rarely any business introduced into parliament but what had passed through the channel of this committee. . . . This committee owed the extraordinary powers vested in it to the military genius of the ancient nobles, too impatient to submit to the drudgery of civil business. . . . The lords of articles, then, not only directed all the proceedings of parliament, but possessed a negative before debate. That committee was chosen and constituted in such a manner as put this valuable privilege entirely in the king's hands. It is extremely probable that our kings once had the sole right of nominating the lords of articles. They came afterwards to be elected by the parliament, and consisted of an equal number out of each estate."—W. Robertson, *Hist. of Scotland, bk.* 1.

A. D. 1328.—The Peace of Northampton.—In 1327 King Edward III. of England collected a splendid army of 60,000 men for his first campaign against the Scots. After several weeks of tiresome marching and countermarching, in vain attempts to bring the agile Scots to an engagement, or to stop the bold ravages of Douglas and Randolph, who led them, the young king abandoned his undertaking in disgust. He next "convoked a parliament at York, in which there appeared a tendency on the part of Eng-

land to concede the main points on which proposals for peace had hitherto failed, by acknowledging the independence of Scotland and the legitimate sovereignty of Bruce." A truce was presently agreed upon, "which it was now determined should be the introduction to a lasting peace. As a necessary preliminary, the English statesmen resolved formally to execute a resignation of all claims of dominion and superiority which had been assumed over the kingdom of Scotland, and agreed that all muniments or public instruments asserting or tending to support such a claim should be delivered up. This agreement was subscribed by the king on the 4th of March, 1328. Peace was afterwards concluded at Edinburgh the 17th of March, 1328, and ratified at a parliament held at Northampton, the 4th of May, 1328. It was confirmed by a match agreed upon between the princess Joanna, sister to Edward III., and David, son of Robert I., though both were as yet infants. Articles of strict amity were settled betwixt the nations, without prejudice to the effect of the alliance between Scotland and France. . . . It was stipulated that all the charters and documents carried from Scotland by Edward I. should be restored, and the king of England was pledged to give his aid in the court of Rome towards the recall of the excommunication awarded against king Robert. Lastly, Scotland was to pay a sum of £20,000 in consideration of these favourable terms. The borders were to be maintained in strict order on both sides, and the fatal coronation-stone was to be restored to Scotland. There was another separate obligation on the Scottish side, which led to most serious consequences in the subsequent reign. The seventh article of the Peace of Northampton provided that certain English barons . . . should be restored to the lands and heritages in Scotland, whereof they had been deprived during the war, by the king of Scots seizing them into his own hand. The execution of this article was deferred by the Scottish king, who was not, it may be conceived, very willing again to introduce English nobles as landholders into Scotland. The English mob, on their part, resisted the removal of the fatal stone from Westminster, where it had been deposited. . . . The deed called Ragman's Roll, being the list of the barons and men of note who subscribed the submission to Edward I. in 1296, was, however, delivered up to the Scots."—Sir W. Scott, *Hist. of Scotland, ch.* 12 (*v.* 1).

Also in: J. Froissart, *Chronicles* (*tr. by Johnes*), *bk.* 1, *ch.* 18.

A. D. 1329.—Accession of David II.

A. D. 1332-1333.—The Disinherited Barons.—Balliol's invasion.—Siege of Berwick and battle of Halidon Hill.—Until his death, in 1329, King Robert Bruce evaded the enforcement of that provision of the Treaty of Northampton which pledged him to restore the forfeited estates of English nobles within the Scottish border. His death left the crown to a child of seven years, his son David, under the regency of Randolph, Earl of Murray, and the regent still procrastinated the restoration of the estates in question. At length, in 1332, the "disinherited barons," as they were called, determined to prosecute their claim by force of arms, and they made common cause with Edward Balliol, son of the ex-king of Scotland, who had been exiled in France. The English king, Edward III. would not openly give countenance to their undertaking, nor permit them to invade Scotland across the English frontier; but he did nothing to prevent their recruiting in the northern counties an army of 3,300 men, which took ship at Ravenspur, in Yorkshire, and landed on the coast of Fifeshire, under Balliol's command. Marching westward, the invaders "finally took up a strong position in the heart of the country, with the river Earn in their front. Just before this crisis, the wise and capable Regent, Randolph, Earl of Murray, had died, and the great Sir James Douglas, having gone with King Robert's heart to offer it at the shrine of the Holy Sepulchre, had perished on his way, in conflict with the Moors of Spain. The regency had devolved upon the Earl of Mar, a man wanting both in energy and in military capacity; but so strong was the national antipathy to Balliol, as representing the idea of English supremacy, that Mar found no difficulty in bringing an army of 40,000 men into the field against him. He drew up over against the enemy on the northern bank of the Earn, on Dupplin Moor, while the Earl of March, with forces scarcely inferior to the Regent's, threatened the flank of the little army of the invaders. Balliol, however, was not wanting in valour or generalship, and there were, as usual, traitors in the Scotch army, one of whom led the English, by a ford which he knew, safe across the river in the darkness of the night. They threw themselves upon the scattered, oversecure, and ill-sentinelled camp of the enemy with such a sudden and furious onslaught, that the huge Scottish army broke up into a panic-stricken and disorganised crowd and were slaughtered like sheep, the number of the slain four times exceeding that of the whole of Balliol's army, which escaped with the loss of thirty men. The invaders now took possession of Perth, which the Earl of March forthwith surrounded, by land and water, and thought to starve into submission; but Balliol's ships broke through the blockade on the Tay, and the besiegers, despairing of success, marched off and disbanded without striking another blow. Scotland having been thus subdued by a handful of men, the nobles one by one came to make their submission. Young King David and his affianced bride were sent over to France for security, and Edward Balliol was crowned King at Scone on September 24, 1332, two months after his disembarkation in Scotland. As Balliol was thus actual (de facto) King of Scotland, Edward could now form an alliance with him without a breach of the treaty; and there seemed to be many arguments in favour of espousing his cause. The young Bruce and his dynasty represented the troublesome spirit of Scottish independence, and were closely allied with France, whose king, as will be seen, lost no opportunity of stimulating and supporting the party of resistance to England. Balliol, on the other hand, admitted in a secret despatch to Edward that the success of the expedition was owing to that King's friendly non-intervention, and the aid of his subjects; offered to hold Scotland 'as his man,' doing him homage for it as an English fief; and, treating the princess Joan's hastily formed union with David as a mere engagement, proposed to marry her himself instead. The King, as always, even on less important issues than the present, con-

sulted his Parliament. . . . Balliol in the meanwhile, having dismissed the greater part of his English auxiliaries, was lying unsuspicious of danger at Annan, when his camp was attacked in the middle of the night by a strong body of cavalry under Murray, son of the wise Regent, and Douglas, brother of the great Sir James. The entrenchments were stormed in the darkness; noble, vassal and retainer were slaughtered before they were able to organise any resistance, and Balliol himself barely escaped with his life across the English border." In the following year, however, Edward restored his helpless vassal, invading Scotland in person, besieging Berwick, and routing and destroying, at Halidon Hill, a Scotch army which came to its relief.—W. Warburton, *Edward III., ch.* 2.

Also in: W. Longman, *Life and Times of Edward III., v.* 1, *ch.* 4.—J. H. Burton, *Hist. of Scotland, v.* 3, *ch.* 25.—See, also, Berwick-upon-Tweed.

A. D. 1333-1370.—The long-continued wars with Edward III.—"Throughout the whole country of Scotland, only four castles and a small tower acknowledged the sovereignty of David Bruce, after the battle of Halidon; and it is wonderful to see how, by their efforts, the patriots soon afterwards changed for the better that unfavourable and seemingly desperate state of things. In the several skirmishes and battles which were fought all over the kingdom, the Scots, knowing the country, and having the good-will of the inhabitants, were generally successful, as also in surprising castles and forts, cutting off convoys of provisions which were going to the English, and destroying scattered parties of the enemy; so that, by a long and incessant course of fighting, the patriots gradually regained what they lost in great battles. . . . You may well imagine that, during those long and terrible wars which were waged, when castles were defended and taken, prisoners made, many battles fought, and numbers of men wounded and slain, the state of the country of Scotland was most miserable. There was no finding refuge or protection in the law. . . . All laws of humanity and charity were transgressed without scruple. People were found starved to death in the woods with their families, while the country was so depopulated and void of cultivation that the wild deer came out of the remote forests, and approached near to cities and the dwellings of men. . . . Notwithstanding the valiant defence maintained by the Scots, their country was reduced to a most disastrous state, by the continued wars of Edward III., who was a wise and warlike King as ever lived. Could he have turned against Scotland the whole power of his kingdom, he might probably have effected the complete conquest, which had been so long attempted in vain. But while the wars in Scotland were at the hottest, Edward became also engaged in hostilities with France, having laid claim to the crown of that kingdom. . . . The Scots sent an embassy to obtain money and assistance from the French; and they received supplies of both, which enabled them to recover their castles and towns from the English. Edinburgh Castle was taken from the invaders by a stratagem. . . . Perth, and other important places, were also retaken by the Scots, and Edward Baliol retired out of the country, in despair of making good his pretensions to the crown. The nobles of Scotland, finding the affairs of the kingdom more prosperous, now came to the resolution of bringing back from France, where he had resided for safety, their young King, David II., and his consort, Queen Joanna. They arrived in 1341. David II. was still a youth, neither did he possess at any period of life the wisdom and talents of his father, the great King Robert. The nobles of Scotland had become each a petty prince on his own estates; they made war on each other as they had done upon the English, and the poor King possessed no power of restraining them. Edward III. being absent in France, and in the act of besieging Calais, David was induced, by the pressing and urgent counsels of the French King, to renew the war, and profit by the King's absence from England. The young King of Scotland raised, accordingly, a large army, and, entering England on the west frontier, he marched eastward towards Durham, harassing and wasting the country with great severity; the Scots boasting that, now the King and his nobles were absent, there were none in England to oppose them, save priests and base mechanics. But they were greatly deceived. The lords of the northern counties of England, together with the Archbishop of York, assembled a gallant army. They defeated the vanguard of the Scots and came upon the main body by surprise. . . . The Scottish army fell fast into disorder. The King himself fought bravely in the midst of his nobles and was twice wounded with arrows. At length he was captured. . . . The left wing of the Scottish army continued fighting long after the rest were routed, and at length made a safe retreat. It was commanded by the Steward of Scotland and the Earl of March. Very many of the Scottish nobility were slain; very many made prisoners. The King himself was led in triumph through the streets of London, and committed to the Tower a close prisoner. This battle was fought at Neville's Cross, near Durham, on 17th October, 1346. Thus was another great victory gained by the English over the Scots. It was followed by farther advantages, which gave the victors for a time possession of the country from the Scottish Border as far as the verge of Lothian. But the Scots, as usual, were no sooner compelled to momentary submission, than they began to consider the means of shaking off the yoke. Edward III. was not more fortunate in making war on Scotland in his own name, than when he used the pretext of supporting Baliol. He marched into East-Lothian in spring, 1355, and committed such ravages that the period was long marked by the name of the Burned Candlemas, because so many towns and villages were burned. But the Scots had removed every species of provisions which could be of use to the invaders, and avoided a general battle, while they engaged in a number of skirmishes. In this manner Edward was compelled to retreat out of Scotland, after sustaining much loss. After the failure of this effort, Edward seems to have despaired of the conquest of Scotland, and entered into terms for a truce, and for setting the King at liberty. Thus David II. at length obtained his freedom from the English, after he had been detained in prison eleven years. The latter years of this King's life have nothing very remarkable. He died in 1370."—Sir W. Scott, *Tales of a Grandfather (Scotland); abridged by E. Ginn, ch.* 14-15.

ALSO IN: J. Froissart, *Chronicles (tr. by Johnes), bk.* 1.—W. Longman, *Life and Times of Edward III., v.* 1, *ch.* 4, 10, 15, 22.

A. D. 1346.—Founding of the Lordship of the Isles. See HEBRIDES: A. D. 1346–1504.

A. D. 1370.—The accession of Robert II. the first of the Stewart or Stuart Dynasty.—On the death of David II. of Scotland (son of Robert Bruce) A. D. 1370, he was succeeded on the throne by his nephew, "Robert the High Steward of Scotland," whose mother was Marjory, daughter of Robert Bruce. The succession had been so fixed by act of the Scottish Parliament during "good King Robert's" life. The new King Robert began the Stewart line, as a royal dynasty. "The name of his family was Allan, or Fitz Allan, but it had become habitual to call them by the name of the feudal office held by them in Scotland, and hence Robert II. was the first of the Steward, or, as it came to be written, the Stewart dynasty. They obtained their feudal influence through the office enjoyed by their ancestors at the Court of Scotland—the office of Steward."—J. H. Burton, *Hist. of Scotland, ch.* 26 (*v.* 3).—The succession of the family on the Scottish throne was as follows: Robert II., Robert III., James I., James II., James III., James IV., James V., Mary, James VI. The grandmother of Mary, the great grandmother of James VI., was Margaret Tudor, of the English royal family—sister of Henry VIII. The death of Queen Elizabeth in 1603 left the English throne with no nearer heir than the Scottish King James. He, therefore, united the two crowns and became James I. of England, as well as James VI. of Scotland. His successors of the dynasty in England were Charles I., before the Rebellion and Commonwealth, then Charles II., James II., Mary (of the joint reign of William and Mary), and Anne. The Hanoverian line, which succeeded, was derived from the Stuart, through a daughter of James I.—Elizabeth of Bohemia.—M. Noble, *Hist. Genealogy of the House of Stuart.*

ALSO IN: Sir W. Scott, *Hist. of Scotland, ch.* 15 (*v.* 1).

A. D. 1388.—The Battle of Otterburn. See OTTERBURN.

A. D. 1390.—Accession of Robert III.

A. D. 1400-1436.—Homildon Hill and Shrewsbury.—The captivity of James I.—From 1389 to 1399 there was a truce between England and Scotland, and the Scotch borderers watched impatiently for the termination of it, that they might be let loose on the northern English counties, "like hounds let off the leash. It was asserted on the part of England, indeed, that they did not wait for the conclusion. Ten years of peaceful husbandry had prepared a harvest for them, and they swept it off in the old way—the English borderers retaliating by an invasion of the Lowlands. The political aspect again became menacing for Scotland. The conditions which rendered peace almost a necessity for England had ceased with a revolution. It was no longer Richard II., but Henry IV., who reigned; and he began his reign by a great invasion of Scotland." He marched with a large army (A. D. 1400) as far as Leith and threatened Edinburgh Castle, which was stoutly defended by the Scottish king's son; but the expedition was fruitless of results. Henry, however, gained the adhesion of the Earl of March, one of the most powerful of the Scottish nobles, who had received an unpardonable affront from the Duke of Albany, then regent of Scotland, and who joined the English against his country in consequence. In the autumn of 1402 the Scotch retaliated Henry's invasion by a great plundering expedition under Douglas, which penetrated as far as Durham. The rievers were returning, laden with plunder, when they were intercepted by Hotspur and the traitor March, at Homildon Hill, near Wooler, and fearfully beaten, a large number of Scotch knights and lords being killed or taken prisoner. Douglas and others among the prisoners of this battle were subsequently released by Hotspur, in defiance of the orders of King Henry, and they joined him with a considerable force when he raised his standard of revolt. Sharing the defeat of the rebellious Percys, Douglas was again taken prisoner at Shrewsbury, A. D. 1403. Two years later the English king gained a more important captive, in the person of the young heir to the Scottish throne, subsequently King James I., who was taken at sea while on a voyage to France. The young prince (who became titular king of Scotland in 1406, on his father's death) was detained at the English court nineteen years, treated with friendly courtesy by Henry IV. and Henry V. and educated with care. He married Jane Beaufort, niece of Henry IV., and was set free to return to his kingdom in 1424, prepared by his English training to introduce in Scotland a better system of government and more respectful ideas of law. The reforms which he undertook gave rise to fear and hatred among the lawless lords of the north, and they rid themselves of a king who troubled them with too many restraints, by assassinating him, on the 20th of February, 1436.—J. H. Burton, *Hist. of Scotland, v.* 3, *ch.* 26–27.

ALSO IN: Sir W. Scott, *Hist. of Scotland, v.* 1, *ch.* 16–18.

A. D. 1411.—Battle of Harlaw.—Defeat of the Lord of the Isles and the Highland clans. See HARLAW.

A. D. 1437-1460.—Reign of James II.—Feuds in the kingdom.—The Douglases.—James II. was crowned (1437) at six years of age. "Sir Alexander Livingstone became guardian of his person; Sir William Crichton, Chancellor of his kingdom; and Archibald, fifth Earl of Douglas, . . . nephew of the late King, became Lieutenant-General. The history of the regency is the history of the perpetual strife of Livingstone and Crichton with each other and with the Earl of Douglas, who had become 'very potent in kine and friendis.' His 'kine and friendis' now spread over vast territories in southern Scotland, including Galloway and Annandale, and in France he was Lord of Longueville and possessor of the magnificent duchy of Touraine. The position the Douglases occupied in being nearly related to the house of Baliol (now extinct) and to the house of Comyn placed them perilously near the throne; but there was a greater peril still, and this lay in the very dearness of the name of Douglas to Scotland. . . . To the Queen-mother had been committed by Parliament the care of her son, but as Crichton, the Chancellor, seemed disposed to take this charge upon himself, she determined to outwit him and to fulfil her duties. Accordingly, saying she was bound on a pilgrimage, she contrived to pack the boy up in her luggage, and carried him

off to Stirling Castle. He was soon, however, brought back to Edinburgh by those in power, and then they executed a wicked plot for the destruction of William, who, in 1439, had, at the age of sixteen, succeeded his father, Archibald, as Earl of Douglas. The Earl and his brother . . . were executed, and for a time it would appear that the mightiness of the Douglases received a shock. . . . The Queen-mother had been early thrust out of the regency by Livingstone and Crichton. Distrusted because she was by birth one 'of our auld enemies of England'; separated from her son; still comparatively young, and needing a strong protector, she gave her hand to Sir James Stewart, the Black Knight of Lorn. . . . After her second marriage she sinks out of notice, but enough is told to make it apparent that neglect and suffering accompanied the last years of the winning Jane Beaufort, who had stolen the heart of the King of Scots at Windsor Castle. . . . The long minority of James, and the first years of his brief reign, were too much occupied in strife with the Douglases to leave time for good government. . . . When there was peace, the King and his Parliament enacted many good laws. . . . Although the Wars of the Roses left the English little time to send armies to Scotland, and although there were no great hostilities with England, yet during this reign a great Scottish army threatened England, and a great English army threatened Scotland. James was on the side of the House of Lancaster, and 'the only key to the complicated understanding of the transactions of Scotland during the Wars of the Two Roses is to recollect that the hostilities of James were directed, not against England, but against the successes of the House of York.' . . . Since the Battle of Durham, the frontier fortress of Roxburgh had been in English hands; and when, in 1460, it was commanded by the great partisan of York, the Earl of Warwick, James laid siege to it in person. Artillery had been in use for some time, and years before we hear of the 'cracks of war.' Still many of the guns were novelties, and, curious to study the strange new machinery of death, 'more curious than became the majesty of ane King,' James ventured too near 'ane misframed gun.' It burst, and one of its oaken wedges striking him, he fell to the ground, and 'died hastlie thairafter,' being in the thirtieth year of his age. . . . King James III., who was eight years old, was crowned at the Monastery of Kelso in 1460."—M. G. J. Kinloch, *Hist. of Scotland, v.* 1, *ch.* 16.

A. D. 1460.—Accession of James III.

A. D. 1482-1488.—Lauder Bridge and Sauchie Burn.—James III., who was an infant at the time of his father's death, developed a character, as he came to manhood, which the rude nobles of his court and kingdom could not understand. "He had a dislike to the active sports of hunting and the games of chivalry, mounted on horseback rarely, and rode ill. . . . He was attached to what are now called the fine arts of architecture and music; and in studying these used the instructions of Rogers, an English musician, Cochrane, a mason or architect, and Torphichen, a dancing-master. Another of his domestic minions was Hommil, a tailor, not the least important in the conclave, if we may judge from the variety and extent of the royal wardrobe, of which a voluminous catalogue is preserved. Spending his time with such persons, who, whatever their merit might be in their own several professions, could not be fitting company for a prince, James necessarily lost the taste for society of a different description, whose rank imposed on him a certain degree of restraint. . . . The nation, therefore, with disgust and displeasure, saw the king disuse the society of the Scottish nobles, and abstain from their counsel, to lavish favours upon and be guided by the advice of a few whom the age termed base mechanics. In this situation, the public eye was fixed upon James's younger brothers, Alexander duke of Albany, and John earl of Mar." The jealousy and suspicion of the king were presently excited by the popularity of his brothers and he caused them to be arrested (1478). Mar, accused of having dealings with witches, was secretly executed in prison and his earldom was sold to the king's favourite, Cochrane, who had amassed wealth by a thrifty use of his influence and opportunities. Albany escaped to France and thence to England, where he put himself forward as a claimant of the Scottish throne, securing the support of Edward IV. by offering to surrender the hard-won independence of the kingdom. An English army, under Richard of Gloucester (afterwards King Richard III.) was sent into Scotland to enforce his claim. The Scotch king assembled his forces and advanced from Edinburgh as far as Lauder (1482), to meet the invasion. At Lauder, the nobles, having becoming deeply exasperated by the arrogant state which the ex-architect assumed as Earl of Mar, held a meeting which resulted in the sudden seizure and hanging of all the king's favourites on Lauder Bridge. "All the favourites of the weak prince perished except a youth called Ramsay of Balmain, who clung close to the king's person," and was spared. Peace with Albany and his English allies was now arranged, on terms which made the duke lieutenant-general of the kingdom; but it lasted no more than a year. Albany became obnoxious and fled to England again. The doings of the king were still hateful to his nobles and people and a continual provocation of smouldering wrath. In 1488, the discontent broke out in actual rebellion, and James was easily defeated in a battle fought at Sauchie Burn, between Bannockburn and Stirling. Flying from the battle-field, he fell from his horse and was taken, badly injured, into the house of a miller near by, where he disclosed his name. "The consequence was, that some of the rebels who followed the chase entered the hut and stabbed him to the heart. The persons of the murderers were never known, nor was the king's body ever found."—Sir W. Scott, *Hist. of Scotland, ch.* 20 (*v.* 1).

Also in: C. M. Yonge, *Cameos from Eng. Hist., series* 3, *ch.* 18 *and* 22.

A. D. 1488.—Accession of James IV.

A. D. 1502.—The marriage which brought the crown of England to the Stuarts.—"On the 8th of August 1502 the ceremony of marriage between King James [IV. of Scotland] and Margaret, Princess of England [daughter of Henry VII. and sister of Henry VIII.], was celebrated in the Chapel of Holyrood. A union of crowns and governments might be viewed as a possible result of such a marriage; but there had been others between Scotland and England whence none followed. It was long ere such a harvest

of peace seemed likely to arise from this union — it seemed, indeed, to be so buried under events of a contrary tenor that it was almost forgotten; yet, a hundred and one years later, it sent the great-grandson of James IV. to be King of England."—J. H. Burton, *Hist. of Scotland, ch.* 30 (*v.* 3).

A. D. 1502-1504.—The Highlands brought to order.—Suppression of the independent Lordship of the Isles.—"The marriage of James in 1502 with the Princess Margaret, daughter of Henry VII., helped to prolong the period of tranquillity. But, in fact, his energetic administration of justice had, almost from the beginning of his reign, restored confidence, and re-awakened in his subjects an industrial activity, that had slumbered since the death of Alexander III. Everywhere he set his barons the novel task of keeping their territories in order. The Huntlys in the North, the Argylls in the West, were made virtual viceroys of the Highlands; the Douglasses were charged with maintaining the peace of the Borders; and at length the formidable Lordship of the Isles, which had been the source of all the Celtic troubles of Scotland since the days of Somerled, was broken up in 1504, after a series of fierce revolts, and the claim to an independent sovereignty abandoned forever. Henceforth the chieftains of the Hebrides held their lands of the Crown, and were made responsible for the conduct of their clans."—J. M. Ross, *Scottish History and Literature, ch.* 5, *p.* 177.

A. D. 1513.—The Battle of Flodden.—In 1513, while Henry VIII. of England, who had joined the Holy League against France, was engaged in the latter country, besieging Terouenne, he received an embassy from James IV., king of Scotland, his brother-in-law. "French intrigues, and the long-standing alliance between the nations, had induced James to entertain the idea of a breach with England. Causes of complaint were not wanting. There was a legacy due from Henry VII.; Sir Robert Ker, the Scotch Warden of the Marches, had been killed by a Heron of Ford, and the murderer found refuge in England; Andrew Barton, who, licensed with letters of marque against the Portuguese in revenge for the death of his father, had extended his reprisals to general piracy, had been captured and slain by Lord Thomas and Sir Edward Howard, and the Scotch King demanded justice for the death of his captain. To these questions, which had been long unsettled, an answer was now imperiously demanded. Henry replied with scorn, and the Scotch King declared war. The safety of England had been intrusted to the Earl of Surrey, who, when James crossed the border, was lying at Pontefract. Without delay, he pushed forward northward, and, challenging James to meet him on the Friday next following, came up with him when strongly posted on the hill of Flodden, with one flank covered by the river Till, the other by an impassable morass, and his front rendered impregnable by the massing of his artillery. Ashamed, after his challenge, to avoid the combat, Surrey moved suddenly northward, as though bound for Scotland, but soon marching round to the left, he crossed the Till near its junction with the Tweed, and thus turned James's position. The Scots were thus compelled to fight [September 9, 1513]. On the English right, the sons of Surrey with difficulty held their own. In the centre, where Surrey himself was assaulted by the Scotch King and his choicest troops, the battle inclined against the English; but upon the English left the Highlanders were swept away by the archers, and Stanley, who had the command in that wing, fell on the rear of the successful Scotch centre, and determined the fortune of the day. The slaughter of the Scotch was enormous, and among the number of the slain was James himself, with all his chief nobility."—J. F. Bright, *Hist. of Eng., v.* 2, *pp.* 370–372.—"There lay slain on the fatal field of Flodden twelve Scottish earls, thirteen lords, and five eldest sons of peers—fifty chiefs, knights, and men of eminence, and about 10,000 common men. Scotland had sustained defeats in which the loss had been numerically greater, but never one in which the number of the nobles slain bore such a proportion to those of the inferior rank. The cause was partly the unusual obstinacy of the long defence, partly that when the common people began . . . to desert their standards, the nobility and gentry were deterred by shame and a sense of honour from following their example."—Sir W. Scott, *Hist. of Scotland, ch.* 21 (*v.* 1).

Also in: P. F. Tytler, *Hist. of Scotland, v.* 2, *ch.* 6.

A. D. 1513.—Accession of James V.

A. D. 1542.—The disaster at Solway-frith.—James V. of Scotland, who was the nephew of Henry VIII. of England—the son of Henry's sister, Margaret Tudor—gave offense to his proud and powerful uncle (A. D. 1541) by excusing himself from a meeting which had been arranged to take place between the two kings, and for which Henry had taken the trouble to travel to York. It was the eager wish of the English king to persuade his royal nephew to take possession of the property of the monasteries of Scotland, in imitation of his own example. The appointed meeting was for the further urging of these proposals, more especially, and it had been frustrated through the influence of the Catholic clergy with young King James,—very much to the disgust of many among the Scottish nobles, as well as to the wrath of King Henry. Whence came results that were unexpectedly sad. Henry determined to avenge himself for the slight that had been put upon him, and, having made his preparations for war, he issued a manifesto, alleging various injuries which gave color to his declaration of hostilities. "He even revived the old claim to the vassalage of Scotland, and he summoned James to do homage to him as his liege lord and superior. He employed the Duke of Norfolk, whom he called the scourge of the Scots, to command in the war." After some preliminary raiding expeditions, the Duke of Norfolk advanced to the border with 20,000 men, or more. "James had assembled his whole military force at Fala and Sautrey, and was ready to advance as soon as he should be informed of Norfolk's invading his kingdom. The English passed the Tweed at Berwick, and marched along the banks of the river as far as Kelso; but hearing that James had collected near 30,000 men, they repassed the river at that village, and retreated into their own country. The King of Scots, inflamed with a desire of military glory, and of revenge on his invaders, gave the signal for pursuing them, and carrying the war into England. He was surprised to find that his nobility, who were in general disaffected on

account of the preference which he had given to the clergy, opposed this resolution, and refused to attend him in his projected enterprise. Enraged at this mutiny, he reproached them with cowardice, and threatened vengeance; but still resolved, with the forces which adhered to him, to make an impression on the enemy. He sent 10,000 men to the western borders, who entered England at Solway-frith [or Solway Moss]; and he himself followed them at a small distance, ready to join them upon occasion." At the same time, he took the command of his little army away from Lord Maxwell, and conferred it on one of his favorites, Oliver Sinclair. "The army was extremely disgusted with this alteration, and was ready to disband; when a small body of English appeared, not exceeding 500 men, under the command of Dacres and Musgrave. A panic seized the Scots, who immediately took to flight, and were pursued by the enemy. Few were killed in this rout, for it was no action; but a great many were taken prisoners, and some of the principal nobility." The effect of this shameful disaster upon the mind of James was so overwhelming that he took to his bed and died in a few days. While he lay upon his deathbed, his queen gave birth to a daughter, who inherited his crown, and who played in subsequent history the unfortunate role of "Mary, Queen of Scots."—D. Hume, *Hist. of Eng., ch.* 33.

Also in: J. H. Burton, *Hist. of Scotland, ch.* 33.—W. Robertson, *Hist. of Scotland, bk.* 1.

A. D. 1542.—Accession of Queen Mary.

A. D. 1544-1548.—The English Wooing of Queen Mary.—Immediately on the death of James V., Henry VIII. of England began a most resolute undertaking to secure the hand of the infant queen Mary for his own infant son. Scotland, however, was averse to the union, and resisted all the influences which the English king could bring to bear. Enraged by his failure, Henry despatched the Earl of Hertford, in May 1544, with a military and naval force, commissioned to do the utmost destructive work in its power, without attempting permanent conquest, for which it was not adequate. The expedition landed at Newhaven and seized the town of Leith, before Cardinal Beaton or Beatoun, then governing Scotland in the name of the Regent, the Earl of Arran, had learned of its approach. "The Cardinal immediately deserted the capital and fled in the greatest dismay to Stirling. The Earl of Hertford demanded the unconditional surrender of the infant Queen, and being informed that the Scottish capital and nation would suffer every disaster before they would submit to his ignominious terms, he marched immediately with his whole forces upon Edinburgh. . . . The English army entered by the Water-gate without opposition, and assaulted the Nether Bow Port, and beat it open on the second day, with a terrible slaughter of the citizens. They immediately attempted to lay siege to the Castle. . . . Baffled in their attempts on the fortress, they immediately proceeded to wreak their vengeance on the city. They set it on fire in numerous quarters, and continued the work of devastation and plunder till compelled to abandon it by the smoke and flames, as well as the continual firing from the Castle. They renewed the work of destruction on the following day; and for three successive days they returned with unabated fury to the smoking ruins, till they had completely effected their purpose. The Earl of Hertford then proceeded to lay waste the surrounding country with fire and sword. . . . This disastrous event forms an important era in the history of Edinburgh; if we except a portion of the Castle, the churches, and the north-west wing of Holyrood Palace, no building anterior to this date now exists in Edinburgh. . . . The death of Henry VIII. in 1547 tended to accelerate the renewal of his project for enforcing the union of the neighbouring kingdoms, by the marriage of his son with the Scottish Queen. Henry, on his deathbed, urged the prosecution of the war with Scotland; and the councillors of the young King Edward VI. lost no time in completing their arrangements for the purpose. . . . In the beginning of September, the Earl of Hertford, now Duke of Somerset, and Lord Protector of England, during the minority of his nephew Edward VI., again entered Scotland at the head of a numerous army; while a fleet of about 60 sail co-operated with him, by a descent on the Scottish coast. At his advance, he found the Scottish army assembled in great force to oppose him. . . . After skirmishing for several days with various success in the neighbourhood of Prestonpans, where the English army was encamped,—a scene long afterwards made memorable by the brief triumph of Mary's hapless descendant, Charles Stuart,—the two armies at length came to a decisive engagement on Saturday the 10th of September 1547, long after known by the name of 'Black Saturday.' The field of Pinkie, the scene of this fatal contest, lies about six miles distant from Edinburgh. . . . The Scots were at first victorious, and succeeded in driving back the enemy, and carrying off the royal standard of England; but being almost destitute of cavalry . . . they were driven from the field, after a dreadful slaughter, with the loss of many of their nobles and leaders, both slain and taken prisoners." Notwithstanding their severe defeat, the Scots were still stubbornly resolved that their young queen should not be won by such savage wooing; and the English returned home, after burning Leith and desolating the coast country once more. Next year the royal maid of Scotland, then six years old, was betrothed to the dauphin of France and sent to the French court to be reared. So the English scheme of marriage was frustrated in a decisive way. Meantime, the Scots were reinforced by 8,000 French and 1,000 Dutch troops, and expelled the English from most of the places they held in the country. —D. Wilson, *Memorials of Edinburgh, pt.* 1, *ch.* 5 (*v.* 1).

Also in: P. F. Tytler, *Hist. of Scotland, v.* 3, *ch.* 1-2.—J. A. Froude, *Hist. of Eng., ch.* 22 (*v.* 4) *and* 24-25 (*v.* 5).

A. D. 1546.—The murder of Cardinal Beatoun.—"Cardinal Beatoun [who had acquired practical control of the government, although the Earl of Arran was nominally Regent] had not used his power with moderation, equal to the prudence by which he attained it. Notwithstanding his great abilities, he had too many of the passions and prejudices of an angry leader of a faction, to govern a divided people with temper. His resentment against one party of the nobility, his insolence towards the rest, his severity to the reformers, and, above all, the barbarous and illegal execution of the famous

George Wishart, a man of honourable birth and of primitive sanctity, wore out the patience of a fierce age; and nothing but a bold hand was wanting to gratify the public wish by his destruction. Private revenge, inflamed and sanctified by a false zeal for religion, quickly supplied this want. Norman Lesly, the eldest son of the earl of Rothes, had been treated by the cardinal with injustice and contempt. It was not the temper of the man, or the spirit of the times, quietly to digest an affront. . . . The cardinal, at that time, resided in the castle of St. Andrew's, which he had fortified at great expense, and, in the opinion of the age, had rendered it impregnable. His retinue was numerous, the town at his devotion, and the neighbouring country full of his dependents. In this situation, sixteen persons undertook to surprise his castle, and to assassinate himself; and their success was equal to the boldness of the attempt. . . . His death was fatal to the catholic religion, and to the French interest in Scotland. The same zeal for both continued among a great party in the nation, but when deprived of the genius and authority of so skilful a leader, operated with less effect." The sixteen conspirators, having full possession of the castle of St. Andrew's, were soon joined by friends and sympathizers—John Knox being one of the party,—until 150 men were within the walls. They stood a siege for five months and only surrendered to a force sent over by the king of France, on being promised their lives. They were sent as prisoners to France, and the castle of St. Andrew's was demolished.—W. Robertson, *Hist. of Scotland, bk.* 2 (*v.* 1).

Also in: P. F. Tytler, *Hist. of Scotland, v.* 3, *ch.* 1-2.—T. M'Crie, *Life of John Knox, period* 2.

A. D. 1547-1557.—The birth of the Protestant Reformation.—In Scotland, the kings of the house of Stuart "obtained a decisive influence over the appointment to the high dignities in the Church, but this proved advantageous neither to the Church nor, at last, to themselves. . . . The French abuses came into vogue here also: ecclesiastical benefices fell to the dependents of the court, to the younger sons of leading houses, often to their bastards: they were given or sold 'in commendam,' and then served only for pleasure and gain: the Scotch Church fell into an exceedingly scandalous and corrupt state. It was not so much disputed questions of doctrine as in Germany, nor again the attempt to keep out Papal influence as in England, but mainly aversion to the moral corruption of the spirituality which gave the first impulse to the efforts at reformation in Scotland. We find Lollard societies among the Scots much later than in England: their tendencies spread through wide circles, owing to the anti-clerical spirit of the century, and received fresh support from the doctrinal writings that came over from Germany. But the Scotch clergy was resolved to defend itself with all its might. . . . It persecuted all with equal severity as tending to injure the stability of holy Church, and awarded the most extreme penalties. To put suspected heretics to death by fire was the order of the day; happy the man who escaped the unrelenting persecution by flight, which was only possible amid great peril. These two causes, an undeniably corrupt condition, and relentless punishment of those who blamed it as it well deserved, gave the Reform movement in Scotland, which was repressed but not stifled, a peculiar character of exasperation and thirst for vengeance. Nor was it without a political bearing, in Scotland as elsewhere. In particular, Henry VIII. proposed to his nephew, King James V., to remodel the Church after his example: and a part of the nobility, which was already favourably disposed towards England, would have gladly seen this done. But James preferred the French pattern to the English: he was kept firm in his Catholic and French sympathies by his wife, Mary of Guise, and by the energetic Archbishop Beaton. Hence he became involved in the war with England in which he fell, and after this it occasionally seemed, especially at the time of the invasions by the Duke of Somerset, as if the English, and in connexion with them the Protestant, sympathies would gain the ascendancy. But national feelings were still stronger than the religious. Exactly because England defended and recommended the religious change it failed to make way in Scotland. Under the regency of the Queen dowager, with some passing fluctuations, the clerical interests on the whole kept the upper hand. . . . It is remarkable how under these unfavourable circumstances the foundation of the Scotch Church was laid. Most of the Scots who had fled from the country were content to provide for their subsistence in a foreign land and improve their own culture. But there was one among them who did not reconcile himself for one moment to this fate. John Knox was the first who formed a Protestant congregation in the besieged fortress of S. Andrew's; when the French took the place in 1547 he was made prisoner and condemned to serve in the galleys. . . . After he was released, he took a zealous share in the labours of the English Reformers under Edward VI., but was not altogether content with the result; after the King's death he had to fly to the continent. He went to Geneva, where he became a student once more and tried to fill up the gaps in his studies, but above all he imbibed, or confirmed his knowledge of, the views which prevailed in that Church. . . . A transient relaxation of ecclesiastical control in Scotland made it possible for him to return thither . . . towards the end of 1555: without delay he set his hand to form a church-union, according to his ideas of religious independence, which was not to be again destroyed by any state power. . . . Sometimes in one and sometimes in another of the places of refuge which he found, he administered the Communion to little congregations according to the Reformed rite; this was done with greater solemnity at Easter 1556, in the house of Lord Erskine of Dun, one of those Scottish noblemen who had ever promoted literary studies and the religious movement as far as lay in his power. A number of people of consequence from the Mearns (Mearnshire) were present. But they were not content with partaking the Communion; following the mind of their preacher they pledged themselves to avoid every other religious community, and to uphold with all their power the preaching of the Gospel. In this union we may see the origin of the Scotch Church, properly so called. . . . At Erskine's house met together also Lord Lorn, afterwards Earl of Argyle, and the Prior of S. Andrew's, subsequently Earl of Murray; in December 1557 Erskine, Lorn, Mur-

ray, Glencairn (also a friend of Knox), and Morton, united in a solemn engagement, to support God's word and defend his congregation against every evil and tyrannical power even unto death. When, in spite of this, another execution took place which excited universal aversion, they proceeded to an express declaration, that they would not suffer any man to be punished for transgressing a clerical law based on human ordinances. What the influence of England had not been able to effect was now produced by antipathy to France. The opinion prevailed that the King of France wished to add Scotland to his territories, and that the Regent gave him aid thereto. When she gathered the feudal array on the borders in 1557 (for the Scots had refused to contribute towards enlisting mercenaries) to invade England according to an understanding with the French, the barons held a consultation on the Tweed, in consequence of which they refused their co-operation for this purpose. . . . It was this quarrel of the Regent with the great men of the country that gave an opportunity to the lords who were combined for the support of religion to advance with increasing resolution."—L. Von Ranke, *Hist. of Eng. principally in the 17th Cent., bk.* 3, *ch.* 2 (*v.* 1).

Also in: T. M'Crie, *Life of John Knox, period* 1–6.—G. Stuart, *Hist. of the Establishment of the Reformation of Religion in Scotland, bk.* 1–2.

A. D. 1557.—The First Covenant and the Lords of the Congregation.—In 1556 John Knox withdrew from Scotland and returned to Geneva—whether through fear of increasing dangers, or for other reasons, is a question in dispute. The following year he was solicited to come back to the Scottish field of labor, by those nobles who favored the Reformation, and he gave up his Genevan congregation for the purpose of obeying their summons. "In the beginning of October he proceeded to Dieppe; but while he waited there for a vessel to convey him to Scotland, he received other letters which dashed all his hopes, by counselling him to remain where he was. The Reformers had suddenly changed their minds. . . . Sitting down in his lodging at Dieppe, Knox wrote a letter to the lords whose faith had failed, after inviting him to come to their help. . . . With it he despatched another addressed to the whole nobility of Scotland, and others to particular friends. . . . The letters of Knox had an immediate and powerful effect in stimulating the decaying zeal of the Reforming nobles. Like a fire stirred up just when ready to die out among its own ashes, it now burned more brightly than ever. Meeting at Edinburgh in the month of December, they drew up a bond which knit them into one body, pledged them to a definite line of conduct and gave consistency and shape to their plans. They had separated from the Roman communion; they now formed themselves into an opposing phalanx. This document is known in our Church history as the first Covenant, and is so important that we give it entire: 'We, perceiving how Satan, in his members, the anti-christs of our time, cruelly do rage, seeking to overthrow and destroy the gospel of Christ and His congregation, ought, according to our bounden duty, to strive in our Master's cause, even unto the death, being certain of the victory in Him. The which our duty being well considered, we do promise before the Majesty of God and His congregation, that we, by His grace, shall, with all diligence, continually apply our whole power, substance, and our very lives, to maintain, set forward, and establish the most blessed Word of God and His congregation; and shall labour, at our possibility, to have faithful ministers, truly and purely to administer Christ's gospel and sacraments to His people. We shall maintain them, nourish them, and defend them, the whole congregation of Christ, and every member thereof, at our whole powers and waging of our lives, against Satan and all wicked power that doth intend tyranny or trouble against the foresaid congregation. Unto the which holy word and congregation we do join us, and so do forsake and renounce the congregation of Satan, with all the superstitious abomination and idolatry thereof; and, moreover, shall declare ourselves manifestly enemies thereto, by this our faithful promise before God, testified to His congregation by our subscription to these presents, at Edinburgh, the 3rd day of December 1557 years. God called to witness—A., Earl of Argyle, Glencairn, Morton, Archibald, Lord of Lorn, John Erskine of Dun,' &c. From the time that the Reformers had resolved to refrain from being present at mass, they had been in the habit of meeting among themselves for the purpose of worship. . . . Elders and deacons were chosen to superintend the affairs of these infant communities. Edinburgh has the honour of having given the example, and the names of her first five elders are still preserved. The existence of these small Protestant 'congregations,' scattered over the country, probably led the lords to employ the word so frequently in their bond, and this again led to their being called the Lords of the Congregation. It was a bold document to which they had thus put their names. It was throwing down the gauntlet to all the powers of the existing Church and State."—J. Cunningham, *Church Hist. of Scotland, v.* 1, *ch.* 10.

Also in: John Knox, *Hist. of the Reformation in Scotland* (*Works, v.* 1), *bk.* 1.—D. Calderwood, *Hist. of the Kirk of Scotland*, 1557 (*v.* 1).—T. M'Crie, *Life of John Knox, period* 5–6.

A. D. 1558.—Marriage of Mary Stuart to the Dauphin of France.—Contemplated union of Crowns. See France: A. D. 1547–1559.

A. D. 1558-1560.—Rebellion and triumph of the Lords of the Congregation.—The Geneva Confession adopted.—"In 1558 the burning of an old preacher, Walter Mill, at St. Andrew's, aroused the Lords of the Congregation, as the signers of the Covenant now called themselves. They presented their demands to the regent [the queen-dowager, Mary of Guise], and some time was spent in useless discussion. But the hands of the Reformers were strengthened by Elizabeth's accession in England, and on May 2, 1559, the leading spirit of the Scottish Reformation, John Knox, returned to Scotland. . . . Knox's influence was soon felt in the course of affairs. In May, 1559, the regent, stirred to action by the Cardinal of Lorraine, summoned the reformed clergy to Stirling. They came, but surrounded by so many followers, that the regent was afraid, and promised that, if they would disperse, she would proceed no further. They agreed; but, scarcely were they gone before Mary caused the preachers to be tried and condemned in their absence. Knox's anger broke out in a fierce ser-

mon against idolatry, preached at Perth. The people of the town rose and destroyed the images in the churches, and tore down all architectural ornaments which contained sculpture. The example of Perth was followed elsewhere, and the churches of Scotland were soon robbed of their old beauty. From this time we must date the decay of the fine ecclesiastical buildings of Scotland, whose ruins still bear witness to their former splendour. . . . The Lords of the Congregation were now in open rebellion against the regent, and war was on the point of breaking out. It was, however, averted for a time by the mediation of a few moderate men, amongst whom was Lord James Stewart, an illegitimate son of the late king, known in later history as the Earl of Murray. Both parties agreed to lay down their arms, and submit their disputes to a meeting of the Estates of the Realm, while the regent promised not to molest the people of Perth, or garrison the town with French soldiers. She kept the letter only of her promise; for she hired native troops with French money, and proceeded to punish the people of Perth. This perfidy gave strength to the Congregation. They again took up arms, seized Edinburgh, summoned a parliament, and deposed the regent (October, 1559). This was a bold step; but without help from England it could not be maintained. As the regent was strong in French troops, the Congregation must ally with England. Elizabeth wished to help them; but her course was by no means clear. To ally with rebels fighting against their lawful sovereign was a bad example for one in Elizabeth's position to set. . . . At last, in January, 1560, a treaty was made at Berwick, between Elizabeth and the Duke of Chatelherault [better known as the Earl of Arran, who had resigned the regency of Scotland in favor of Mary of Guise, and received from the French king the duchy of Chatelherault], the second person in the Scottish realm. Elizabeth undertook to aid the Scottish lords in expelling the French, but would only aid them so long as they acknowledged their queen. And now a strange change had come over Scotland. The Scots were fighting side by side with the English against their old allies the French. Already their religious feelings had overcome their old national animosities; or, rather, religion itself had become a powerful element in their national spirit. . . . But meanwhile affairs in France took a direction favourable to the Reformers. . . . The French troops were needed at home, and could no longer be spared for Scotland. The withdrawal of the French made peace necessary in Scotland, and by the treaty of Edinburgh (July, 1560), it was provided that henceforth no foreigners should be employed in Scotland without the consent of the Estates of the Realm. Elizabeth's policy was rewarded by a condition that Mary and Francis II. should acknowledge her queen of England, lay aside their own pretensions, and no longer wear the British arms. Before the treaty was signed the queen-regent died (June 20), and with her the power of France and the Guises in Scotland was gone for the present. The Congregation was now triumphant, and the work of Reformation was quickly carried on. A meeting of the Estates approved of the Geneva Confession of Faith, abjured the authority of the Pope, and forbade the administration, or presence at the administration, of the mass, on pain of death for the third offence (August 25, 1560). . . . The plans of the Guises were no longer to be carried on in Scotland and England by armed interference, but by the political craft and cunning of their niece, Mary of Scotland [now widowed by the death, December 4, 1560, of her husband, the young French king, Francis II.], who had been trained under their influence."—M. Creighton, *The Age of Elizabeth, bk.* 2, *ch.* 1.

Also in: J. A. Froude, *Hist. of Eng., v.* 7, *ch.* 2–3.—J. Knox, *Hist. of the Reformation in Scotland, bk.* 2 (*Works, v.* 1).—J. H. Burton, *Hist. of Scotland, ch.* 37–38 (*v.* 4).

A. D. 1561-1568.—The reign of Mary.—Differing views of her conduct and character.—In August, 1561, Queen Mary returned from her long residence in France, to undertake the government of a country of which she was the acknowledged sovereign, but of which she knew almost nothing. "She was now a widow, so the Scots were freed from the fear they had felt of seeing their country sink into a province of France. The people, who had an almost superstitious reverence for kingship, which was very inconsistent with their contempt for kingly authority, welcomed her with open arms. . . . They had yet to find out that she had come back to them French in all but birth, gifted with wit, intellect, and beauty, but subtle beyond their power of searching, and quite as zealous for the old form of religion as they were for the new one. The Queen, too, who came thus as a stranger among her own people, had to deal with a state of things unknown in former reigns. Hitherto the Church had taken the side of the Crown against the nobles; now both [the Reformed Church and the Lords of the Congregation] were united against the Crown, whose only hope lay in the quarrels between these ill-matched allies. The chief cause of discord between them was the property of the Church. The Reformed ministers fancied that they had succeeded, not only to the Pope's right of dictation in all matters, public and private, but to the lands of the Church as well. To neither of these claims would the Lords agree. They were as little inclined to submit to the tyranny of presbyters as to the tyranny of the Pope. They withstood the ministers who wished to forbid the Queen and her attendants hearing mass in her private chapel, and they refused to accept as law the First Book of Discipline, a code of rules drawn up by the ministers for the guidance of the new Church. As to the land, much of it had already passed into the hands of laymen, who, with the lands, generally bore the title of the Church dignitary who had formerly held them. The Privy Council took one-third of what remained to pay the stipends of the ministers, while the rest was supposed to remain in the hands of the Churchmen in possession, and, as they died out, it was to fall in to the Crown. Lord James Stewart, Prior of St. Andrews, whom the Queen created Earl of Murray, was the hope of the Protestants, but in the north the Romanists were still numerous and strong. Their head was the Earl of Huntly, chief of the Gordons, who reigned supreme over most of the north." One of the first proceedings of the Queen was to join the Earl of Murray in hostilities which pursued the Earl of Huntly and his son to their death. And yet they were the main pillars of the Church

which she was determined to restore! "The most interesting question now for all parties was, whom the Queen would marry. Many foreign princes were talked of, and Elizabeth suggested her own favourite, the Earl of Leicester, but Mary settled the matter herself by falling in love with her own cousin, Henry Stewart, Lord Darnley." Murray opposed the marriage with bitterness, and took up arms against it, but failed of support and fled to England. The wretched consequences of Mary's union with the handsome but worthless Darnley are among the tragedies of history which all the world is acquainted with. She tired of him, and inflamed his jealousy, with that of all her court, by making a favorite of her Italian secretary, David Rizzio. Rizzio was brutally murdered, in her presence, March 9, 1566, by a band of conspirators, to whom Darnley had pledged his protection. The Queen dissembled her resentment until she had power to make it effective, flying from Edinburgh to Dunbar, meantime. When, within a month, she returned to the capital, it was with a strong force, brought to her support by James Hepburn, Earl of Bothwell. The murderers of Rizzio were outlawed, and Darnley, while recovering from an attack of smallpox, was killed (February 9, 1567) by the blowing up of a house, outside of Edinburgh, in which the Queen had placed him. "It was commonly believed that Bothwell was guilty of the murder, and it was suspected that he had done it to please the Queen and with her consent. This suspicion was strengthened by her conduct. She made no effort to find out the murderer and to bring him to punishment, and on the day of the funeral she gave Bothwell the feudal superiority over the town of Leith." In May, three months after Darnley's death, she married the Earl of Bothwell,—who had freed himself from an earlier tie by hasty divorce. This shameless conduct caused a rising of the barons, who occupied Edinburgh in force. Bothwell attempted to oppose them with an army; but there was no battle. The Queen surrendered herself, at Carberry, June 15, 1567; Bothwell escaped, first to Orkney, and then to Denmark, where he died about ten years later. "Just a month after her third marriage the Queen was brought back to Edinburgh, to be greeted by the railings of the mob, who now openly accused her as a murderess. . . . From Edinburgh she was taken to a lonely castle built on a small island in the centre of Loch Leven. A few days later a casket containing eight letters was produced. These letters, it was said, Bothwell had left behind him in his flight, and they seemed to have been written by Mary to him while Darnley was ill in Glasgow. If she really wrote them, they proved very plainly that she had planned the murder with Bothwell. They are called the 'casket letters,' from the box or casket in which they were found. The confederate barons acted as if they were really hers. The Lord Lindsay and Robert Melville were sent to her at Loch Leven, and she there signed the demission of the government to her son, and desired that Murray should be the first regent." The infant king, James VI., was crowned at Stirling; and Murray, recalled from France, became regent. Within a year Mary escaped from her prison, reasserted her right of sovereignty, and was supported by a considerable party. Defeated in a battle fought at Langside, May 13, 1568, she then fled to England, and received from Elizabeth the hospitality of a prison. She was confined in various castles and manor-houses, ending her life, after many removes, at Fotheringay, where she was executed [see ENGLAND: A. D. 1585–1587] February 8, 1587.—M. Macarthur, *Hist. of Scotland, ch.* 6.—"In spite of all the prurient suggestions of writers who have fastened on the story of Mary's life as on a savoury morsel, there is no reason whatever for thinking that she was a woman of licentious disposition, and there is strong evidence to the contrary. There was never anything to her discredit in France. . . . The charge of adultery with Rizzio is dismissed as unworthy of belief even by Mr. Froude, the severest of her judges. Bothwell indeed she loved, and, like many another woman who does not deserve to be called licentious, she sacrificed her reputation to the man she loved. But the most conclusive proof that she was no slave to appetite is afforded by her nineteen years' residence in England, which began when she was only twenty-five. During almost the whole of that time she was mixing freely in the society of the other sex, with the fullest opportunity for misconduct had she been so inclined. It is not to be supposed that she was fettered by any scruples of religion or morality. Yet no charge of unchastity is made against her. . . . That Darnley was murdered by Bothwell is not disputed. That Mary was cognisant of the plot and lured him to the shambles, has been doubted by few investigators at once competent and unbiassed. She lent herself to this part not without compunction. Bothwell had the advantage over her that the loved has over the lover; and he used it mercilessly for his headlong ambition, hardly taking the trouble to pretend that he cared for the unhappy woman who was sacrificing everything for him. He in fact cared more for his lawful wife, whom he was preparing to divorce, and to whom he had been married only six months. . . . What brought sudden and irretrievable ruin on Mary was not the murder of Darnley, but the infatuation which made her the passive instrument of Bothwell's presumptuous ambition."—E. S. Beesly, *Queen Elizabeth, ch.* 4.—"Constitutionally, Mary was not a person likely to come under the sway of a violent and absorbing passion. Her whole nature was masculine in its moderation, its firmness, its magnanimity. She was tolerant, uncapricious, capable of carrying out a purpose steadily, yet with tact and policy. She was never hysterical, never fanciful. With her, love was not an engrossing occupation; on the contrary, to Mary, as to most men, it was but the child and plaything of unfrequent leisure. Her lovers went mad about her, but she never went mad about her lovers. She sent Chatelar to the scaffold. She saw Sir John Gordon beheaded. She admitted Rizzio to a close intimacy. Rizzio was her intellectual mate, the depository of her state secrets, her politic guide and confidant: but the very notoriety of her intercourse with him showed how innocent and unsexual it was in its nature,—the frank companionship of friendly statesmen. Had she been Rizzio's mistress, nay, even had love in the abstract been a more important matter to her than it was, she would have been more cautious and discreet; however

important the public business which they were transacting might have been, she would hardly have kept the Italian secretary in her boudoir half the night. Her marriage with Darnley was not exclusively a love-match: it was a marriage to which her judgment, as well as her heart, consented. Her love-letters abound in pretty trifles: her business letters are clear, strong, rapid, brilliantly direct. By the fantastic irony of fate this masculine unsentimental career has been translated into an effeminate love-story,—the truth being, as I have had to say again and again, that no woman ever lived to whom love was less of a necessity. This was the strength of Mary's character as a queen—as a woman, its defect. A love-sick girl, when her castle in the air was shattered, might have come to hate Darnley with a feverish feminine hatred; but the sedate and politic intelligence of the Queen could only have been incidentally affected by such considerations. She knew that, even at the worst, Darnley was a useful ally, and the motives which induced her to marry him must have restrained her from putting him forcibly away. Yet when the deed was done, it is not surprising that she should have acquiesced in the action of the nobility. Bothwell, again, was in her estimation a loyal retainer, a trusted adviser of the Crown; but he was nothing more. Yet it need not surprise us that after her forcible detention at Dunbar, she should have resolved to submit with a good grace to the inevitable. Saving Argyle and Huntley, Bothwell was the most powerful of her peers. He was essentially a strong man; fit, it seemed, to rule that turbulent nobility. He had been recommended to her acceptance by the unanimous voice of the aristocracy, Protestant and Catholic. . . . On a woman of ardent sentimentality these considerations would have had little effect: they were exactly the considerations which would appeal to Mary's masculine common-sense. Yet, though she made what seemed to her the best of a bad business, she was very wretched."—J. Skelton, *Essays in History and Biography, pp.* 40–41.—"To establish the genuineness of the Casket Letters is necessarily to establish that Mary was a co-conspirator with Bothwell in the murder of her husband. . . . The expressions in the letters are not consistent with an innocent purpose, or with the theory that she brought Darnley to Edinburgh in order to facilitate the obtaining of a divorce. Apart even from other corroborative evidence, the evidence of the letters, if their genuineness be admitted, is sufficient to establish her guilt. Inasmuch, however, as her entire innocence is not consistent with other evidence, it can scarcely be affirmed that the problem of the genuineness of the letters has an absolutely vital bearing on the character of Mary. Mr. Skelton, who does not admit the genuineness of the letters, and who may be reckoned one of the most distinguished and ingenious defenders of Mary in this country, has taken no pains to conceal his contempt for what he terms the 'theory of the ecclesiastics'—that Mary, during the whole progress of the plot against Darnley's life, was 'innocent as a child, immaculate as a saint.' He is unable to adopt a more friendly attitude towards her than that of an apologizer, and is compelled to attempt the assumption of a middle position—that she was neither wholly innocent nor wholly guilty; that, ignorant of the details and method of the plot, she only vaguely guessed that it was in progress, and failed merely in firmly and promptly forbidding its execution. But in a case of murder a middle position—a position of even partial indifference—is, except in very peculiar circumstances, well-nigh impossible; in the case of a wife's attitude to the murder of her husband, the limit of impossibility is still more nearly approached; but when the wife possesses such exceptional courage, fertility of resource, and strength of will as were possessed by Mary, the impossibility may be regarded as absolute. Besides, as a matter of fact, Mary was not indifferent in the matter. She had long regarded her husband's conduct with antipathy and indignation; she did not conceal her eager desire to be delivered from the yoke of marriage to him; and she had abundant reasons, many of which were justifiable, for this desire. . . . The fatal weakness . . . of all such arguments as are used to establish either Mary's absolute or partial innocence of the murder is, that they do not harmonize with the leading traits of her disposition. She was possessed of altogether exceptional decision and force of will; she was remarkably wary and acute; and she was a match for almost any of her contemporaries in the art of diplomacy. She was not one to be concussed into a course of action to which she had any strong aversion."—T. F. Henderson, *The Casket Letters and Mary Queen of Scots, ch.* 1.—"The beauties of her person, and graces of her air, combined to make her the most amiable of women; and the charms of her address and conversation aided the impression which her lovely figure made on the hearts of all beholders. Ambitious and active in her temper, yet inclined to cheerfulness and society; of a lofty spirit, constant and even vehement in her purpose, yet polite, and gentle, and affable in her demeanour; she seemed to partake only so much of the male virtues as to render her estimable, without relinquishing those soft graces which compose the proper ornament of her sex. In order to form a just idea of her character, we must set aside one part of her conduct, while she abandoned herself to the guidance of a profligate man; and must consider these faults, whether we admit them to be imprudences or crimes, as the result of an inexplicable, though not uncommon, inconstancy in the human mind, of the frailty of our nature, of the violence of passion, and of the influence which situations, and sometimes momentary incidents, have on persons whose principles are not thoroughly confirmed by experience and reflection. Enraged by the ungrateful conduct of her husband, seduced by the treacherous counsels of one in whom she reposed confidence, transported by the violence of her own temper, which never lay sufficiently under the guidance of discretion, she was betrayed into actions which may with some difficulty be accounted for, but which admit of no apology, nor even of alleviation. An enumeration of her qualities might carry the appearance of a panegyric; an account of her conduct must in some parts wear the aspect of severe satire and invective. Her numerous misfortunes, the solitude of her long and tedious captivity, and the persecutions to which she had been exposed on account of her religion, had wrought her up to a degree of bigotry during her later years; and such were the prevalent spirit and principles of the age, that it is the less

wonder if her zeal, her resentment, and her interest uniting, induced her to give consent to a design which conspirators, actuated only by the first of these motives, had formed against the life of Elizabeth."—D. Hume, *Hist. of England, ch.* 42 (*v.* 4).—"More books have been written about Mary Stuart than exist as to all the Queens in the world; yet, so greatly do those biographies vary in their representations of her character, that at first it seems scarcely credible how any person could be so differently described. The triumph of a creed or party has unhappily been more considered than the development of facts, or those principles of moral justice which ought to animate the pen of the Historian; and, after all the literary gladiatorship that has been practised in this arena for some three hundred years, the guilt or innocence of Mary Queen of Scots is still under consideration, for party feeling and sectarian hate have not yet exhausted their malice. . . . If the opinions of Mary Stuart's own sex were allowed to decide the question at issue, a verdict of not guilty would have been pronounced by an overwhelming majority of all readers, irrespective of creed or party. Is, then, the moral standard erected by women for one another, lower than that which is required of them by men? Are they less acute in their perceptions of right and wrong, or more disposed to tolerate frailties? The contrary has generally been proved. With the exception of Queen Elizabeth, Catharine de Medicis, Lady Shrewsbury, and Margaret Erskine (Lady Douglas), of infamous memory, Mary Stuart had no female enemies worthy of notice. It is a remarkable fact that English gold could not purchase witnesses from the female portion of the household of the Queen of Scots. None of the ladies of the Court, whether Protestant or Catholic, imputed crime at any time to their mistress. In the days of her Royal splendour in France Queen Mary was attended by ladies of ancient family and unsullied honour, and, like true women, they clung to her in the darkest hour of her later adversity, through good and evil report they shared the gloom and sorrow of her prison life."—S. H. Burke, *Historical Portraits of the Tudor Dynasty and the Reformation Period, v.* 4, *ch.* 7.—"Mary Stuart was in many respects the creature of her age, of her creed, and of her station; but the noblest and most noteworthy qualities of her nature were independent of rank, opinion, or time. Even the detractors who defend her conduct on the plea that she was a dastard and a dupe are compelled in the same breath to retract this implied reproach, and to admit, with illogical acclamation and incongruous applause, that the world never saw more splendid courage at the service of more brilliant intelligence; that a braver if not 'a rarer spirit never did steer humanity.' A kinder or more faithful friend, a deadlier or more dangerous enemy, it would be impossible to dread or to desire. Passion alone could shake the double fortress of her impregnable heart and ever active brain. The passion of love, after very sufficient experience, she apparently and naturally outlived; the passion of hatred and revenge was as inextinguishable in her inmost nature as the emotion of loyalty and gratitude. Of repentance it would seem that she knew as little as of fear; having been trained from her infancy in a religion where the Decalogue was supplanted by the Creed. Adept as she was in the most exquisite delicacy of dissimulation, the most salient note of her original disposition was daring rather than subtlety. Beside or behind the voluptuous or intellectual attractions of beauty and culture, she had about her the fresher charm of a fearless and frank simplicity, a genuine and enduring pleasure in small and harmless things no less than in such as were neither. . . . For her own freedom of will and of way, of passion and of action, she cared much; for her creed she cared something; for her country she cared less than nothing. She would have flung Scotland with England into the hellfire of Spanish Catholicism rather than forego the faintest chance of personal revenge. . . . In the private and personal qualities which attract and attach a friend to his friend and a follower to his leader, no man or woman was ever more constant and more eminent than Mary Queen of Scots."—A. C. Swinburne, *Mary Queen of Scots* (*Miscellanies, pp.* 357-359).

Also in: J. H. Burton, *Hist. of Scotland, ch.* 41-47 (*v.* 4).—M. Laing, *Hist. of Scotland, v.* 1-2.—F. A. Mignet, *Hist. of Mary, Queen of Scots.*—A. Strickland, *Life of Mary, Queen of Scots.*—J. Skelton, *Maitland of Lethington.*—W. Robertson, *Hist. of Scotland, Appendix.*—C. M. Yonge, *Cameos of English History, series* 4, *c.* 32, *and series* 5, *c.* 1, 2, 5 *and* 6.

A. D. 1567.—Accession of James VI.

A. D. 1568-1572.—Distracted state of the kingdom.—The Reformed Church and John Knox.—During the whole minority of the young king, James VI., Scotland was torn by warring factions. Murray, assassinated in 1570, was succeeded in the regency by the Earl of Lennox, who was killed in a fight the next year. The Earl of Mar followed him, and Morton held the office next. "The civil commotions that ensued on Murray's assassination were not wholly adverse to the reformed cause, as they gave it an overwhelming influence with the king's party, which it supported. On the other hand they excused every kind of irregularity. There was a scramble for forfeited estates and the patrimony of the kirk, from which latter source the leaders of both parties rewarded their partisans. . . . The church . . . viewed with alarm the various processes by which the ecclesiastical revenues were being secularised. Nor can it be doubted that means, by which the evil might be stayed, were the subject of conference between committees of the Privy Council and General Assembly. The plan which was actually adopted incorporated in the reformed church the spiritual estate, and reintroduced the bishops by their proper titles, subject to stringent conditions of qualification [see below: A. D. 1572]. . . . Knox, whose life had been attempted in March 1570-1, had been constrained to retire from Edinburgh and was at St. Andrews when the new platform was arranged. On the strength of certain notices that are not at all conclusive, it has been strenuously denied that he was a party to it even by consent. . . . There are facts, however, to the contrary. . . . On the evidence available Knox cannot be claimed as the advocate of a divine right, either of presbytery or episcopacy. . . . With fast-failing strength he returned to Edinburgh towards the end of August." On the 24th of November, 1572, he died.—M. C. Taylor, *John Knox* (*St. Giles' Lect's, 3d series*).—"It seems to me hard measure that this Scottish

man [John Knox], now after three-hundred years, should have to plead like a culprit before the world; intrinsically for having been, in such way as it was then possible to be, the bravest of all Scotchmen! Had he been a poor Half-and-half, he could have crouched into the corner, like so many others; Scotland had not been delivered; and Knox had been without blame. He is the one Scotchman to whom, of all others, his country and the world owe a debt. He has to plead that Scotland would forgive him for having been worth to it any million 'unblamable' Scotchmen that need no forgiveness. He bared his breast to the battle; had to row in French galleys, wander forlorn in exile, in clouds and storms; was censured, shot-at through his windows; had a right sore fighting life: if this world were his place of recompense, he had made but a bad venture of it. I cannot apologise for Knox. To him it is very indifferent, these two-hundred-and-fifty years or more, what men say of him."—T. Carlyle, *Heroes and Hero-worship, lect.* 4.—"Altogether, if we estimate him [Knox], as we are alone entitled to do, in his historical position and circumstances, Knox appears a very great and heroic man—no violent demagogue, or even stern dogmatist—although violence and sternness and dogmatism were all parts of his character. These coarser elements mingled with but did not obscure the fresh, living, and keenly sympathetic humanity beneath. Far inferior to Luther in tenderness and breadth and lovableness, he is greatly superior to Calvin in the same qualities. You feel that he had a strong and loving heart under all his harshness, and that you can get near to it, and could have spent a cheery social evening with him in his house at the head of the Canongate, over that good old wine that he had stored in his cellar, and which he was glad and proud to dispense to his friends. It might not have been a very pleasant thing to differ with him even in such circumstances; but, upon the whole, it would have been a pleasanter and safer audacity than to have disputed some favourite tenet with Calvin. There was in Knox far more of mere human feeling and of shrewd worldly sense, always tolerant of differences; and you could have fallen back upon these, and felt yourself comparatively safe in the utterance of some daring sentiment. And in this point of view it deserves to be noticed that Knox alone of the reformers, along with Luther, is free from all stain of violent persecution. Intolerant he was towards the mass, towards Mary, and towards the old Catholic clergy; yet he was no persecutor. He was never cruel in act, cruel as his language sometimes is, and severe as were some of his judgments. Modern enlightenment and scientific indifference we have no right to look for in him. His superstitions about the weather and witches were common to him with all men of his time. . . . As a mere thinker, save perhaps on political subjects, he takes no rank; and his political views, wise and enlightened as they were, seem rather the growth of his manly instinctive sense than reasoned from any fundamental principles. Earnest, intense, and powerful in every practical direction, he was not in the least characteristically reflective or speculative. Everywhere the hero, he is nowhere the philosopher or sage.—He was, in short, a man for his work and time—knowing what was good for his country there and then, when the old Catholic bonds had rotted to the very heart. A man of God, yet with sinful weaknesses like us all. There is something in him we can no longer love,—a harshness and severity by no means beautiful or attractive; but there is little in him that we cannot in the retrospect heartily respect, and even admiringly cherish."—J. Tulloch, *Leaders of the Reformation: Knox.*

A. D. 1570-1573.—Civil War.—"All the miseries of civil war desolated the kingdom. Fellow-citizens, friends, brothers, took different sides, and ranged themselves under the standards of the contending factions. In every county, and almost in every town and village, 'king's men' and 'queen's men' were names of distinction. Political hatred dissolved all natural ties, and extinguished the reciprocal good-will and confidence which hold mankind together in society. Religious zeal mingled itself with these civil distinctions, and contributed not a little to heighten and to inflame them. The factions which divided the kingdom were, in appearance, only two; but in both these there were persons with views and principles so different from each other that they ought to be distinguished. With some, considerations of religion were predominant, and they either adhered to the queen because they hoped by her means to reestablish popery, or they defended the king's authority as the best support of the protestant faith. Among these the opposition was violent and irreconcilable. . . . As Morton, who commanded the regent's forces [1572, during the regency of Mar], lay at Leith, and Kirkaldy still held out the town and castle of Edinburgh [for the party of the queen], scarce a day passed without a skirmish. . . . Both parties hanged the prisoners which they took, of whatever rank or quality, without mercy and without trial. Great numbers suffered in this shocking manner; the unhappy victims were led by fifties at a time to execution; and it was not till both sides had smarted severely that they discontinued this barbarous practice." In 1573, Morton, being now regent, made peace with one faction of the queen's party, and succeeded, with the help of a siege train and force which Queen Elizabeth sent him from England, in overcoming the other faction which held Edinburgh and its castle. Kirkaldy was compelled to surrender after a siege of thirty-three days, receiving promises of protection from the English commander, in spite of which he was hanged.—W. Robertson, *Hist. of Scotland, bk.* 6 (*v.* 2).

Also in: J. H. Burton, *Hist. of Scotland, ch.* 53–56 (*v.* 5).

A. D. 1572.—Episcopacy restored.—The Concordat of Leith.—The Tulchan Bishops.—"On the 12th of January, 1572, a Convention of the Church assembled at Leith. By whom it was convened is unknown. It was not a regular Assembly, but it assumed to itself 'the strength, force, and effect of a General Assembly,' and it was attended by 'the superintendents, barons, commissioners to plant kirks, commissioners of provinces, towns, kirks, and ministers.' . . . By the 1st of February the joint committees framed a concordat, of which the following articles were the chief:—1. That the names of archbishops and bishops, and the bounds of dioceses, should remain as they were before the Reformation, at the least till the majority of the

king, or till a different arrangement should be made by the parliament; and that to every cathedral church there should be attached a chapter of learned men; but that the bishops should have no more power than was possessed by the superintendents, and should like them be subject to the General Assemblies. 2. That abbots and friars should be continued as parts of the Spiritual Estate of the realm. . . . Such was the famous concordat agreed upon by the Church and State in Scotland in 1572. . . . The Church had in vain . . . struggled to get possession of its patrimony. It had in vain argued that the bishoprics and abbacies should be dissolved, and their revenues applied for the maintenance of the ministry, the education of the youthhead, and the support of the poor. The bishoprics and abbacies were maintained as if they were indissoluble. Some of them were already gifted to laymen, and the ministers of the Protestant Church were poorly paid out of the thirds of benefices. The collection of these even the regent had recently stopped, and beggary was at the door. What was to be done? The only way of obtaining the episcopal revenues was by reintroducing the episcopal office. . . . The ministers regarded archbishops, bishops, deans and chapters as things lawful, but not expedient—'they sounded of papistry'; but now, under the pressure of a still stronger expediency, they received them into the Church. . . . Knox yielded to the same necessity under which the Church had bowed. . . . It was a mongrel prelacy that was thus introduced into Scotland—a cross betwixt Popery and Presbytery. It was not of the true Roman breed. It was not even of the Anglican. It could not pretend to the apostolical descent."—J. Cunningham, *Church Hist. of Scotland, v.* 1, *ch.* 12.—"The new dignitaries got from the populace the name of the Tulchan bishops. A tulchan, an old Scots word of unknown origin, was applied to a stuffed calf-skin which was brought into the presence of a recently-calved cow. It was an agricultural doctrine of that age, and of later times, that the presence of this changeling induced the bereaved mother easily to part with her milk. To draw what remained of the bishops' revenue, it was expedient that there should be bishops; but the revenues were not for them, but for the lay lords, who milked the ecclesiastical cow."—J. H. Burton, *Hist. of Scotland, ch.* 54 (*v.* 5).

A. D. 1581.—The Second Covenant, called also The First National Covenant.—"The national covenant of Scotland was simply an abjuration of popery, and a solemn engagement, ratified by a solemn oath, to support the protestant religion. Its immediate occasion was a dread, too well founded—a dread from which Scotland was never entirely freed till the revolution—of the re-introduction of popery. It was well known that Lennox was an emissary of the house of Guise, and had been sent over to prevail on the young king to embrace the Roman catholic faith. . . . A conspiracy so dangerous at all times to a country divided in religious sentiment, demanded a counter-combination equally strict and solemn, and led to the formation of the national covenant of Scotland. This was drawn up at the king's request, by his chaplain, John Craig. It consisted of an abjuration, in the most solemn and explicit terms, of the various articles of the popish system, and an engagement to adhere to and defend the reformed doctrine and discipline of the reformed church of Scotland. The covenanters further pledged themselves, under the same oath, 'to defend his majesty's person and authority with our goods, bodies, and lives, in the defence of Christ's evangel, liberties of our country, ministration of justice, and punishment of iniquity, against all enemies within the realm or without.' This bond, at first called 'the king's confession,' was sworn and subscribed by the king and his household, for example to others, on the 28th of January 1581; and afterwards, in consequence of an order in council, and an act of the general assembly, it was cheerfully subscribed by all ranks of persons through the kingdom; the ministers zealously promoting the subscription in their respective parishes."—T. M'Crie, *Sketches of Scottish Church History, v.* 1, *ch.* 4.

Also in: D. Calderwood, *Hist. of the Kirk of Scotland, v.* 3, 1581.—J. Row, *Hist. of the Kirk of Scotland*, 1581.

A. D. 1582.—The Raid of Ruthven.—"The two favourites [Lennox and Arran], by their ascendant over the king, possessed uncontrolled power in the kingdom, and exercised it with the utmost wantonness." The provocation which they gave brought about, at length, a combination of nobles, formed for the purpose of removing the young king from their influence. Invited to Ruthven Castle in August, 1582, by its master, Lord Ruthven, lately created Earl of Gowrie, James found there a large assemblage of the conspirators and was detained against his will. He was afterwards removed to Stirling, and later to the palace of Holyrood, but still under restraint. This continued until the following June, when the king effected his escape and Arran recovered his power. Lennox had died meantime in France. All those concerned in what was known as the Raid of Ruthven were proclaimed guilty of high treason and fled the country. The clergy gave great offense to the king by approving and sustaining the Raid of Ruthven. He never forgave the Church for its attitude on this occasion.—W. Robertson, *Hist. of Scotland, bk.* 6 (*v.* 2).

Also in: C. M. Yonge, *Cameos from Eng. Hist., series* 5, *c.* 20.

A. D. 1584.—The Black Acts.—"James was bent upon destroying a form of Church government which he imagined to be inconsistent with his own kingly prerogatives. The General Assembly rested upon too popular a basis; they were too independent of his absolute will; they assumed a jurisdiction which he could not allow. The ministers were too much given to discuss political subjects in the pulpit—to speak evil of dignities—to resist the powers that were ordained of God. . . . On the 22d of May, 1584, the Parliament assembled. . . . A series of acts were passed almost entirely subversive of the rights hitherto enjoyed by the Church. By one, the ancient jurisdiction of the Three Estates was ratified,—and to speak evil of any one of them was declared to be treason; thus were the bishops hedged about. By another, the king was declared to be supreme in all causes and over all persons, and to decline his judgment was pronounced to be treason; thus was the boldness of such men as Melville to be chastised. By a third, all convocations except those specially licensed

by the king were declared to be unlawful; thus were the courts of the Church to be shorn of their power. By a fourth, the chief jurisdiction of the Church was lodged in the hands of the Episcopal body; for the bishops must now do what the Assemblies and presbyteries had hitherto done. By still another act, it was provided 'that none should presume, privately or publicly, in sermons, declamations, or familiar conferences, to utter any false, untrue, or slanderous speeches, to the reproach of his Majesty or council, or meddle with the affairs of his Highness and Estate, under the pains contained in the acts of parliament made against the makers and reporters of lies.' . . . The parliament registered the resolves of the king; for though Scottish barons were turbulent, Scottish parliaments were docile, and seldom thwarted the reigning power. But the people sympathized with the ministers; the acts became known as the Black Acts; and the struggle between the court and the Church, which lasted with some intermissions for more than a century, was begun."—J. Cunningham, *Church Hist. of Scotland, v.* 1, *ch.* 12.

Also in: D. Calderwood, *Hist. of the Kirk of Scotland, v.* 4, 1584.—*Scottish Divines* (*St. Giles' Lect's, series* 3), *lect.* 2.—J. Melville, *Autobiog. and Diary*, 1584.

A. D. 1587.—The execution of Mary Stuart in England. See England: A. D. 1585–1587.

A. D. 1587.—Appropriation of Church lands and ruin of the Episcopacy.—The parliament of 1587 passed an act which "annexed to the crown such lands of the church as had not been inalienably bestowed upon the nobles or landed gentry; these were still considerable, and were held either by the titular bishops who possessed the benefices, or were granted to laymen by rights merely temporary. The only fund reserved for the clergy who were to serve the cure was the principal mansion house, with a few acres of glebe land. The fund from which their stipends were to be paid was limited to the tithes. . . . The crown . . . was little benefitted by an enactment which, detaching the church lands from all connection with ecclesiastical persons, totally ruined the order of bishops, for the restoration of whom, with some dignity and authority, king James, and his successor afterwards, expressed considerable anxiety."—Sir W. Scott, *Hist. of Scotland, ch.* 37 (*v.* 2).

A. D. 1600.—The Gowrie Plot.—"On the morning of the 5th of August, 1600, as James was setting out hunting from Falkland Palace, he was met by Alexander Ruthven, the younger brother of the Earl of Gowrie [both being sons of the Gowrie of the 'Raid of Ruthven'], who told him with a great air of mystery that he had discovered a man burying a pot of money in a field, and that he thought the affair so suspicious that he had taken him prisoner, and begged the King to come to Gowrie House in Perth to see him. James went, taking with him Mar, Lennox, and about twenty other gentlemen. After dinner Alexander took the King aside, and, when his attendants missed him, they were told that he had gone back to Falkland. They were preparing to follow him there when some of them heard cries from a turret. They recognized the King's voice, and they presently saw his head thrust out of a window, calling for help. They had much ado to make their way to him, but they found him at last in a small room struggling with Alexander, while a man dressed in armour was looking on. Alexander Ruthven and Gowrie were both killed in the scuffle which followed. A tumult rose in the town, for the Earl had been Provost and was very popular with the townsfolk, and the King and his followers had to make their escape by the river. The doom of traitors was passed on the dead men, and their name was proscribed, but as no accomplice could be discovered, it was hard to say what was the extent or object of their plot. The whole affair was very mysterious, the only witnesses being the King himself and Henderson the man in armour. Some of the ministers thought it so suspicious that they refused to return thanks for the King's safety, as they thought the whole affair an invention of his own." Eight years later, however, some letters were discovered which seemed to prove that there had really been a plot to seize the King's person.—M. Macarthur, *Hist. of Scotland, ch.* 6.

Also in: Sir W. Scott, *Hist. of Scotland, ch.* 40 (*v.* 2).—P. F. Tytler, *Hist. of Scotland, v.* 4, *ch.* 11.

A. D. 1603.—Accession of James VI. to the English throne. See England: A. D. 1603.

A. D. 1618.—The Five Articles of Perth.—After his accession to the English throne, James became more deeply enamoured of Episcopacy, and of its ecclesiastical and ceremonial incidents, than before, and more determined to force them on the Scottish church. He worked to that end with arbitrary insolence and violence, and with every kind of dishonest intrigue, until he had accomplished his purpose completely. Not only were his bishops seated, with fair endowments and large powers restored, but he had them ordained in England, to ensure their apostolic legitimacy. When this had been done, he resolved to impose a liturgy upon the Church, with certain ordinances of his own framing. The five articles in which the latter were embodied became for two years the subject of a most bitter and heated struggle between the court and its bishops on one side, with most of the general clergy on the other. At length, in August, 1618, an Assembly made up at Perth proved subservient enough to submit to the royal brow-beating and to adopt the five articles. These Five Articles of Perth, as they are known, enjoined kneeling at the communion, observance of five holidays, and episcopal confirmation; and they authorized the private dispensation both of baptism and of the Lord's Supper. The powers of the court of high commission were actively brought into play to enforce them.—J. Cunningham, *Church Hist. of Scotland, v.* 2, *ch.* 1.

A. D. 1637.—Laud's Liturgy and Jenny Geddes' Stool.—"Now we are summoned to a sadder subject; from the sufferings of a private person [John Williams, bishop of Lincoln, pursued and persecuted by Laud] to the miseries and almost mutual ruin of two kingdoms, England and Scotland. I confess, my hands have always been unwilling to write of that cold country, for fear my fingers should be frostbitten therewith; but necessity to make our story entire puts me upon the employment. Miseries, caused from the sending of the Book of Service or new Liturgy thither, which may sadly be termed a 'Rubric' indeed, dyed with the blood of so many of both nations, slain on that occasion. It seems the design began in the reign of king

James; who desired and endeavoured an uniformity of public prayers through the kingdom of Scotland. . . . In the reign of king Charles, the project being resumed (but whether the same book or no, God knoweth), it was concluded not to send into Scotland the same Liturgy of England 'totidem verbis,' lest this should be misconstrued a badge of dependence of that church on ours. It was resolved also, that the two Liturgies should not differ in substance, lest the Roman party should upbraid us with weighty and material differences. A similitude therefore not identity being resolved of, it was drawn up with some, as they termed them, insensible alterations, but such as were quickly found and felt by the Scotch to their great distaste. . . . The names of sundry saints, omitted in the English, are inserted into the Scotch Calendar (but only in black letters), on their several days. . . . Some of these were kings, all of them natives of that country. . . . But these Scotch saints were so far from making the English Liturgy acceptable, that the English Liturgy rather made the saints odious unto them. . . . No sooner had the dean of Edinburgh begun to read the book in the church of St. Giles, Sunday, July 23rd, in the presence of the Privy Council, both the archbishops, divers bishops, and magistrates of the city, but presently such a tumult was raised that, through clapping of hands, cursing, and crying, one could neither hear nor be heard. The bishop of Edinburgh endeavoured in vain to appease the tumult; when a stool, aimed to be thrown at him [according to popular tradition by an old herb-woman named Jenny Geddes], had killed, if not diverted by one present; so that the same book had occasioned his death and prescribed the form of his burial; and this hubbub was hardly suppressed by the lord provost and bailiffs of Edinburgh. This first tumult was caused by such, whom I find called 'the scum of the city,' considerable for nothing but their number. But, few days after, the cream of the nation (some of the highest and best quality therein) engaged in the same cause, crying out, 'God defend all those who will defend God's cause! and God confound the service-book and all the maintainers of it!'"—T. Fuller, *Church Hist. of Britain, bk.* 11, *sect.* 2 (*v.* 3).—"One of the most distinct and familiar of historical traditions attributes the honour of flinging the first stool, and so beginning the great civil war, to a certain Jenny or Janet Geddes. But a search among contemporary writers for the identification of such an actor on the scene, will have the same inconclusive result that often attends the search after some criminal hero with a mythical celebrity when he is wanted by the police. . . . Wodrow, on the authority of Robert Stewart—a son of the Lord Advocate of the Revolution—utterly dethrones Mrs. Geddes: 'He tells me that it's the constantly-believed tradition that it was Mrs. Mean, wife to John Mean, merchant in Edinburgh, that cast the first stool when the service was read in the New Kirk, Edinburgh, 1637; and that many of the lasses that carried on the fray were prentices in disguise, for they threw stools to a great length.'"—J. H. Burton, *Hist. of Scotland, v.* 6, *pp.* 443–444, *foot-note.*

A. D. 1638.—The Tables, and the signing of the National Covenant.—"Nobles, ministers, gentlemen, and burghers from every district poured into Edinburgh to take part in a national resistance to these innovations [of the Service Book], and an appeal was made from the whole body assembled in the capital, not only against the Service Book, but also against the Book of Canons and the conduct of the bishops. Instead, however, of granting redress of these grievances, the King issued a series of angry and exasperating proclamations, commanding the crowds of strangers in the capital to return immediately to their own homes, and instructing the Council and the Supreme Courts of Law to remove to Linlithgow. But instead of obeying the injunction to leave Edinburgh, the multitudes there continued to receive accessions from all parts of the country. . . . In answer to the complaint of the Council that their meeting in such numbers was disorderly and illegal, the supplicants offered to choose a limited number from each of the classes into which they were socially divided—nobles, lesser barons, burgesses, and clergy—to act as their representatives. This was at once very imprudently agreed to by the Council. A committee of four was accordingly selected by each of these classes, who were instructed to reside in the capital, and were empowered to take all necessary steps to promote their common object. They had also authority to assemble the whole of their constituents should any extraordinary emergency arise. The opponents of the new Canons and Service Book were thus organised with official approval into one large and powerful body, known in history as 'The Tables,' which speedily exercised an important influence in the country. As soon as this arrangement was completed, the crowds of supplicants who thronged the metropolis returned to their own homes, leaving the committee of sixteen to watch the progress of events." But the obstinacy of the King soon brought affairs to a crisis, and early in 1638 the deputies of The Tables "resolved to summon the whole body of supplicants to repair at once to the capital in order to concert measures for their common safety and the furtherance of the good cause. The summons was promptly obeyed, and after full deliberation it was resolved, on the suggestion of Johnstone of Warriston, that in order to strengthen their union against the enemies of the Protestant faith they should renew the National Covenant, which had been originally drawn up and sworn to at a time [A. D. 1581] when the Protestant religion was in imminent peril, through the schemes of France and Spain, and the plots of Queen Mary and the Roman Catholics in England and Scotland. The original document denounced in vehement terms the errors and devices of the Romish Church, and an addition was now made to it, adapting its declarations and pledges to existing circumstances."—J. Taylor, *The Scottish Covenanters, ch.* 1.—"It was in the Greyfriars' Church at Edinburgh that it [the National Covenant] was first received, on February 28, 1638. The aged Earl of Sutherland was the first to sign his name. Then the whole congregation followed. Then it was laid on the flat grave-stone still preserved in the church-yard. Men and women crowded to add their names. Some wept aloud, others wrote their names in their own blood; others added after their names 'till death.' For hours they signed, till every corner of the parchment was filled, and only room left for their initials, and

the shades of night alone checked the continual flow. From Greyfriars' church-yard it spread to the whole of Scotland. Gentlemen and noblemen carried copies of it 'in their portmanteaus and pockets, requiring and collecting subscriptions publicly and privately.' Women sat in church all day and all night, from Friday till Sunday, in order to receive the Communion with it. None dared to refuse their names."—A. P. Stanley, *Lect's on the Hist. of the Church of Scotland, lect.* 2.

Also in: J. Cunningham, *Church Hist. of Scotland, v.* 2, *ch.* 2.—D. Masson, *Life of John Milton, v.* 1, *ch.* 7.—R. Chambers, *Domestic Annals of Scotland, v.* 2, *pp.* 116–127.

The following is the text of the Scottish National Covenant:

"The confession of faith of the Kirk of Scotland, subscribed at first by the King's Majesty and his household in the year of God 1580; thereafter by persons of all ranks in the year 1581, by ordinance of the Lords of the secret council, and acts of the General Assembly; subscribed again by all sorts of persons in the year 1590, by a new ordinance of council, at the desire of the General Assembly; with a general band for the maintenance of the true religion, and the King's person, and now subscribed in the year 1638, by us noblemen, barons, gentlemen, burgesses, ministers, and commons under subscribing; together with our resolution and promises for the causes after specified, to maintain the said true religion, and the King's Majesty, according to the confession aforesaid, and Acts of Parliament; the tenure whereof here followeth: 'We all, and every one of us underwritten, do protest, that after long and due examination of our own consciences in matters of true and false religion, we are now thoroughly resolved of the truth, by the word and spirit of God; and therefore we believe with our hearts, confess with our mouths, subscribe with our hands, and constantly affirm before God and the whole world, that this only is the true Christian faith and religion, pleasing God, and bringing salvation to man, which now is by the mercy of God revealed to the world by the preaching of the blessed evangel, and received, believed, and defended by many and sundry notable kirks and realms, but chiefly by the Kirk of Scotland, the King's Majesty, and three estates of this realm, as God's eternal truth and only ground of our salvation; as more particularly is expressed in the confession of our faith, established and publicly confirmed by sundry Acts of Parliament; and now of a long time hath been openly professed by the King's Majesty, and whole body of this realm, both in burgh and land. To the which confession and form of religion we willingly agree in our consciences in all points, as unto God's undoubted truth and verity, grounded only upon His written Word; and therefore we abhor and detest all contrary religion and doctrine, but chiefly all kind of papistry in general and particular heads, even as they are now damned and confuted by the Word of God and Kirk of Scotland. But in special we detest and refuse the usurped authority of that Roman Antichrist upon the Scriptures of God, upon the Kirk, the civil magistrate, and consciences of men; all his tyrannous laws made upon indifferent things against our Christian liberty; his erroneous doctrine against the sufficiency of the written Word, the perfection of the law, the office of Christ and His blessed evangel; his corrupted doctrine concerning original sin, our natural inability and rebellion to God's law, our justification by faith only, our imperfect sanctification and obedience to the law, the nature, number, and use of the holy sacraments; his five bastard sacraments, with all his rites, ceremonies, and false doctrine, added to the ministration of the true sacraments, without the Word of God; his cruel judgments against infants departing without the sacrament; his absolute necessity of baptism; his blasphemous opinion of transubstantiation or real presence of Christ's body in the elements, and receiving of the same by the wicked, or bodies of men; his dispensations, with solemn oaths, perjuries, and degrees of marriage, forbidden in the Word; his cruelty against the innocent divorced; his devilish mass; his blasphemous priesthood; his profane sacrifice for the sins of the dead and the quick; his canonization of men, calling upon angels or saints departed, worshipping of imagery, relics, and crosses, dedicating of kirks, altars, days, vows to creatures; his purgatory, prayers for the dead, praying or speaking in a strange language; with his processions and blasphemous litany, and multitudes of advocates or mediators; his manifold orders, auricular confession; his desperate and uncertain repentance; his general and doubtsome faith; his satisfaction of men for their sins; his justification by works, "opus operatum," works of supererogation, merits, pardons, perigrinations and stations; his holy water, baptizing of bells, conjuring of spirits, crossing, saning, anointing, conjuring, hallowing of God's good creatures, with the superstitious opinion joined therewith; his worldly monarchy and wicked hierarchy; his three solemn vows, with all his shavelings of sundry sorts; his erroneous and bloody decrees made at Trent, with all the subscribers and approvers of that cruel and bloody band conjured against the Kirk of God. And finally, we detest all his vain allegories, rites, signs, and traditions, brought in the Kirk without or against the Word of God, and doctrine of this true reformed Kirk, to which we join ourselves willingly, in doctrine, religion, faith, discipline, and life of the holy sacraments, as lively members of the same, in Christ our head, promising and swearing, by the great name of the Lord our God, that we shall continue in the obedience of the doctrine and discipline of this Kirk, and shall defend the same according to our vocation and power all the days of our lives, under the pains contained in the law, and danger both of body and soul in the day of God's fearful judgment. And seeing that many are stirred up by Satan and that Roman Antichrist, to promise, swear, subscribe, and for a time use the holy sacraments in the Kirk, deceitfully against their own consciences, minding thereby, first under the external cloak of religion, to corrupt and subvert secretly God's true religion within the Kirk; and afterwards, when time may serve, to become open enemies and persecutors of the same, under vain hope of the Pope's dispensation, devised against the Word of God, to his great confusion, and their double condemnation in the day of the Lord Jesus. We therefore, willing to take away all suspicion of hypocrisy, and of such double dealing with God and his Kirk, protest and call the Searcher of all hearts for witness, that our minds and hearts do

fully agree with this our confession, promise, oath, and subscription: so that we are not moved for any worldly respect, but are persuaded only in our consciences, through the knowledge and love of God's true religion printed in our hearts by the Holy Spirit, as we shall answer to Him in the day when the secrets of all hearts shall be disclosed. And because we perceive that the quietness and stability of our religion and Kirk doth depend upon the safety and good behaviour of the King's Majesty, as upon a comfortable instrument of God's mercy granted to this country for the maintenance of His Kirk, and ministration of justice among us, we protest and promise with our hearts under the same oath, handwrit, and pains, that we shall defend his person and authority with our goods, bodies, and lives, in the defence of Christ His evangel, liberties of our country, ministration of justice, and punishment of iniquity, against all enemies within this realm or without, as we desire our God to be a strong and merciful defender to us in the day of our death, and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ; to Whom, with the Father and the Holy Spirit, be all honour and glory eternally. Like as many Acts of Parliament not only in general do abrogate, annul, and rescind all laws, statutes, acts, constitutions, canons civil or municipal, with all other ordinances and practick penalties whatsoever, made in prejudice of the true religion, and professors thereof, or of the true Kirk discipline, jurisdiction, and freedom thereof; or in favours of idolatry and superstition; or of the papistical kirk (as Act 3. Act 31. Parl. 1. Act 23. Parl. 11. Act 114. Parl. 12, of K. James VI), that papistry and superstition may be utterly suppressed, according to the intention of the Acts of Parliament reported in Act 5. Parl. 20. K. James VI. And to that end they ordained all papists and priests to be punished by manifold civil and ecclesiastical pains, as adversaries to God's true religion preached, and by law established within this realm (Act 24. Parl. 11. K. James VI) as common enemies to all Christian government (Act 18. Parl. 16. K. James VI), as rebellers and gainstanders of our Sovereign Lord's authority (Act 47. Parl. 3. K. James VI, and as idolaters, Act 104. Parl. 7. K. James VI), but also in particular (by and attour the confession of faith) do abolish and condemn the Pope's authority and jurisdiction out of this land, and ordains the maintainers thereof to be punished (Act 2. Parl. 1. Act 51. Parl 3. Act 106. Parl. 7. Act 114. Parl. 12. of K. James VI); do condemn the Pope's erroneous doctrine, or any other erroneous doctrine repugnant to any of the Articles of the true and Christian religion publicly preached, and by law established in this realm; and ordains the spreaders or makers of books or libels, or letters or writs of that nature, to be punished (Act 46. Parl. 3. Act 106. Parl. 7. Act 24. Parl. 11. K. James VI); do condemn all baptism conform to the Pope's kirk, and the idolatry of the Mass; and ordains all sayers, wilful hearers, and concealers of the Mass, the maintainers, and resetters of the priests, Jesuits, trafficking Papists, to be punished without exception or restriction (Act 5. Parl. 1. Act 120. Parl. 12. Act 164. Parl. 13. Act 193. Parl. 14. Act 1. Parl. 19. Act 5. Parl. 20. K. James VI); do condemn all erroneous books and writs containing erroneous doctrine against the religion presently professed, or containing superstitious rights or ceremonies papistical, whereby the people are greatly abused; and ordains the home-bringers of them to be punished (Act 25. Parl. 11. K. James VI); do condemn the monuments and dregs of bygone idolatry, as going to crosses, observing the festival days of saints, and such other superstitious and papistical rites, to the dishonour of God, contempt of true religion, and fostering of great errors among the people, and ordains the users of them to be punished for the second fault as idolaters (Act 104. Parl. 7. K. James VI). Like as many Acts of Parliament are conceived for maintenance of God's true and Christian religion, and the purity thereof in doctrine and sacraments of the true Church of God, the liberty and freedom thereof in her national synodal assemblies, presbyteries, sessions, policy, discipline, and jurisdiction thereof, as that purity of religion and liberty of the Church was used, professed, exercised, preached, and confessed according to the reformation of religion in this realm. (As for instance: Act 99. Parl. 7. Act 23. Parl. 11. Act 114. Parl. 12. Act 160. Parl. 13. K. James VI, ratified by Act 4. K. Charles.) So that Act 6. Parl. 1. and Act 68. Parl. 6. of K. James VI, in the year of God 1579, declare the ministers of the blessed evangel, whom God of His mercy had raised up or hereafter should raise, agreeing with them that then lived in doctrine and administration of the sacraments, and the people that professed Christ, as He was then offered in the evangel, and doth communicate with the holy sacraments (as in the reformed Kirks of this realm they were presently administered) according to the confession of faith to be the true and holy Kirk of Christ Jesus within this realm, and discerns and declares all and sundry, who either gainsays the word of the evangel, received and approved as the heads of the confession of faith, professed in Parliament in the year of God 1560, specified also in the first Parliament of K. James VI, and ratified in this present parliament, more particularly do specify; or that refuses the administration of the holy sacraments as they were then ministrated, to be no members of the said Kirk within this realm and true religion presently professed, so long as they keep themselves so divided from the society of Christ's body. And the subsequent Act 69. Parl. 6. K. James VI, declares that there is no other face of Kirk, nor other face of religion than was presently at that time by the favour of God established within this realm, which therefore is ever styled God's true religion, Christ's true religion, the true and Christian religion, and a perfect religion, which by manifold Acts of Parliament all within this realm are bound to profess to subscribe the Articles thereof, the confession of faith, to recant all doctrine and errors repugnant to any of the said Articles (Act 4 and 9. Parl. 1. Act 45. 46. 47. Parl. 3. Act 71. Parl. 6. Act 106. Parl. 7. Act 24. Parl. 11. Act 123. Parl. 12. Act 194 and 197. Parl. 14 of King James VI). And all magistrates, sheriffs, &c., on the one part, are ordained to search, apprehend, and punish all contravenors (for instance, Act 5. Parl. 1. Act 104. Parl. 7. Act 25. Parl. 11. K. James VI), and that, notwithstanding of the King's Majesty's licences on the contrary, which are discharged and declared to be of no force, in so far as they tend in any ways to the prejudice and hindrance of the execution of the Acts of Parliament against Papists and adversaries of the true religion (Act 106.

Parl. 7. K. James VI). On the other part, in Act 47. Parl. 3. K. James VI, it is declared and ordained, seeing the cause of God's true religion and His Highness's authority are so joined as the hurt of the one is common to both; and that none shall be reputed as loyal and faithful subjects to our Sovereign Lord or his authority, but be punishable as rebellers and gainstanders of the same, who shall not give their confession and make profession of the said true religion; and that they, who after defection shall give the confession of their faith of new, they shall promise to continue therein in time coming to maintain our Sovereign Lord's authority, and at the uttermost of their power to fortify, assist, and maintain the true preachers and professors of Christ's religion, against whatsoever enemies and gainstanders of the same; and namely, against all such of whatsoever nation, estate, or degree they be of, that have joined or bound themselves, or have assisted or assists to set forward and execute the cruel decrees of Trent, contrary to the preachers and true professors of the Word of God, which is repeated word by word in the Articles of Pacification at Perth, the 23d Feb., 1572, approved by Parliament the last of April 1573, ratified in Parliament 1578, and related Act 123. Parl. 12. of K. James VI., with this addition, that they are bound to resist all treasonable uproars and hostilities raised against the true religion, the King's Majesty and the true professors. Like as all lieges are bound to maintain the King's Majesty's royal person and authority, the authority of Parliaments, without which neither any laws or lawful judicatories can be established (Act 130. Act 131. Parl. 8. K. James VI), and the subject's liberties, who ought only to live and be governed by the King's laws, the common laws of this realm allanerly (Act 48. Parl. 3. K. James I, Act 79. Parl. 6. K. James VI, repeated in Act 131. Parl. 8. K. James VI), which if they be innovated or prejudged the commission anent the union of the two kingdoms of Scotland and England, which is the sole Act of 17 Parl. James VI, declares such confusion would ensue as this realm could be no more a free monarchy, because by the fundamental laws, ancient privileges, offices, and liberties of this kingdom, not only the princely authority of His Majesty's royal descent hath been these many ages maintained; also the people's security of their lands, livings, rights, offices, liberties and dignities preserved; and therefore for the preservation of the said true religion, laws and liberties of this kingdom, it is statute by Act 8. Parl. 1. repeated in Act 99. Parl. 7. ratified in Act 23. Parl. 11 and 14. Act of K. James VI and 4 Act of K. Charles, that all Kings and Princes at their coronation and reception of their princely authority, shall make their faithful promise by their solemn oath in the presence of the Eternal God, that during the whole time of their lives they shall serve the same Eternal God to the utmost of their power, according as He hath required in His most Holy Word, contained in the Old and New Testaments, and according to the same Word shall maintain the true religion of Christ Jesus, the preaching of His Holy Word, the due and right ministration of the sacraments now received and preached within this realm (according to the confession of faith immediately preceding); and shall abolish and gainstand all false religion contrary to the same; and shall rule the people committed to their charge according to the will and commandment of God revealed in His aforesaid Word, and according to the lowable laws and constitutions received in this realm, no ways repugnant to the said will of the Eternal God; and shall procure to the utmost of their power, to the Kirk of God, and whole Christian people, true and perfect peace in all time coming; and that they shall be careful to root out of their Empire all heretics and enemies to the true worship of God, who shall be convicted by the true Kirk of God of the aforesaid crimes. Which was also observed by His Majesty at his coronation in Edinburgh, 1633, as may be seen in the Order of the Coronation. In obedience to the commands of God, conform to the practice of the godly in former times, and according to the laudable example of our worthy and religious progenitors, and of many yet living amongst us, which was warranted also by act of council, commanding a general band to be made and subscribed by His Majesty's subjects of all ranks for two causes: one was, for defending the true religion, as it was then reformed, and is expressed in the confession of faith above written, and a former large confession established by sundry acts of lawful general assemblies and of Parliament unto which it hath relation, set down in public catechisms, and which had been for many years with a blessing from heaven preached and professed in this Kirk and kingdom, as God's undoubted truth grounded only upon His written Word. The other cause was for maintaining the King's Majesty, his person and estate: the true worship of God and the King's authority being so straitly joined, as that they had the same friends and common enemies, and did stand and fall together. And finally, being convinced in our minds, and confessing with our mouths, that the present and succeeding generations in this land are bound to keep the aforesaid national oath and subscription inviolable:—We noblemen, barons, gentlemen, burgesses, ministers, and commons under subscribing, considering divers times before, and especially at this time, the danger of the true reformed religion of the King's honour, and of the public of the kingdom, by the manifold innovations and evils generally contained and particularly mentioned in our late supplications, complaints, and protestations, do hereby profess, and before God, His angels and the world, solemnly declare, that with our whole hearts we agree and resolve all the days of our life constantly to adhere unto and to defend the aforesaid true religion, and forbearing the practice of all novations already introduced in the matters of the worship of God, or approbation of the corruptions of the public government of the Kirk, or civil places and power of kirkmen till they be tried and allowed in free assemblies and in Parliaments, to labour by all means lawful to recover the purity and liberty of the Gospel as it was established and professed before the aforesaid novations; and because, after due examination, we plainly perceive and undoubtedly believe that the innovations and evils contained in our supplications, complaints and protestations have no warrant of the Word of God, are contrary to the articles of the aforesaid confessions, to the intention and meaning of the blessed reformers of religion in this land, to the above-written Acts of Parliament, and do sensibly tend to the reëstablishing of the popish religion and

tyranny, and to the subversion and ruin of the true reformed religion, and of our liberties, laws and estates; we also declare that the aforesaid confessions are to be interpreted, and ought to be understood of the aforesaid novations and evils, no less than if every one of them had been expressed in the aforesaid confessions; and that we are obliged to detest and abhor them, amongst other particular heads of papistry abjured therein. And therefore from the knowledge and conscience of our duty to God, to our King and country, without any worldly respect or inducement so far as human infirmity will suffer, wishing a further measure of the grace of God for this effect, we promise and swear by the great name of the Lord our God, to continue in the profession and obedience of the aforesaid religion; that we shall defend the same, and resist all these contrary errors and corruptions according to our vocation, and to the utmost of that power that God hath put into our hands, all the days of our life. And in like manner, with the same heart we declare before God and men, that we have no intention or desire to attempt anything that may turn to the dishonour of God or the diminution of the King's greatness and authority; but on the contrary we promise and swear that we shall to the utmost of our power, with our means and lives, stand to the defence of our dread Sovereign the King's Majesty, his person and authority, in the defence and preservation of the aforesaid true religion, liberties and laws of the kingdom; as also to the mutual defence and assistance every one of us of another, in the same cause of maintaining the true religion and His Majesty's authority, with our best counsels, our bodies, means and whole power, against all sorts of persons whatsoever; so that whatsoever shall be done to the least of us for that cause shall be taken as done to us all in general, and to every one of us in particular; and that we shall neither directly or indirectly suffer ourselves to be divided or withdrawn by whatsoever suggestion, combination, allurement or terror from this blessed and loyal conjunction; nor shall cast in any let or impediment that may stay or hinder any such resolution as by common consent shall be found to conduce for so good ends; but on the contrary shall by all lawful means labour to further and promote the same; and if any such dangerous and divisive motion be made to us by word or writ, we and every one of us shall either suppress it or (if need be) shall incontinently make the same known, that it may be timously obviated. Neither do we fear the foul aspersions of rebellion, combination or what else our adversaries from their craft and malice would put upon us, seeing what we do is so well warranted, and ariseth from an unfeigned desire to maintain the true worship of God, the majesty of our King, and the peace of the kingdom for the common happiness of ourselves and posterity. And because we cannot look for a blessing from God upon our proceedings, except with our profession and subscription, we join such a life and conversation as beseemeth Christians who have renewed their covenant with God: we therefore faithfully promise, for ourselves, our followers, and all other under us, both in public, in our particular families and personal carriage, to endeavour to keep ourselves within the bounds of Christian liberty, and to be good examples to others of all godliness, soberness and righteousness, and of every duty we owe to God and man; and that this our union and conjunction may be observed without violation we call the living God, the searcher of our hearts to witness, who knoweth this to be our sincere desire and unfeigned resolution, as we shall answer to Jesus Christ in the great day, and under the pain of God's everlasting wrath, and of infamy, and of loss of all honour and respect in this world; most humbly beseeching the Lord to strengthen us by His Holy Spirit for this end, and to bless our desires and proceedings with a happy success, that religion and righteousness may flourish in the land, to the glory of God, the honour of our King, and peace and comfort of us all.' In witness whereof we have subscribed with our hands all the premises, &c."

A. D. 1638-1640.—The First Bishops' War.—In November, 1638, a General Assembly was convened at Glasgow, with the consent of the king, and was opened by the Marquis of Hamilton as Royal Commissioner. But when the Assembly took in hand the trial of the bishops, Hamilton withdrew and ordered the members to disperse. They paid no heed to the order, but deposed the bishops and excommunicated eight of them. "The Canons and the Liturgy were then rejected, and all acts of the Assemblies held since 1606 were annulled. In the North, where Huntly was the King's lieutenant, the Covenant had not been received, and the Tables resolved to enforce it with the sword. Scotland was now full of trained soldiers just come back from Germany, where they had learnt to fight in the Thirty Years' war, and as plenty of money had been collected among the Covenanters, an army was easily raised. Their banner bore the motto, 'For Religion, the Covenant, and the Country,' and their leader was James Graham, Earl of Montrose, one of the most zealous among the champions of the cause. . . . While Montrose had been thus busy for the Covenant in the North, the King had been making ready to put down his rebellious Scottish subjects with the sword. Early in May a fleet entered the Forth under the command of Hamilton. But the Tables took possession of the strongholds, and seized the ammunition which had been laid in for the King. They then raised another army of 22,000 foot and 1,200 horse, and placed at its head Alexander Leslie, a veteran trained in the German war. Their army they sent southwards to meet the English host which the King was bringing to reduce Scotland. The two armies faced each other on opposite banks of the Tweed. The Scots were skilfully posted on Dunse Law, a hill commanding the Northern road. To pass them without fighting was impossible, and to fight would have been almost certain defeat. The King seeing this agreed to treat. By a treaty called the Pacification of Berwick, it was settled that the questions at issue between the King and the Covenanters should be put to a free Assembly, that both armies should be disbanded, and that the strongholds should be restored to the King (June 9, 1639). The Assembly which met at Edinburgh repeated and approved all that had been done at Glasgow. When the Estates met for the first time in the New Parliament-house, June 2, 1640, they went still further, for they not only confirmed the Acts of the Assemblies, but ordered every one to sign the Covenant under pain of civil penal-

ties. Now for the first time they acted in open defiance of the King, to whom hitherto they had professed the greatest loyalty and submission. Three times had they been adjourned by the King, who had also refused to see the Commissioners whom they sent up to London. Now they met in spite of him, and, as in former times of troubles and difficulties, they appealed to France for help. When this intrigue with the French was found out, the Lord Loudon, one of their Commissioners, was sent to the Tower, and the English Parliament was summoned to vote supplies for putting down the Scots by force of arms."—M. Macarthur, *Hist. of Scotland, ch.* 7.

Also in: S. R. Gardiner, *Hist. of Eng.*, 1603–1641, *ch.* 88–89 (*v.* 9).—D. Masson, *Life of John Milton, v.* 2, *bk.* 1, *ch.* 1.

A. D. 1640.—The Second Bishops' War.—Invasion of England. See England: A. D. 1640.

A. D. 1643.—The Solemn League and Covenant with the English Parliament. See England: A. D. 1643 (July—September).

A. D. 1644-1645.—The exploits of Montrose.—At the beginning of the conflict between Charles I. and the Covenanters, James Graham, the brilliant and accomplished Earl of Montrose, attached himself to the latter, but soon deserted their cause and gave himself with great earnestness to that of the court. For his reward, he was raised to the dignity of Marquis of Montrose. After the great defeat of Prince Rupert at Marston Moor, Montrose obtained a commission to raise forces among the Highlanders and proved to be a remarkably successful leader of these wild warriors. Along with his Highlanders he incorporated a body of still wilder Celts, received from Ireland. On the 1st of September, 1644, Montrose attacked an army of the Covenanters, 6,000 foot and horse, at Tippermuir, "totally routed them, and took their artillery and baggage, without losing a man. Perth immediately surrendered to Montrose, and he had some further successes; but threatened by a superior force under the Marquis of Argyll, he retreated northwards into Badenoch, and thence sweeping down into Argyllshire, he mercilessly ravaged the country of the Campbells. Exasperated with the devastation of his estates, Argyll marched against Montrose, who, not waiting to be attacked, surprised the army of the Covenanters at Inverlochy, 2d February, 1645, and totally defeated them, no fewer than 1,500 of the clan Campbell perishing in the battle, while Montrose lost only four or five men. Brilliant as were these victories, they had no abiding influence in quenching this terrible civil war. It was a game of winning and losing; and looking to the fact that the Scotch generally took the side of the Covenant, the struggle was almost hopeless. Still Montrose was undaunted. After the Inverlochy affair, he went southwards through Elgin and Banff into Aberdeenshire, carrying everything before him. Major-general Baillie, a second-rate Covenanting commander, and his lieutenant, General Hurry, were at Brechin, with a force to oppose him; but Montrose, by a dexterous movement, eluded them, captured and pillaged the city of Dundee, and escaped safely into the Grampians. On the 4th May, he attacked, and by extraordinary generalship routed Hurry at Auldearn, near Nairn. After enjoying a short respite with his fierce veterans in Badenoch, he again issued from his wilds, and inflicted a still more disastrous defeat on Baillie, at Alford, in Aberdeenshire, July 2. There was now nothing to prevent his march south, and he set out with a force of from 5,000 to 6,000 men." Overtaken by Baillie at Kilsyth, he once more defeated that commander overwhelmingly. "The number of slain was upwards of 6,000, with very few killed on the side of the royalists. The victory so effected, 15th August 1645, was the greatest Montrose ever gained. His triumph was complete; for the victory of Kilsyth put him in possession of the whole of Scotland. The government of the country was broken up; every organ of the recent administration, civil and ecclesiastical, at once vanished. The conqueror was hailed as 'the great Marquis of Montrose.' Glasgow yielded him tribute and homage; counties and burghs compounded for mercy. The city of Edinburgh humbly deprecated his vengeance, and implored his pardon and forgiveness." But, if the conquest of Scotland was complete for the moment, it came too late. The battle of Naseby had been fought two months before the battle of Kilsyth, and the king's cause was lost. It was in vain that Charles sent to his brilliant champion of the north a commission as Lieutenant-governor of Scotland. Montrose's army melted away so rapidly that when, in September, he marched south, leading his forlorn hope to the help of the king in England, he had but 700 foot and 200 mounted gentlemen. The small force was intercepted and surprised at Philiphaugh (September 13, 1645) by Leslie, with 4,000 horse. Montrose, after fighting with vain obstinacy until no more fighting could be done, made his escape, with a few followers. Most of his troops, taken prisoners, were massacred a few days afterwards, cold-bloodedly, in the courtyard of Newark Castle; and the deed is said to have been due, not to military, but to clerical malignity.—W. Chambers, *Stories of Old Families, pp.* 206–217.

Also in: M. Napier, *Montrose and the Covenanters.*—J. H. Burton, *Hist. of Scotland, ch.* 73 (*v.* 7).—Lady V. Greville, *Montrose.*—P. Bayne, *The Chief Actors in the Puritan Revolution, ch.* 7.

A. D. 1646-1647.—Flight of King Charles to the Scots army and his surrender to the English Parliament. See England: A. D. 1646–1647.

A. D. 1648.—Royalist invasion of England and Battle of Preston. See England: A. D. 1648 (April—August).

A. D. 1650 (March—July).—Scottish loyalty revived.—Charles II. accepted as a "Covenant King."—"The Scots had begun the great movement whose object was at once to resist the tyranny of the Stuarts and the tyranny of Rome, and which was destined to result in incalculable consequences for Europe. But now they retraced their steps, and put themselves in opposition to the Commonwealth of England. They wanted a leader. 'With Oliver Cromwell born a Scotchman,' says Carlyle; 'with a Hero King and a unanimous Hero Nation at his back, it might have been far otherwise. With Oliver born Scotch, one sees not but the whole world might have become Puritan.' Without shutting our eyes to the truth there may be in this passage, we find the cause of this northern war elsewhere. In spiritual things the Scots acknowledged Jesus Christ as their king; in temporal, they recognized Charles II. They had no wish

that the latter should usurp the kingdom of the former; but they also had no desire that Cromwell should seize upon the Stuarts' throne. They possessed a double loyalty — one towards the heavenly king, and another to their earthly sovereign. They had cast off the abuses of the latter, but not the monarchy itself. They accordingly invited the prince, who was then in Holland, to come to Scotland, and take possession of his kingdom. . . . Charles at this time was conniving at Montrose, who was spreading desolation throughout Scotland; and the young king hoped by his means to recover a throne without having to take upon himself any embarrassing engagement. But when the marquis was defeated, he determined to surrender to the Scottish parliament. One circumstance had nearly caused his ruin. Among Montrose's papers was found a commission from the king, giving him authority to levy troops and subdue the country by force of arms. The indignant parliament immediately recalled their commissioner from Holland; but the individual to whom the order was addressed treacherously concealed the document from his colleagues, and by showing it to none but the prince, gave him to understand that he could no longer safely temporize. Charles being thus convinced hurried on board, and set sail for Scotland, attended by a train of unprincipled men. The most serious thinkers in the nation saw that they could expect little else from him than duplicity, treachery, and licentiousness. It has been said that the Scotch compelled Charles to adopt their detested Covenant voluntarily. Most certainly the political leaders cannot be entirely exculpated of this charge; but it was not so with the religious part of the government. When he declared his readiness to sign that deed on board the ship, even before he landed, Livingston, who doubted his sincerity, begged him to wait until he had reached Scotland, and given satisfactory proofs of his good faith. But it was all to no effect. . . . If Charles Stuart had thought of ascending his native throne only, Cromwell and the English would have remained quiet; but he aimed at the recovery of the three kingdoms, and the Scotch were disposed to aid him. Oliver immediately saw the magnitude of the danger which threatened the religion, liberty, and morals of England, and did not hesitate."— J. H. Merle d'Aubigne, *The Protector, ch.* 7.

Also in: A. Bisset, *Omitted Chapters of the Hist. of Eng., v.* 1, *ch.* 5.—J. H. Burton, *Hist. of Scotland, ch.* 75 (*v.* 7).—P. Bayne, *The Chief Actors in the Puritan Revolution, ch.* 6.

A. D. 1650 (September).— Cromwell's victory at Dunbar.— War with Scotland having been determined upon by the English Council of State, and Fairfax having declined the command, Cromwell was recalled from Ireland to head the army. "He passed the Tweed with an army of 16,000 men on the 16th of July. The Scots had placed themselves under the command of the old Earl of Leven and of David Leslie. As yet their army was a purely Covenanting one. By an act of the Scotch Church, called the Act of Classes, all known Malignants, and the Engagers (as those men were called who had joined Hamilton's insurrection), had been removed from the army. The country between the Tweed and Edinburgh had been wasted; and the inhabitants, terrified by ridiculous stories of the English cruelty, had taken flight; but Cromwell's army, marching by the coast, was supplied by the fleet. He thus reached the immediate neighbourhood of Edinburgh; but Leslie skilfully availed himself of the advantages of the ground and refused to be brought to an engagement. It became necessary for Cromwell to withdraw towards his supplies. He fell back to Dunbar, which lies upon a peninsula, jutting out into the Firth of Forth. The base of this peninsula is at a little distance encircled by high ground, an offshoot of the Lammermuir Hills. These heights were occupied by the Scotch army, as was also the pass through which the road to Berwick lies. Cromwell was therefore apparently shut up between the enemy and the sea, with no choice but to retire to his ships or surrender. Had Leslie continued his cautious policy, such might have been the event. A little glen, through which runs a brook called the Broxburn, separated the two enemies. Between it and the high grounds lay a narrow but comparatively level tract. Either army attacking the other must cross this glen. There were two convenient places for passing it: one, the more inland one, towards the right of the English, who stood with their back to the sea, was already in the hands of the Scotch. Could Leslie secure the other, at the mouth of the glen, he would have it in his power to attack when he pleased. The temptation was too strong for him; he gradually moved his army down from the hills towards its own right flank, thereby bringing it on the narrow ground between the hill and the brook, intending with his right to secure the passage at Broxmouth. Cromwell and Lambert saw the movement, saw that it gave them a corresponding advantage if they suddenly crossed the glen at Broxmouth, and fell upon Leslie's right wing, while his main body was entangled in the narrow ground before mentioned. The attack was immediately decided upon, and [next morning] early on the 3rd of September carried out with perfect success. The Scotch horse of the right wing were driven in confusion back upon their main body, whom they trampled under foot, and the whole army was thus rolled back upon itself in inextricable confusion."— J. F. Bright, *Hist. of Eng., period* 2, *pp.* 694–696.— "The pursuit extended over a distance of eight miles, and the total loss of the Scots amounted to 3,000 killed and 10,000 prisoners, while 30 guns and 15,000 stand of arms were taken; the casualties of the English army did not exceed 20 men. Of the prisoners, 5,000, being wounded, old men or boys, were allowed to return home; the remaining 5,000 were sent into England, whence, after enduring terrible hardships, they were, as had been the prisoners taken at Preston, sold either as slaves to the planters or as soldiers to the Venetians. On the day following that of the battle, Lambert pushed on to Edinburgh with six regiments of horse and one of foot; Cromwell himself, after a rest of a few days, advanced on the capital, which at once surrendered to the victors. The example thus set was followed by Leith, but Edinburgh Castle still held out [until the following December] against the English. The remnant of the Scottish army (but 1,300 horse remained of the 6,000 who took part in the battle) retired on Stirling, while Charles himself took up his residence at Perth."— N. L. Walford, *Parliamentary Generals of the Great Civil War, ch.* 8.

ALSO IN: A. Bisset, *Omitted Chapters of the Hist. of Eng., ch.* 6.—T. Carlyle, *Oliver Cromwell's Letters and Speeches, pt.* 6.

A. D. 1651 (August).—Charles' rash advance into England.—Cromwell's pursuit and crushing victory at Worcester.—"Lesley was gathering the wreck of his army about him at Stirling. Charles, with the Scottish authorities, had retired to Perth. The Presbyterian party became divided; and the royalists obtained a higher influence in the direction of the national policy. Charles, without further question of his real intentions, was crowned at Scone on the 1st of January, 1651. After a three months' blockade, and then a bombardment, Edinburgh Castle was surrendered to Cromwell on the 18th of December. He had little to do to make himself master of Scotland on the south of the Forth. On the 4th of February the army marched towards Stirling, but returned without any result, driven to the good quarters of Edinburgh by terrible storms of sleet and snow. The Lord-General became seriously ill through this exposure. But on the 5th of June he was out again; and at the end of the month was vigorously prosecuting the campaign. The Scottish army was entrenched at Stirling. The king had been invited to take its command in person. Cromwell, on the 2nd of August, had succeeded in possessing himself of Perth. At that juncture the news reached him that the royal camp at Stirling was broken up, on the 31st of July; and that Charles was on his march southward, at the head of 11,000 men, his lieutenant-general being David Lesley. Argyll was opposed to this bold resolution, and had retired to Inverary. Charles took the western road by Carlisle; and when on English ground issued a proclamation offering pardon to those who would return to their allegiance — exempting from his promised amnesty Bradshaw, Cromwell, and Cook. He was also proclaimed king of England, at the head of his army: and similar proclamation was made at Penrith and other market-towns. Strict discipline was preserved, and although the presence of Scots in arms was hateful to the people, they were not outraged by any attempts at plunder. Charles, however, had few important accessions of strength. There was no general rising in his favour. The gates of Shrewsbury were shut against him. At Warrington, his passage of the Mersey was opposed by Lambert and Harrison, who had got before him with their cavalry. On the 22nd of August Charles reached Worcester, the parliamentary garrison having evacuated the city. He there set up his standard, and a summons went forth for all male subjects of due age to gather round their Sovereign Lord, at the general muster of his forces on the 26th of August. An inconsiderable number of gentlemen came, with about 200 followers. Meanwhile Cromwell had marched rapidly from Scotland with 10,000 men, leaving behind him 6,000 men under Monk. The militias of the counties joined him with a zeal which showed their belief that another civil war would not be a national blessing. On the 28th of August the General of the Commonwealth was close to Worcester, with 30,000 men." On the 3d of September (the anniversary of the victory of Dunbar, won just a year before), he attacked the royalist army and made an end of it. "'We beat the enemy from hedge to hedge [he wrote to parliament] till we beat him into Worcester. The enemy then drew all his forces on the other side the town, all but what he had lost; and made a very considerable fight with us, for three hours' space; but in the end we beat him totally, and pursued him to his royal fort, which we took,—and indeed have beaten his whole army.' The prisoners taken at the battle of Worcester, and in the subsequent flight, exceeded 7,000. They included some of the most distinguished leaders of the royalists in England and Scotland. Courts-martial were held upon nine of these; and three, amongst whom was the earl of Derby, were executed." Charles Stuart escaped by flight, with his long cavalier locks cut close and his royal person ignobly disguised, wandering and hiding for six weeks before he reached the coast and got ship for France. The story of his adventures — his concealment in the oak at Boscobel, his ride to Bristol as a serving man, with a lady on the pillion behind him, &c., &c.,— has been told often enough.—C. Knight, *Crown Hist. of Eng., ch.* 27.

ALSO IN: T. Carlyle, *Oliver Cromwell's Letters and Speeches, pt.* 6, *letters* 96–124.—Earl of Clarendon, *Hist. of the Rebellion, bk.* 13 (*v.* 5).—A. Bisset, *Omitted Chapters of Eng. Hist., ch.* 10–11 (*v.* 2).—F. P. Guizot, *Hist. of Oliver Cromwell, bk.* 2 (*v.* 1).

A. D. 1651 (August—September).—The conquest completed by Monk.—When Cromwell followed Charles and his Scottish army into England, to destroy them at Worcester, he left Monk in Scotland, with a few thousand men, and that resolute general soon completed the conquest of the kingdom. He met with most resistance at Dundee. "Dundee was a town well fortified, supplied with a good garrison under Lumisden, and full of all the rich furniture, the plate, and money of the kingdom, which had been sent thither as to a place of safety. Monk appeared before it; and having made a breach, gave a general assault. He carried the town; and, following the example and instructions of Cromwell, put all the inhabitants to the sword, in order to strike a general terror into the kingdom. Warned by this example, Aberdeen, St. Andrew's, Inverness, and other towns and forts, yielded, of their own accord, to the enemy. . . . That kingdom, which had hitherto, through all ages, by means of its situation, poverty, and valour, maintained its independence, was reduced to total subjection."—D. Hume, *Hist. of Eng., ch.* 60 (*v.* 5).

ALSO IN: J. Browne, *Hist. of the Highlands, v.* 2, *ch.* 4.

A. D. 1654.—Incorporated with England by Protector Cromwell.—In 1654, "Cromwell completed another work which the Long Parliament and the Barebone Parliament had both undertaken and left unfinished. Under favour of the discussions which had arisen between the great powers of the Commonwealth, the Scottish royalists had once more conceived hopes, and taken up arms. . . . The insurrection, though chiefly confined to the Highlands, descended occasionally to ravage the plains; and towards the beginning of February, 1654, Middleton had been sent from France, by Charles II., to attempt to give, in the king's name, that unity and consistency of action in which it had until then been deficient. No sooner had he been proclaimed Protector, than Cromwell took decisive measures to crush

these dangers in their infancy: he despatched to Ireland his second son, Henry, an intelligent, circumspect, and resolute young man, and to Scotland, Monk, whom that country had already once recognized as her conqueror. Both succeeded in their mission. . . . Monk, with his usual prompt and intrepid boldness, carried the war into the very heart of the Highlands, established his quarters there, pursued the insurgents into their most inaccessible retreats, defeated Middleton and compelled him to re-embark for the Continent, and, after a campaign of four months, returned to Edinburgh at the end of August, 1654, and began once more, without passion or noise, to govern the country which he had twice subjugated. Cromwell had reckoned beforehand on his success, for, on the 12th of April, 1654, at the very period when he ordered Monk to march against the Scottish insurgents, he had, by a sovereign ordinance, incorporated Scotland with England, abolished all monarchical or feudal jurisdiction in the ancient realm of the Stuarts, and determined the place which its representatives, as well as those of Ireland, should occupy in the common Parliament of the new State."—F. P. Guizot, *Hist. of Oliver Cromwell, bk.* 5 (*v.* 2).

Also in: J. Lingard, *Hist. of Eng., v.* 11, *ch.* 1.

A. D. 1660-1666.—The restored King and the restored prelatical Church.—The oppression of the Covenanters.—"In Scotland the restoration of the Stuarts had been hailed with delight; for it was regarded as the restoration of national independence. And true it was that the yoke which Cromwell had imposed was, in appearance, taken away, that the Scottish Estates again met in their old hall at Edinburgh, and that the Senators of the College of Justice again administered the Scottish law according to the old forms. Yet was the independence of the little kingdom necessarily rather nominal than real: for, as long as the King had England on his side, he had nothing to apprehend from disaffection in his other dominions. He was now in such a situation that he could renew the attempt which had proved destructive to his father without any danger of his father's fate. . . . The government resolved to set up a prelatical church in Scotland. The design was disapproved by every Scotchman whose judgment was entitled to respect. . . . The Scottish Parliament was so constituted that it had scarcely ever offered any serious opposition even to Kings much weaker than Charles then was. Episcopacy, therefore, was established by law. As to the form of worship, a large discretion was left to the clergy. In some churches the English Liturgy was used. In others, the ministers selected from that Liturgy such prayers and thanksgivings as were likely to be least offensive to the people. But in general the doxology was sung at the close of public worship, and the Apostles' Creed was recited when baptism was administered. By the great body of the Scottish nation the new Church was detested both as superstitious and as foreign; as tainted with the corruptions of Rome, and as a mark of the predominance of England. There was, however, no general insurrection. The country was not what it had been twenty-two years before. Disastrous war and alien domination had tamed the spirit of the people. . . . The bulk of the Scottish nation, therefore, sullenly submitted, and, with many misgivings of conscience, attended the ministrations of the Episcopal clergy, or of Presbyterian divines who had consented to accept from the government a half toleration known by the name of the Indulgence. But there were, particularly in the western lowlands, many fierce and resolute men who held that the obligation to observe the Covenant was paramount to the obligation to obey the magistrate. These people, in defiance of the law, persisted in meeting to worship God after their own fashion. The Indulgence they regarded, not as a partial reparation of the wrongs inflicted by the State on the Church, but as a new wrong, the more odious because it was disguised under the appearance of a benefit. Persecution, they said, could only kill the body; but the black Indulgence was deadly to the soul. Driven from the towns, they assembled on heaths and mountains. Attacked by the civil power, they without scruple repelled force by force. At every conventicle they mustered in arms. They repeatedly broke out into open rebellion. They were easily defeated and mercilessly punished: but neither defeat nor punishment could subdue their spirit. Hunted down like wild beasts, tortured till their bones were beaten flat, imprisoned by hundreds, hanged by scores, exposed at one time to the license of soldiers from England, abandoned at another time to the mercy of troops of marauders from the Highlands, they still stood at bay, in a mood so savage that the boldest and mightiest oppressor could not but dread the audacity of their despair."—Lord Macaulay, *Hist. of Eng., ch.* 2 (*v.* 1).—The Scottish Parliament by which Episcopacy was established at the king's bidding is known as the Drunken Parliament. "Every man of them, with one exception, is said to have been intoxicated at the time of passing it [October 1, 1662]. Its effect was that 350 ministers were ejected from their livings. The apparatus of ecclesiastical tyranny was completed by a Mile Act, similar to the Five Mile Act of England, forbidding any recusant minister to reside within twenty miles of his own parish, or within three miles of a royal borough."—J. F. Bright, *Hist. of Eng., period* 2, *p.* 729.—"The violence of the drunken parliament was finally shown in the absurdity of what was called the 'Act Rescissory,' by which every law that had been passed in the Scottish parliament during twenty-eight years was wholly annulled. The legal foundations of Presbytery were thus swept away."—C. Knight, *Crown Hist. of Eng., ch.* 29.

Also in: J. Aikman, *Annals of the Persecution in Scotland, v.* 1, *bk.* 2–5.

A. D. 1669-1679.—Lauderdale's despotism.—The Highland host.—"A new Parliament was assembled [October 19, 1669] at Edinburgh, and Lauderdale was sent down commissioner. . . . It were endless to recount every act of violence and arbitrary authority exercised during Lauderdale's administration. All the lawyers were put from the bar, nay banished, by the king's order, twelve miles from the capital, and by that means the whole justice of the kingdom was suspended for a year, till these lawyers were brought to declare it as their opinion that all appeals to Parliament were illegal. A letter was procured from the king, for expelling twelve of the chief magistrates of Edinburgh, and declaring them incapable of all public office, though their only crime had been their want of compliance with

Lauderdale. . . . The private deportment of Lauderdale was as insolent and provoking as his public administration was violent and tyrannical. Justice likewise was universally perverted by faction and interest: and from the great rapacity of that duke, and still more of his duchess, all offices and favours were openly put to sale. No one was allowed to approach the throne who was not dependent on him; and no remedy could be hoped for or obtained against his manifold oppressions. . . . The law enacted against conventicles had called them seminaries of rebellion. This expression, which was nothing but a flourish of rhetoric, Lauderdale and the privy council were willing to understand in a literal sense; and because the western counties abounded in conventicles, though otherwise in profound peace, they pretended that these counties were in a state of actual war and rebellion. They made therefore an agreement with some highland chieftains to call out their clans, to the number of 8,000 men; to these they joined the guards, and the militia of Angus: and they sent the whole to live at free quarters upon the lands of such as had refused the bonds [engaging them as landlords to restrain their tenants from attending conventicles] illegally required of them. The obnoxious counties were the most populous and most industrious in Scotland. The highlanders were the people the most disorderly and the least civilized. It is easy to imagine the havoc and destruction which ensued. . . . After two months' free quarter, the highlanders were sent back to their hills, loaded with the spoils and the execrations of the west. . . . Lest the cry of an oppressed people should reach the throne, the council forbad, under severe penalties, all noblemen or gentlemen of landed property to leave the kingdom. . . . It is reported that Charles, after a full hearing of the debates concerning Scottish affairs, said, 'I perceive that Lauderdale has been guilty of many bad things against the people of Scotland; but I cannot find that he has acted anything contrary to my interest.'"—D. Hume, *Hist. of Eng., ch.* 66 (*v.* 6).

Also in: G. Burnet, *Hist. of My Own Time, bk.* 2–3.—J. H. Burton, *Hist. of Scotland, ch.* 78 (*v.* 7).

A. D. 1679 (May—June).—The Defeat of Claverhouse at Drumclog.—"The public indignation which these measures [under Lauderdale] roused was chiefly directed against the Archbishop of St. Andrews [Dr. James Sharp], who was generally regarded as their author or instigator, and was doubly obnoxious as the Judas of the Presbyterian Church." On the 3d of May, 1679, the Archbishop was dragged from his carriage on Magus Moor, three miles from St. Andrews, and murdered, by a band of twelve Covenanters, headed by Hackston of Rathillet, and Balfour of Burley, his brother-in-law. "The great body of the Presbyterians, though doubtless thinking that 'the loon was weel away,' condemned this cruel and bloody deed as a foul murder; and they could not fail to see that it would greatly increase the severity of the persecution against their party. . . . It was now declared a treasonable act to attend a conventicle, and orders were issued to the commanders of the troops in the western district to disperse all such meetings at the point of the sword. . . . Towards the end of May preparations were made to hold a great conventicle on a moor in the parish of Avondale, near the borders of Lanarkshire. The day selected for the service was the first of June. No secret was made of the arrangement, and it became known to John Graham of Claverhouse, the 'Bloody Claverhouse,' as he was called, who commanded a body of dragoons, stationed at Glasgow, for the purpose of suppressing the Covenanters in that district. . . . Having been apprised of the intended meeting, he hastened towards the spot at the head of his own troop of horse and two companies of dragoons. . . . The Covenanters had assembled on the farm of Drumclog, in the midst of a high and moorland district out of which rises the wild craggy eminence of Loudoun Hill, in whose vicinity Robert Bruce gained his first victory. . . . The preacher, Thomas Douglas, had proceeded only a short way with his sermon when a watchman posted on an adjoining height fired his gun as a signal that the enemy was approaching. The preacher paused in his discourse, and closed with the oft-quoted words—'You have got the theory; now for the practice.' The women and children were sent to the rear. The armed men separated from the rest of the meeting and took up their position. . . . Claverhouse and his dragoons were descending the slope of the opposite eminence, called Calder Hill, and with a loud cheer they rushed towards the morass and fired a volley at the Covenanters. It was returned with great effect, emptying a number of saddles. The dragoons made several unsuccessful attempts to cross the marsh, and flanking parties sent to the right and to the left were repulsed with considerable loss. At this juncture John Nisbet [an old soldier of the Thirty Years War] cried out, 'Jump the ditch and charge the enemy.' The order was instantly obeyed. Balfour, at the head of the horsemen, and Cleland, with a portion of the infantry, crossed the marsh and attacked the dragoons with such fury that they were thrown into confusion and took to flight, leaving from forty to fifty of their number dead on the field. Claverhouse himself had his horse killed under him and narrowly escaped his pursuers. . . . The victory at Drumclog roused the whole country. Great numbers poured in to join the victors, and in a short time their ranks had swelled to upwards of 6,000 men."—J. Taylor, *The Scottish Covenanters, ch.* 4.

Also in: M. Morris, *Claverhouse, ch.* 4.—Sir W. Scott, *Old Mortality.*

A. D. 1679 (June).—Monmouth's success at Bothwell Bridge.—"The King was for suppressing the insurrection immediately by forces from England to join those in Scotland, and the Duke of Monmouth to command them all. . . . The Duke of Monmouth, after a friendly parting with the King, who had been displeased with him, set out from London, June 18, for Scotland, where he arrived in three days, with an expedition considered incredible, and took the command. The Covenanters were 5,000 or 6,000 strong, and had taken up a position six miles from Hamilton, at Bothwell Bridge, which they barricadoed and disputed the Duke's passage. These Covenanters were irresolute. An attempt to negotiate was made, but they were told that no proposal could be received from rebels in arms. One half hour was allowed. The Covenanters went on consuming their time in theological controversy, considering 'the Duke to be in rebellion against the Lord and his people.'

While thus almost unprepared, they were entirely defeated in an action, 22d of June, which, in compliment to the Duke of Monmouth, was too proudly called the battle of Bothwell Bridge. Four hundred Covenanters were killed, and 1,200 made prisoners. Monmouth was evidently favourable to them. . . . The Duke would not let the dragoons pursue and massacre those (as Oldmixon calls them) Protestants. . . . The same historian adds, that the Duke of York talked of Monmouth's expedition to Scotland, as a courting the people there, and their friends in England, by his sparing those that were left alive; and that Charles himself said to Monmouth, 'If I had been there, we would not have had the trouble of prisoners.' The Duke answered, 'I cannot kill men in cold blood; that's work only for butchers.' The prisoners who promised to live peaceably were set at liberty; the others, about 270, were transported to our plantations, but were all cast away at sea! The Duke of Lauderdale's creatures pressed the keeping the army some time in Scotland, with a design to have them eat it up; but the Duke of Monmouth sent home the militia, and put the troops under discipline; so that all the country was sensible he had preserved them from ruin. The Duke asked the King to grant an indemnity for what was past, and liberty to the Covenanters to hold their meetings under the King's license; but these softening measures fell with Monmouth, and rage and slaughter again reigned when the Duke of York obtained the government of Scotland."—G. Roberts, *Life of Monmouth, ch.* 4 (*v.* 1).

Also in: J. H. Burton, *Hist. of Scotland, ch.* 79 (*v.* 7).

A. D. 1681-1689.—The pitiless rule of James II.—The hunting of the Cameronians.—Claverhouse's brutalities.—In 1681 the government of Scotland was committed to the king's brother, the duke of York (afterwards James II.), as viceroy. "Succeeding the duke of Monmouth, who was universally beloved, he was anxious to exhibit as a statesman that capacity which he thought he had given sufficient proof of as a general and as a naval commander. In assuming the direction of the affairs of Scotland, he at first affected moderation; but at a very early period an occasion presented itself for displaying severity; he was then pitiless. A few hundred presbyterians, under the conduct of two ministers, Cameron and Cargill, having taken arms and declared that they would acknowledge neither the king nor the bishops, he sent the troops against them. The insurgents, who called themselves Cargillites and Cameronians, were beaten, and a great number of them killed. The prisoners, taken to Edinburgh, were tortured and put to death. The duke was present at the executions, which he witnessed with an unmoved countenance, and as though they were curious experiments."—A. Carrel, *Hist. of the Counter-Revolution in Eng., ch.* 2.—"Unlike the English Puritans, the great majority of the Scottish Presbyterians were staunch supporters of monarchy. . . . Now, however, owing to the 'oppression which maketh a wise man mad,' an extreme party arose among them, who not only condemned the Indulgence and refused to pay cess, but publicly threw off their allegiance to the King, on the ground of his violation of his coronation oath, his breach of the Covenant which he solemnly swore to maintain, his perfidy, and his 'tyranny in matters civil.' A declaration to this effect was publicly read, and then affixed (June 22d, 1680) to the market cross of Sanquhar in Dumfriesshire, by Richard Cameron and Donald Cargill, two of the most distinguished Covenanting ministers, accompanied by an armed party of about twenty persons. . . . These acts of the 'Society men,' or Cameronians, as they were called after their leader, afforded the government a plausible pretext for far more severe measures than they had yet taken against the Hillmen, whom they hunted for several weeks through the moors and wild glens of Ayr and Galloway."—J. Taylor, *The Scottish Covenanters, ch.* 4.—"He [James II.], whose favourite theme had been the injustice of requiring civil functionaries to take religious tests, established in Scotland, when he resided there as Viceroy, the most rigorous religious test that has ever been known in the empire. He, who had expressed just indignation when the priests of his own faith were hanged and quartered, amused himself with hearing Covenanters shriek and seeing them writhe while their knees were beaten flat in the boots. In this mood he became King, and he immediately demanded and obtained from the obsequious Estates of Scotland, as the surest pledge of their loyalty, the most sanguinary law that has ever in our islands been enacted against Protestant Nonconformists. With this law the whole spirit of his administration was in perfect harmony. The fiery persecution, which had raged when he ruled Scotland as vicegerent, waxed hotter than ever from the day on which he became sovereign. Those shires in which the Covenanters were most numerous were given up to the license of the army. . . . Preeminent among the bands which oppressed and wasted these unhappy districts were the dragoons commanded by John Graham of Claverhouse. The story ran that these wicked men used in their revels to play at the torments of hell, and to call each other by the names of devils and damned souls. The chief of this Tophet, a soldier of distinguished courage and professional skill, but rapacious and profane, of violent temper and obdurate heart, has left a name which, wherever the Scottish race is settled on the face of the globe, is mentioned with a peculiar energy of hatred. To recapitulate all the crimes by which this man, and men like him, goaded the peasantry of the Western Lowlands into madness, would be an endless task."—Lord Macaulay, *Hist. of Eng., ch.* 4 (*v.* 1).

Also in: J. Cunningham, *Hist. of the Ch. of Scotland, v.* 2, *ch.* 6.—M. Morris, *Claverhouse.*—J. Aikman, *Annals of the Persecution in Scotland, v.* 2, *bk.* 5–12.—*A Cloud of Witnesses.*—J. Howie, *The Scots Worthies.*

A. D. 1685.—Argyll's invasion.—Monmouth's rebellion. See England: A. D. 1685 (May—July).

A. D. 1687.—Declarations of Indulgence by James II. See England: A. D. 1687–1688.

A. D. 1688-1690.—The Revolution.—Fall of the Stuarts and their Bishops.—Presbyterianism finally restored and established.—"At the first prospect of invasion from Holland [by William of Orange], James had ordered the regiments on duty in Scotland to march southward. The withdrawal of the troops was followed by outbreaks in various parts. In Glasgow the

Covenanters rose, and proclaimed the Prince of Orange king. In Edinburgh riots broke out. The chapel of Holyrood Palace was dismantled, and the Romish bishops and priests fled in fear for their lives. On hearing that William had entered into London, the leading Whigs, under the Duke of Hamilton, repaired thither, and had an interview with him. He invited them to meet in Convention. This they accordingly did, and on January 9, 1689, it was resolved to request William to summon a meeting of the Scottish Estates for the 14th of March, and in the interim to administer the government. To this William consented. The Estates of Scotland met on the appointed day. All the bishops, and a great number of the peers were adherents of James. After a stormy debate, the Duke of Hamilton was elected President. But the minority (Jacobites) was a large one. . . . The Duke of Gordon still held Edinburgh Castle for James, and when the minority found it hopeless to carry their measures, he proposed they should with him withdraw from Edinburgh and hold a rival Convention at Stirling. But these intentions were discovered, many Jacobites were arrested, and many others, amongst them Viscount Dundee, escaped to the Highlands. In the end, the crown was offered to William and Mary on the same terms on which it had been offered by the English Convention. The offer was accompanied by a claim of rights, almost identical with the English declaration, but containing the additional clause, that 'prelacy was a great and insupportable grievance.' On April 11, 1689, William and Mary were solemnly proclaimed at the Cross of Edinburgh. It was high time some form of government should be settled, for, throughout the Lowlands, scenes of mob violence were daily witnessed. The Presbyterians, so long down-trodden, rose in many a parish. The Episcopal clergy were ejected, in some cases with bloodshed. The 'rabbling,' as it is called in Scotch history, continued for some months, until the Presbyterian Church was reinstated by law as the Established Church of Scotland, in June 1690."—E. Hale, *The Fall of the Stuarts, ch.* 13.—"Episcopacy was now thrown down; but Presbytery was yet to be built up. . . . Months passed away, and the year 1690 began. King William was quite prepared to establish Presbytery, but he was most unwilling to abolish patronage. Moreover, he was desirous that the foundations of the new Church should be as widely laid as possible, and that it should comprehend all the ministers of the old Church who chose to conform to its discipline. But he began to see that some concession was necessary, if a Church was to be built up at all. On the 25th of April the Parliament met which was to give us the Establishment which we still enjoy. Its first act was to abolish the Act 1669, which asserted the king's supremacy over all persons and in all causes. Its second act was to restore all the Presbyterian ministers who had been ejected from their livings for not complying with Prelacy. This done, the parliament paused in its full career of ecclesiastical legislation, and abolished the Lords of the Articles, who for so many centuries had managed the whole business of the Scotch Estates, and ordained that the electors of commissioners to the Estates should take the Oath of Allegiance before exercising the franchise. The next act forms the foundation of our present Establishment. It ratifies the 'Westminster Confession of Faith'; it revives the Act 1592; it repeals all the laws in favour of Episcopacy; it legalizes the ejections of the western rabble; it declares that the government of the Church was to be vested in the ministers who were outed for nonconformity, on and after the 1st January 1661, and were now restored, and those who had been or should be admitted by them; it appoints the General Assembly to meet; and empowers it to nominate visitors to purge out all insufficient, negligent, scandalous, and erroneous ministers, by due course of ecclesiastical process. In this act the Presbyterians gained all that they could desire, as Presbytery was established, and the government of the Church was placed entirely in their hands. By this act, the Westminster Confession became the creed of the Church, and is recorded at length in the minutes of the parliament. But the Catechisms and the 'Directory of Worship' are not found by its side. A pamphleteer of the day declares that the Confession was read amid much yawning and weariness, and, by the time it was finished, the Estates grew restive, and would hear no more. It is at least certain that the Catechisms and Directory are not once mentioned, though the Presbyterian ministers were very anxious that they should. From this it would appear that, while the State has fixed the Church's faith, it has not fixed the Church's worship. . . . The Covenants were utterly ignored, though there were many in the Church who would have wished them revived."—J. Cunningham, *Church Hist. of Scotland, v.* 2, *ch.* 7.

A. D. 1689 (July).—War in the Highlands.—The Battle of Killiecrankie.—"The duke of Gordon still held out the castle of Edinburgh for James; and the viscount Dundee [Graham of Claverhouse], the soul of the Jacobite party in Scotland, having collected a small but gallant army of Highlanders, threatened with subjection the whole northern part of the kingdom. Dundee, who had publicly disavowed the authority of the Scottish convention, had been declared an outlaw by that assembly; and general Mackay was sent against him with a body of regular troops. The castle of Blair being occupied by the adherents of James, Mackay resolved to attempt its reduction. The viscount, apprised of the design of his antagonist, summoned up all his enterprising spirit, and by forced marches arrived at Athol before him. He was soon [July 27, 1689] informed that Mackay's vanguard had cleared the pass of Killicranky; a narrow defile, formed by the steep sides of the Grampian hills, and a dark, rapid, and deep river. Though chagrined at this intelligence he was not disconcerted. He despatched Sir Alexander Maclean to attack the enemy's advanced party while he himself should approach with the main body of the Highlanders. But before Maclean had proceeded a mile, Dundee received information that Mackay had marched through the pass with his whole army. He commanded Maclean to halt, and boldly advanced with his faithful band, determined to give battle to the enemy." Mackay's army, consisting of four thousand five hundred foot, and two troops of horse, was formed in eight battalions, and ready for action when Dundee came in view. His own brave but undisciplined followers, of all ranks and conditions,

did not exceed 3,300 men. "These he instantly ranged in hostile array. They stood inactive for several hours in sight of the enemy, on the steep side of a hill, which faced the narrow plain where Mackay had formed his line, neither party choosing to change its ground. But the signal for battle was no sooner given, than the Highlanders rushed down the hill in deep columns; and having discharged their muskets with effect, they had recourse to the broadsword, their proper weapon, with which they furiously attacked the enemy. Mackay's left wing was instantly broken, and driven from the field with great slaughter by the Macleans, who formed the right of Dundee's army. The Macdonalds, who composed his left, were not equally successful: colonel Hasting's regiment of English foot repelled their most vigorous efforts, and obliged them to retreat. But Maclean and Cameron, at the head of part of their respective clans, suddenly assailed this gallant regiment in flank, and put it to the rout. Two thousand of Mackay's army were slain; and his artillery, baggage, ammunition, provisions, and even king William's Dutch standard, fell into the hands of the Highlanders. But their joy, like a smile upon the cheek of death, delusive and insincere, was of short duration. Dundee was mortally wounded by a musket shot as he was pursuing the fugitives; he expired soon after his victory, and with him perished the hopes of James in Scotland. The castle of Edinburgh had already surrendered to the convention; and the Highlanders, discouraged by the loss of a leader whom they loved and almost adored, gradually dispersed themselves, and returned to their savage mountains, to bewail him in their songs. His memory is still dear to them; he is considered as the last of their heroes; and his name, even to this day, is seldom mentioned among them without a sigh or a tear."—W. Russell, *Hist. of Modern Europe, pt.* 2, *letter* 17 (*v.* 2).

Also in: J. Browne, *Hist. of the Highlands, v.* 2, *ch.* 6–7.—M. Morris, *Claverhouse, ch.* 11.

A. D. 1689 (August).—Cameronian victory at Dunkeld.—After the victory and death of Dundee at Killiecrankie, the command of his Highlanders had devolved upon Cannon, an Irish officer. "With an army increased to 4,000 men, he continued to coast along the Grampians, followed by Mackay; the one afraid to descend from the mountains, and the other to quit, with his cavalry, the advantage of the open plains. Returning by a secret march to Dunkeld [August 21], he surrounded the regiment of Cameronians, whose destruction appeared so inevitable that they were abandoned by a party of horse to their fate. But the Cameronians, notwithstanding the loss of Cleland, their gallant commander, defended themselves . . . with such desperate enthusiasm that the highlanders, discouraged by the repulse, and incapable of persevering fortitude, dispersed and returned to their homes."—M. Laing, *Hist. of Scotland,* 1603–1707, *bk.* 10 (*v.* 4).

A. D. 1692.—The Massacre of Glenco.—A scheme, originating with Lord Breadalbane, for the pacifying of the Highlanders, was approved by King William and acted upon, in 1691. It offered a free pardon and a sum of money to all the chiefs who would take the oath of allegiance to William and Mary before the first of January, 1692, and it contemplated the extirpation of such clans as refused. "The last man to submit to government was Macdonald of Glenco. Towards the end of December he applied to the governor of Fort William, who refused, as not being a civil magistrate, to administer the oaths; but dispatched him in haste, with an earnest recommendation to the Sheriff of Argyle. From the snows and other interruptions which he met with on the road, the day prescribed for submission had elapsed, before he reached Inverary, the county town. The benefit of the indemnity was strictly forfeited; the sheriff was moved, however, by his tears and entreaties, to receive his oath of allegiance, and to certify the unavoidable cause of his delay. But his oath was industriously suppressed, by the advice particularly of Stair the president; the certificate was erased from the list presented to the privy council; and it appears that an extensive combination was formed for his destruction. The earl of Breadalbane, whose lands he had plundered, and . . . Dalrymple, the secretary, . . . persuaded William that Glenco was the chief obstacle to the pacification of the highlands. Perhaps they concealed the circumstance that he had applied within due time for the oaths to government, and had received them since. But they procured instructions, signed, and for their greater security, countersigned by the king himself, to proceed to military execution against such rebels as had rejected the indemnity, and had refused to submit on assurance of their lives. As these instructions were found insufficient, they obtained an additional order, signed, and also countersigned, by the king, 'that if Glenco and his clan could well be separated from the rest, it would be a proper vindication of public justice to extirpate that sect of thieves.' But the directions given by Dalrymple far exceeded even the king's instructions. . . . Glenco, assured of an indemnity, had remained at home, unmolested for a month, when a detachment arrived from Fort William, under Campbell of Glenlyon, whose niece was married to one of his sons. The soldiers were received on assurance of peace and friendship; and were quartered among the inhabitants of the sequestered vale. Their commander enjoyed for a fortnight the daily hospitality of his nephew's table. They had passed the evening at cards together, and the officers were to dine with his father next day. Their orders arrived that night, to attack their defenceless hosts while asleep at midnight, and not to suffer a man, under the age of seventy, to escape their swords. From some suspicious circumstances the sons were impressed with a sudden apprehension of danger, and discovered their approach; but before they could alarm their father, the massacre spread through the whole vale. Before the break of day, a party, entering as friends, shot Glenco as he rose from his bed. His wife was stript naked by the soldiers, who tore the rings with their teeth from her fingers; and she expired next morning with horror and grief. Nine men were bound and deliberately shot at Glenlyon's quarters; his landlord was shot by his orders, and a young boy, who clung to his knees for protection, was stabbed to death. At another part of the vale the inhabitants were shot while sitting around their fire; women perished with their children in their arms; an old man of eighty was put to the sword; another, who escaped to a house for

concealment, was burnt alive. Thirty-eight persons were thus inhumanly massacred by their inmates and guests. The rest, alarmed by the report of musquetry, escaped to the hills, and were preserved from destruction by a tempest that added to the horrors of the night. . . . The carnage was succeeded by rapine and desolation. The cattle were driven off or destroyed. The houses, to fulfil Dalrymple's instructions, were burnt to the ground; and the women and children, stript naked, were left to explore their way to some remote and friendly habitation, or to perish in the snows. The outcry against the massacre of Glenco was not confined to Scotland; but, by the industry of the Jacobites, it resounded with every aggravation through Europe. Whether the inhuman rigour or the perfidious execution of the orders were considered, each part of the bloody transaction discovered a deliberate, treacherous, and an impolitic cruelty, from which the king himself was not altogether exempt. Instead of the terror which it was meant to inspire, the horror and universal execration which it excited rendered the highlanders irreconcileable to his government, and the government justly odious to his subjects."—M. Laing, *Hist. of Scotland*, 1603-1707, *bk.* 10 (*v.* 4).

Also in: Lord Macaulay, *Hist. of Eng., ch.* 18 (*v.* 4).—J. Browne, *Hist. of the Highlands, v.* 2, *ch.* 10.—G. Burnet, *Hist. of My Own Time, bk.* 5 (*v.* 4), 1692.

A. D. 1695-1699.—The Darien scheme.—King William urges a Union of the kingdoms.—"The peace of Ryswic was succeeded by an event which had well nigh created a civil war between Scotland and England. As the writers of no nation are more marked by grandeur and meanness of composition in the same person, and the actors in public life by grandeur and meanness of character in the same person, than those of England; so the proceedings of the national assembly of England, the noblest that ever was on earth, except that of Rome, are often tinctured with a strange mixture of the great and the little. Of this truth an instance appeared at this time, in the proceedings of parliament with regard to the Scots colony of Darien, settled by Mr. Paterson. . . . Paterson, having examined the places, satisfied himself that on the isthmus of Darien there was a tract of country running across from the Atlantic to the South Sea, which the Spaniards had never possessed, and inhabited by a people continually at war with them; . . . that the two seas were connected by a ridge of hills, which, by their height, created a temperate climate; . . . that roads could be made with ease along the ridge, by which mules, and even carriages, might pass from the one sea to the other in the space of a day, and that consequently this passage seemed to be pointed out by the finger of nature, as a common centre, to connect together the trade and intercourse of the universe. . . . By this obscure Scotsman a project was formed to settle, on this neglected spot, a great and powerful colony, not as other colonies have for the most part been settled, by chance, and unprotected by the country from whence they went, but by system, upon foresight, and to receive the ample protection of those governments to whom he was to offer his project. And certainly no greater idea has been formed since the time of Columbus. . . . Paterson's original intention was to offer his project to England, as the country which had the most interest in it." Receiving no encouragement, however, in London, nor in Holland, nor Germany, to which countries he repaired, he returned finally to Scotland, and there awakened the interest of several influential gentlemen, including Mr. Fletcher of Salton, the Marquis of Tweddale, Lord Stair, and others. "These persons, in June 1695, procured a statute from parliament, and afterwards a charter from the crown in terms of it, for creating a trading company to Africa and the new world, with power to plant colonies and build forts, with consent of the inhabitants, in places not possessed by other European nations. Paterson, now finding the ground firm under him, . . . threw his project boldly upon the public, and opened a subscription for a company. The frenzy of the Scots nation to sign the solemn league and covenant never exceeded the rapidity with which they ran to subscribe to the Darien company. The nobility, the gentry, the merchants, the people, the royal burghs, without the exception of one, most of the other public bodies, subscribed. Young women threw their little fortunes into the stock, widows sold their jointures to get the command of money for the same purpose Almost in an instant £400,000 were subscribed in Scotland, although it be now known that there was not at that time above £800,000 of cash in the kingdom. . . . The English subscribed £300,000, and the Dutch and Hamburghers £200,000 more. . . . In the mean time, the jealousy of trade, which has done more mischief to the trade of England than all other causes put together, created an alarm in England; and the houses of lords and commons, without previous inquiry or reflection, on the 13th December of the year 1695, concurred in a joint address to the King against the establishment of the Darien company, as detrimental to the interest of the East India company. Soon after, the commons impeached some of their own countrymen for being instrumental in erecting the company. . . . The King's answer was 'that he had been ill-advised in Scotland.' He soon after changed his Scottish ministers, and sent orders to his resident at Hamburgh to present a memorial to the senate, in which he disowned the company, and warned them against all connections with it. . . . The Scots, not discouraged, were rather animated by this oppression; for they converted it into a proof of the envy of the English, and of their consciousness of the great advantages which were to flow to Scotland from the colony. The company proceeded to build six ships in Holland, from 36 to 60 guns, and they engaged 1,200 men for the colony; among whom were younger sons of many of the noble and most ancient families of Scotland, and sixty officers who had been disbanded at the peace." The first colony sailed from Leith, July 26, 1698, and arrived safely at Darien in two months. They "fixed their station at Acta, calling it New St. Andrew, . . . and the country itself New Caledonia. . . . The first public act of the colony was to publish a declaration of freedom of trade and religion to all nations. This luminous idea originated with Paterson. But the Dutch East India company having pressed the King, in concurrence with his English subjects, to prevent the settlement of Darien, orders had been sent

from England to the governors of the West Indian and American colonies, to issue proclamations against giving assistance, or even to hold correspondence with the colony; and these were more or less harshly expressed, according to the tempers of the different governors. The Scots, trusting to far different treatment, and to the supplies which they expected from those colonies, had not brought provisions enough with them; they fell into diseases, from bad food, and from want of food. . . . They lingered eight months, awaiting, but in vain, for assistance from Scotland, and almost all of them either died out or quitted the settlement. Paterson, who had been the first that entered the ship at Leith, was the last who went on board at Darien." To complete the destruction of the undertaking, the Spanish government, which had not moved in opposition before, now bestirred itself against the Scottish company, and entered formal complaints at London (May 3, 1699). "The Scots, ignorant of the misfortunes of their colony, but provoked at this memorial [of Spain], sent out another colony soon after of 1,300 men, to support an establishment which was now no more." This last colony, after gallant fighting and great suffering, was expelled from Darien by a Spanish expedition, and "not more than thirty, saved from war, shipwreck, or disease, ever saw their own country again. . . . While the second colony of the Scots were exposing themselves, far from their country, in the cause, mediately or immediately, of all who spoke the English language, the house of lords of England were a second time addressing the King at home against the settlement itself. . . . He answered the address of the lords, on the 12th of February 1699, in the following words: 'His Majesty does apprehend that difficulties may too often arise, with respect to the different interests of trade between his two kingdoms, unless some way be found out to unite them more nearly and completely; and therefore his Majesty takes this opportunity of putting the house of peers in mind of what he recommended to his parliament soon after his accession to the throne, that they would consider of an union between the two kingdoms.'" —Sir J. Dalrymple, *Memorials of Gt. Britain, pt.* 3, *bk.* 6 (*v.* 3).

Also in: J. H. Burton, *Hist. of the Reign of Queen Anne, ch.* 4 (*v.* 1).—Lord Macaulay, *Hist. of Eng., ch.* 24 (*v.* 5).

A. D. 1703-1704.—Hostility to England.—The Act of Security.—The Scottish Plot.—"This Parliament of 1703 was not in a temper of conciliation towards England. Glencoe and Darien were still watchwords of strife. The failure of the negotiations for Union necessarily produced exasperation. Whilst Marlborough was fighting the battles of the Allies, the Scottish Parliament manifested a decided inclination to the interests of France, by removing restrictions on the importation of French wines. The 'Act for the Security of the Kingdom' was a more open declaration not only of the independence of Scotland, but of her disposition to separate wholly from England—to abrogate, on the first opportunity, that union of the crowns which had endured for a century. The Act of Settlement, by which the crown of England was to pass in the Protestant line to the electress Sophia and her descendants, was not to be accepted; but, on the demise of queen Anne without issue, the Estates of Scotland were to name a successor from the Protestant descendants of the Stuart line, and that successor was to be under conditions to secure 'the religious freedom and trade of the nation from English or any foreign influence.' For four months this matter was vehemently debated in the Scottish Parliament. The Act of Security was carried, but the Lord High Commissioner refused his assent. Following this legislative commotion came what was called in England the Scottish plot—a most complicated affair of intrigue and official treachery, with some real treason at the bottom of it. [This Scottish Plot, otherwise called the Queensberry Plot, was a scheme to raise the Highland clans for the Pretender, abortively planned by one Simon Fraser.] The House of Lords in England took cognizance of the matter, which provoked the highest wrath in Scotland, that another nation should interfere with her affairs. . . . When the Scottish Estates reassembled in 1704 they denounced the proceedings of the House of Lords, as an interference with the prerogative of the queen of Scotland; and they again passed the Security Act. The royal assent was not now withheld; whether from fear or from policy on the part of the English ministry is not very clear. The Parliament of England then adopted a somewhat strong measure of retaliation. The queen was addressed, requesting her to put Carlisle, Newcastle, Tynemouth, and Hull in a state of defence, and to send forces to the border. A Statute was passed which in the first place provided for a treaty of Union; and then enacted that until the Scottish Parliament should settle the succession to the crown in the same line as that of the English Act of Settlement, no native of Scotland, except those domiciled in England, or in the navy or army, should acquire the privileges of a natural-born Englishman; and prohibiting all importations of coals, cattle, sheep, or linen from Scotland. It was evident that there must be Union or War."—C. Knight, *Popular Hist. of Eng., v.* 5, *ch.* 21.

Also in: J. H. Burton, *Hist. of the Reign of Queen Anne, ch.* 4 *and* 7 (*v.* 1).

A. D. 1707.—The Union with England.—To avert war between Scotland and England by a complete political Union of the two kingdoms in one became now the greatest object of the solicitude of the wiser statesmen on both sides. They used their influence to so good an effect that, in the spring of 1706, thirty-one Commissioners on the part of each kingdom were appointed to negotiate the terms of Union. The Commissioners held their first meeting on the 16th of April, and were in session until the 22d of July, when the Articles of Union agreed upon by them received the signature of twenty-seven of the English and twenty-six of the Scots. On the 16th of the following January (1707) these Articles were ratified with amendments by the Scottish Parliament. The English Parliament adopted them as amended a month later, and on the 6th of March the Union was perfected by the royal assent, given solemnly by the Queen, in presence of the Lords and Commons of England. "It was agreed that Great Britain should be the designation of the united island; the name of Scotland to be merged in the name of North Britain. It was agreed that the Crosses of St. George and St. Andrew should be conjoined in the flag of the united kingdom. It was agreed

that the arms of the two countries — the three lions passant and guardant Or, and the lion rampant Or, within a double tressure flory and counterflory, Gules — should be quartered with all heraldic honours. It was agreed that the united kingdom should have a new Great Seal. As regards the House of Commons, the English party proposed that Scotland should be represented by 38 members. Even Scottish writers have observed that if taxation be taken as the measure of representation, and if it be remembered that the Scots of that time had asked and been allowed to limit their share of the Land-tax to one-fortieth of the share of England, it would follow that, as an addition to the 513 members of Parliament returned by England, Scotland was entitled to demand no more than 13. But even 38 seemed by no means adequate to the claims on other grounds of that ancient and renowned kingdom. The Scottish Commissioners stood out for an increase, and the English Commissioners finally conceded 45. The Peers of England were at this juncture 185 and the Peers of Scotland 154. It was intended that the latter should send representatives to the former, and the proportion was settled according to the precedent that was just decided. The 45 members from Scotland when added to the 513 from England would make one-twelfth of the whole; and 16 Peers from Scotland when added to the 185 from England would also make about one-twelfth of the whole. Sixteen was therefore the number adopted; and the mode of election both of Commoners and Peers was left to be determined by the Parliament of Scotland, before the day appointed for the Union, that is the first of May 1707. By this treaty Scotland was to retain her heritable jurisdiction, her Court of Session and her entire system of law. The Presbyterian Church as by law established was to continue unaltered, having been indeed excluded from debate by the express terms of the Commission."—Earl Stanhope, *Hist. of Eng.: Reign of Queen Anne, ch.* 8.

Also in: J. H. Burton, *Hist. of the Reign of Queen Anne, ch.* 7 (*v.* 1).—Sir W. Scott, *Tales of a Grandfather: Scotland, series* 2, *ch.* 12.—H. Hallam, *Const. Hist. of Eng., ch.* 17 (*v.* 3).—The text of the Act of Union may be found in the *Parliamentary History, v.* 6, *app.* 2.

A. D. 1707-1708.—Hostility to the Union.—Spread of Jacobitism.—"In Scotland it [the Union] was regarded with an almost universal feeling of discontent and dishonour. The Jacobite party, who had entertained great hopes of eluding the act for settling the kingdom upon the family of Hanover, beheld them entirely blighted; the Whigs, or Presbyterians, found themselves forming part of a nation in which Prelacy was an institution of the state; the Country party, who had nourished a vain but honourable idea of maintaining the independence of Scotland, now saw it, with all its symbols of ancient sovereignty, sunk and merged under the government of England. All the different professions and classes of men saw each something in the obnoxious treaty which affected their own interest. . . . There was, therefore, nothing save discontent and lamentation to be heard throughout Scotland, and men of every class vented their complaints against the Union the more loudly, because their sense of personal grievances might be concealed, and yet indulged under popular declamations concerning the dishonour done to the country. . . . Almost all the dissenting and Cameronian ministers were anti-unionists, and some of the more enthusiastic were so peculiarly vehement, that long after the controversy had fallen asleep, I have heard my grandfather say (for your grandfather, Mr. Hugh Littlejohn, had a grandfather in his time), that he had heard an old clergyman confess he could never bring his sermon, upon whatever subject, to a conclusion, without having what he called a 'blaud,' that is a slap, at the Union. . . . The detestation of the treaty being for the present the ruling passion of the times, all other distinctions of party, and even of religious opinions in Scotland, were laid aside, and a singular coalition took place, in which Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Cavaliers, and many friends of the revolution, drowned all former hostility in the predominant aversion to the Union. . . . For a time almost all the inhabitants of Scotland were disposed to join unanimously in the Restoration, as it was called, of James the Second's son to the throne of his fathers; and had his ally, the King of France, been hearty in his cause, or his Scottish partisans more united among themselves, or any leader amongst them possessed of distinguished talent, the Stewart family might have repossessed themselves of their ancient domain of Scotland, and perhaps of England also." Early in 1708 an attempt was made to take advantage of this feeling in Scotland, on behalf of the Pretender, by a naval and military expedition from France, fitted out by the French king. It was vulgarly frustrated by an attack of measles, which prostrated the Stuart adventurer (the Chevalier de St. George) at Dunkirk, until the English government had warning enough to be too well prepared.—Sir W. Scott, *Tales of a Grandfather: Scotland, series* 3, *ch.* 1-2.

A. D. 1715.—The Jacobite rising.—In 1715 "there were Jacobite risings both in Scotland and in England. Early in September John Erskine, Earl of Mar — who some years before had been a Whig and helped to bring about the Union — raised the standard of rebellion in Braemar, and in a short time found himself in command of a large Highland army. But Mar was very slow in his movements, and lingered for six weeks in Perth. The Duke of Argyle, famous as both a warrior and a statesman, was sent from London to deal with this danger; and, going to Stirling, used the time which Mar was wasting in gathering round him soldiers and loyal Lowlanders. While things stood thus in the far north a few hundred Jacobites took up arms in Northumberland under Mr. Forster and Lord Derwentwater. Joining with some Southern Scots raised by Lord Kenmure, and some Highlanders whom Mar had sent to their aid, they marched to Preston, in Lancashire. The fate of the two risings was settled on the same day. At Preston the English Jacobites and their Scottish allies had to give themselves up to a small body of soldiers under General Carpenter. At Sheriffmuir, about eight miles north of Stirling, the Highlanders, whom Mar had put in motion at last, met Argyle's little army in battle, and, though not utterly beaten, were forced to fall back to Perth. There Mar's army soon dwindled to a mere handful of men. Just when things seemed at the worst the Pretender himself landed in Scotland. But he altogether lacked

the daring and high spirit needful to the cause at the time; and his presence at Perth did not even delay the end, which was now sure. Late in January 1716 Argyle's troops started from Stirling northwards; and the small Highland force broke up from Perth and went to Montrose. Thence James Edward and Mar slipped away unnoticed, and sailed to France; and the Highlanders scampered off to their several homes. Of the rebels that were taken prisoners about forty were tried and put to death; and many were sent beyond the seas. Derwentwater and Kenmure were beheaded; the other leaders of rank either were forgiven or escaped from prison."—J. Rowley, *The Settlement of the Constitution, bk.* 3, *ch.* 1.

ALSO IN: J. McCarthy, *Hist. of the Four Georges, v.* 1, *ch.* 7.—J. H. Jesse, *Memoirs of the Pretenders, v.* 1, *ch.* 3–4.—Earl Stanhope, *Hist. of Eng.*, 1713–1783, *ch.* 5–6 (*v.* 1).—Mrs. K. Thomson, *Memoirs of the Jacobites, v.* 1–2.

A. D. 1736.—The Porteous Riot. See EDINBURGH: A. D. 1736.

A. D. 1745-1746.—The Young Pretender's invasion.—The last rising of the Jacobites.—"As early as 1744 Charles Edward [known as 'the Young Pretender'], the grandson of James II., was placed by the French government at the head of a formidable armament. But his plan of a descent on Scotland was defeated by a storm which wrecked his fleet, and by the march of the French troops which had sailed in it to the war in Flanders. In 1745, however, the young adventurer again embarked with but seven friends in a small vessel and landed on a little island of the Hebrides. For three weeks he stood almost alone; but on the 29th of August the clans rallied to his standard in Glenfinnan. . . . His force swelled to an army as he marched through Blair Athol on Perth, entered Edinburgh in triumph, and proclaimed 'James the Eighth' at the Town Cross: and two thousand English troops who marched against him under Sir John Cope were broken and cut to pieces on the 21st of September by a single charge of the clansmen at Preston Pans. Victory at once doubled the forces of the conqueror. The Prince was now at the head of 6,000 men; but all were still Highlanders. . . . After skilfully evading an army gathered at Newcastle, he marched through Lancashire, and pushed on the 4th of December as far as Derby. But here all hope of success came to an end. Hardly a man had risen in his support as he passed through the districts where Jacobitism boasted of its strength. . . . Catholics and Tories abounded in Lancashire, but only a single squire took up arms. . . . The policy of Walpole had in fact secured England for the House of Hanover. The long peace, the prosperity of the country, and the clemency of the Government, had done their work. . . . Even in the Highlands the Macleods rose in arms for King George, while the Gordons refused to stir, though roused by a small French force which landed at Montrose. To advance further south was impossible, and Charles fell rapidly back on Glasgow; but the reinforcements which he found there raised his army to 9,000 men, and on the 23rd January, 1746, he boldly attacked an English army under General Hawley, which had followed his retreat and had encamped near Falkirk. Again the wild charge of his Highlanders won victory for the Prince, but victory was as fatal as defeat. The bulk of his forces dispersed with their booty to the mountains, and Charles fell sullenly back to the north before the Duke of Cumberland. On the 16th of April the armies faced one another on Culloden Moor, a few miles eastward of Inverness. The Highlanders still numbered 6,000 men, but they were starving and dispirited. . . . In a few moments all was over, and the Stuart force was a mass of hunted fugitives. Charles himself after strange adventures escaped [in the disguise of a female servant, attending the famous Flora Macdonald] to France. In England fifty of his followers were hanged; three Scotch lords, Lovat, Balmerino, and Kilmarnock, brought to the block; and forty persons of rank attainted by Act of Parliament. More extensive measures of repression were needful in the Highlands. The feudal tenures were abolished. The hereditary jurisdictions of the chiefs were bought up and transferred to the Crown. The tartan, or garb of the Highlanders, was forbidden by law. These measures, followed by a general Act of Indemnity, proved effective for their purpose."—J. R. Green, *Short Hist. of the Eng. People, ch.* 10, *sect.* 1.

ALSO IN: Lord Mahon (Earl Stanhope), *Hist. of Eng.*, 1713–1783, *ch.* 26–29 (*v.* 3).—R. Chambers, *Hist. of the Rebellion of* 1745.—Mrs. K. Thomson, *Memoirs of the Jacobites, v.* 2–3.—Chevalier de Johnstone, *Memoirs of the Rebellion of* 1745.—J. H. Jesse, *Memoirs of the Pretenders.*

A. D. 1779.—No-Popery Riots. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1778–1780.

A. D. 1832.—Representation in Parliament increased by the Reform Bill. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1830–1832.

A. D. 1843.—The Disruption of the Church.—Formation of the Free Church.—"Lay patronage was . . . inconsistent with the conception and the fundamental principles of the Presbyterian Church, and she opposed and rejected it, and fought against it. It was abolished shortly after the Revolution of 1688, but again restored by the British Parliament in 1712, contrary to the letter and the spirit of the Treaty of Union, and to all conceptions of a wise policy toward the Scottish nation. . . . An internal struggle arose between the party who held firmly to these sentiments and the new party—called 'the Moderate party.' . . . In the middle of the 18th century the opposite views of the popular and the moderate parties had become distinct. The chief point of polity in dispute was the settlement of ministers in parishes against the wishes of the congregations. Cases of this character were constantly coming before the presbyteries and general assemblies; and in 1733 it was on matters arising from such cases that a secession took place. . . . In 1773 there were upwards of two hundred dissenting congregations, besides Episcopalians and Roman Catholics. . . . As an attempt to redress the evils involved in patronage, the popular party proposed, in the assembly of 1833, that when a majority of a congregation objected to the minister presented by the patron, the presbytery should not proceed with the settlement. . . . It was on this reasonable regulation [passed into an act, called the Veto Act, by the Assembly of 1834] that the struggle which issued in the Disruption was fought, although there were other principles involved in the conflict." In 1839, a

case arising in the parish church of Auchterarder, in Perthshire, led to a decision in the Court of Session against the legality of the Veto Act, and this decision, on appeal, was affirmed by the House of Lords. "For several years the country rang with the clamour and talk of non-intrusion and spiritual independence, and the excitement was intense. Pamphlets, speeches and ballads were circulated through the kingdom in hundreds of thousands. The engrossing subject attracted the attention of every household, and many a family became divided in religious sentiments." Finally, in 1843, finding no prospect of legislation from Parliament to free the Church of Scotland from the odious fetters of patronage, the popular party resolved upon a general secession from it. This occurred in a memorable scene at the opening of the Assembly, in Edinburgh, on the 18th of May, 1843. The Moderator of the body, Dr. Welsh, read a protest against further proceedings in the Assembly, because of certain acts, sanctioned by the Government of the country, which had infringed on the liberties of the constitution of the Church. He then left the chair and walked out of the church. "Instantly Dr. Chalmers, Dr. Gordon, and the whole of those in the left side of the Church, rose and followed him. Upwards of two hundred ministers walked out, and they were joined outside by three hundred clergymen and other adherents. Dr. Welsh wore his Moderator's dress, and when he appeared on the street, and the people saw that principle had risen above interest, shouts of triumph rent the air such as had not been heard in Edinburgh since the days of the Covenant. They walked through Hanover Street to Canonmills, where a large hall was erected for the reception of the disestablished assembly. They elected Dr. Chalmers Moderator, and formed the first General Assembly of 'The Free Church of Scotland.' Four hundred and seventy-four ministers left the Establishment in 1843; they were also joined by two hundred probationers, nearly one hundred theological students of the University of Edinburgh, three fourths of those in Glasgow, and a majority of those in Aberdeen. The Disruption was an accomplished fact."—J. Mackintosh, *Scotland, ch.* 19.—"It is not every nation, it is not every age, which can produce the spectacle of nearly 500 men leaving their homes, abandoning their incomes, for the sake of opinion. It is literally true that disruption was frequently a sentence of poverty, and occasionally of death, to the ministers of the Church. Well, then, might a great Scotchman of that time [Lord Jeffrey] say that he was proud of his country, proud of the heroism and self-denial of which her pastors proved capable. But well also might a Scotchman of the present time say that he was proud of the success which Voluntaryism achieved. It was the good fortune of the Church that in the hour of her trial she had a worthy leader. Years before, while ministering to a poor congregation in Glasgow, Chalmers had insisted on the cardinal doctrine that the poor should be made to help themselves. He applied the same principle to the Scotch Church. He . . . called on his friends around him to 'organise, organise, organise.' It is not, however, the Church alone which deserves commendation. The nation supported the Church. . . . In the four years which succeeded the disruption, the Free Church raised £1,254,000, and built 654 churches. Her ministrations were extended to every district and almost every parish in the land."—S. Walpole, *Hist. of Eng. from* 1815, *ch.* 21 (*v.* 4).—"In 1874 the Patronage Act of 1712 was repealed, but it was too late to be of much use, and Scottish Presbyterianism remains split up into different camps. Some of the older secessions were in 1847 joined together to form the United Presbyterian Church, mostly distinguished from the Free Church by its upholding as a theory the 'Voluntary Principle.'"—T. F. Tout, *Hist. of Eng. from* 1689, *p.* 238.

Also in: T. Brown, *Annals of the Disruption.*—R. Buchanan, *The Ten Years' Conflict.*—W. Hanna, *Memoirs of Thomas Chalmers, v.* 3, *ch.* 18 *and v.* 4, *ch.* 6–25.—P. Bayne, *Life and Letters of Hugh Miller, bk.* 5 (*v.* 2).

A. D. 1868.—Parliamentary Reform. See England: A. D. 1865–1868.

A. D. 1884.—Enlargement of the Suffrage.—Representation of the People Act. See England: A. D. 1884–1885.

SCOTS, Deliverance of Roman Britain by Theodosius from the. See Britain: A. D. 367–370.

SCOTT, Dred, The case of. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1857.

SCOTT, General Winfield.—In the War of 1812. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1812 (September—November); 1814 (July—September).....**The Mexican campaign of.**—See Mexico: A. D. 1847 (March—September).....**Defeat in Presidential Election.** See United States of Am.: A. D. 1852.....**Retirement from military service.** See United States of Am.: A. D. 1861 (July—November).

SCOTTI.—SCOTS. See Scotland: The Picts and Scots.

SCOTTISH PLOT, The. See Scotland: A. D. 1703–1704.

SCOURGE OF GOD, The. See Huns: A. D. 451.

SCREW PROPELLER, Invention of the. See Steam Navigation: On the Ocean.

SCRIBES, The.—"The Scribes or 'Lawyers,' that is, the learned in the Pentateuch. . . . It is evident that in the Scribes, rather than in any of the other functionaries of the Jewish Church, is the nearest original of the clergy of later times."—Dean Stanley, *Lect's on the Hist. of the Jewish Church, lect.* 44.—"The learned men after Ezra were called 'Sopherim' (singular 'Sopher'), Scribes; because to be a skilled writer was the first criterion of a man of learning. To transcribe the authenticated Law as deposited in the temple was one of the Scribe's occupations. His next occupations were to read, expound and teach it. The text was without vowel points, without divisions of words, verses and chapters; hence it was nearly hieroglyphic, so that the correct reading thereof was traditional, and had to be communicated from master to disciple. As the Great Synod legislated by expounding and extending the Law, these additions also had to be taught orally."—I. M. Wise, *Hist. of the Hebrews' Second Commonwealth, period* 1, *ch.* 4.

SCROOBY, The Separatist Church at. See Independents: A. D. 1604–1617.

SCRUPULA. See As.

SCRUTIN DE LISTE.—A term applied in France to the mode of electing deputies by a general ticket in each department — that is, in groups — instead of singly, in separate districts. See FRANCE: A. D. 1875–1889.

SCUTAGE.— "The origin of this tax is implied in its title; it was derived from the 'service of the shield' (scutum)—one of the distinguishing marks of feudal tenure — whereby the holder of a certain quantity of land was bound to furnish to his lord the services of a fully-armed horseman for forty days in the year. The portion of land charged with this service constituted a 'knight's fee,' and was usually reckoned at the extent of five hides, or the value of twenty pounds annually."—K. Norgate, *England Under the Angevin Kings, v.* 1, *ch.* 9.

ALSO IN: W. Stubbs, *The Early Plantagenets, p.* 54.

SCUTARI: A. D. 1473-1479. — Stubborn resistance and final surrender to the Turks. See GREECE: A. D. 1454–1479.

SCUTUM.—A long wooden shield, covered with leather, having the form of a cylinder cut in half, which the Romans are said to have adopted from the Samnites.—E. Guhl and W. Koner, *Life of the Greeks and Romans, sect.* 107.

SCYRI, The.—The Scyri were a tribe known to the Greeks as early as the second century B. C. They were then on the shores of the Black Sea. In the fifth century of the Christian era, after the breaking up of the Hunnish empire of Attila, they appeared among the people occupying the region embraced in modern Austria,—on the Hungarian borders. They seem to have spoken the Gothic language.—T. Hodgkin, *Italy and her Invaders, bk.* 3, *ch.* 8 (*v.* 2).

SCYRIS, The dynasty of the. See ECUADOR: THE ABORIGINAL KINGDOM.

SCYTALISM AT ARGOS, The.—The city of Argos was the scene of a terrible outbreak of mob violence (B. C. 370) consequent on the discovery of an oligarchical conspiracy to overturn the democratic constitution. The furious multitude, armed with clubs, slew twelve hundred of the more prominent citizens, including the democratic leaders who tried to restrain them. "This was the rebellion at Argos known under the name of the Scytalism (cudgelling): an event hitherto unparalleled in Greek history,—so unprecedented, that even abroad it was looked upon as an awful sign of the times, and that the Athenians instituted a purification of their city, being of opinion that the whole Hellenic people was polluted by these horrors."—E. Curtius, *Hist. of Greece, bk.* 6, *ch.* 2.

ALSO IN: G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece, pt.* 2, *ch.* 78.

SCYTHIANS, The. — "Their name, unnoticed by Homer, occurs for the first time in the Hesiodic poems. When the Homeric Zeus in the Iliad turns his eye away from Troy towards Thrace, he sees, besides the Thracians and Mysians, other tribes, whose names cannot be made out, but whom the poet knows as milk-eaters and mare-milkers. The same characteristic attributes, coupled with that of 'having waggons for their dwelling-houses,' appear in Hesiod connected with the name of the Scythians. . . . Herodotus, who personally visited the town of Olbia, together with the inland regions adjoining to it, and probably other Grecian settlements in the Euxine (at a time which we may presume to have been about 450–440 B. C.) — and who conversed with both Scythians and Greeks competent to give him information — has left us far more valuable statements respecting the Scythian people, dominion, and manners, as they stood in his day. His conception of the Scythians, as well as that of Hippokrates, is precise and well-defined — very different from that of the later authors, who use the word almost indiscriminately to denote all barbarous Nomads. His territory called Scythia is a square area, twenty days' journey or 4,000 stadia (somewhat less than 500 English miles) in each direction — bounded by the Danube (the course of which river he conceives in a direction from N. W. to S. E.), the Euxine, and the Palus Mæotis with the river Tanais, on three sides respectively — and on the fourth or north side by the nations called Agathyrsi, Neuri, Androphagi and Melanchlæni. . . . The whole area was either occupied by or subject to the Scythians. And this name comprised tribes differing materially in habits and civilization. The great mass of the people who bore it, strictly Nomadic in their habits — neither sowing nor planting, but living only on food derived from animals, especially mare's-milk and cheese — moved from place to place, carrying their families in waggons covered with wicker and leather, themselves always on horseback with their flocks and herds, between the Borysthenes [the Dnieper] and the Palus Mæotis [sea of Azov]. . . . It is the purely Nomadic Scythians whom he [Herodotus] depicts, the earliest specimens of the Mongolian race (so it seems probable) known to history, and prototypes of the Huns and Bulgarians of later centuries."—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece, pt.* 2, *ch.* 17.—"The Scythians Proper of Herodotus and Hippocrates extended from the Danube and the Carpathians on the one side, to the Tanais or Don upon the other. The Sauromatæ, a race at least half-Scythic, then succeeded, and held the country from the Tanais to the Wolga. Beyond this were the Massagetæ, Scythian in dress and customs, reaching down to the Jaxartes on the east side of the Caspian. In the same neighbourhood were the Asiatic Scyths or Sacæ, who seem to have bordered upon the Bactrians."—G. Rawlinson, *Five Great Monarchies: Assyria, ch.* 9, *footnote.*—For an account of the Scythian expedition of Darius, B. C. 508, see PERSIA: B. C. 521–493.

SCYTHIANS, OR SCYTHÆ, of Athens. —"The Athenian State also possessed slaves of its own. Such slaves were, first of all, the so-called Scythæ or archers, a corps at first of 300, then of 600 or even 1,200 men, who were also called Speusinii, after a certain Speusinus, who first (at what time is uncertain) effected the raising of the corps. They served as gendarmes or armed police, and their guard-house was at first in the market, afterwards in the Areopagus. They were also used in war, and the corps of Hippotoxotæ or mounted archers 200 strong, which is named in the same connection with them, likewise without doubt consisted of slaves."—G. F. Schömann, *Antiq. of Greece: The State, pt.* 3, *ch.* 3.

ALSO IN: A. Boeckh, *Public Economy of Athens: The State, bk.* 2, *ch.* 11.

SEARCH, The Right of. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1804–1809; and 1812.

SEBASTE. See SAMARIA: REBUILDING OF THE CITY BY HEROD.

SEBASTIAN, King of Portugal, A. D. 1557–1578.

SEBASTOPOL: The Name.—"The Greeks translated the name of Augustus into Sebastos . . . , in consequence of which a colony founded by Augustus on the shores of the Black Sea was called Sebastopolis."—H. N. Humphreys, *Hist. of the Art of Printing, p.* 68.

A. D. 1854-1855.—Siege and capture by the English, French, and Sardinians. See Russia: A. D. 1854 (September—October); and 1854–1856.

SECESH. See Boys in Blue.

SECESSION, AMERICAN WAR OF. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1860 (November—December), and after.

SECESSIONS OF THE ROMAN PLEBS.—During the prolonged struggle of the plebeians of Rome to extort civil and political rights from the originally governing order, the patricians, they gained their end on several occasions by marching out in a body from the city, refusing military service and threatening to found a new city. The first of these secessions was about 494 B. C. when they wrung from the patricians the extraordinary concession of the Tribunate (see Rome: B. C. 494–492). The second was B. C. 449, when the tyranny of the Decemvirs was overthrown. The third was four years later, on the demand for the Canuleian Law. The last was B. C. 286, and resulted in the securing of the Hortensian Laws. See Rome: B. C. 445–400; and 286.

SECOFFEE INDIANS, The. See American Aborigines: Algonquian Family.

SECOND EMPIRE (French), The. See France: A. D. 1851–1852, to 1870 (September).

SECOND REPUBLIC (French), The. See France: A. D. 1841–1848, to 1851–1852.

SECULAR CLERGY.—The secular clergy of the monastic ages "was so called because it lived in the world, in the 'siècle.' It was composed of all the ecclesiastics who were not under vows in a religious community. The ecclesiastical members of communities, or inhabitants of convents, composed the 'regular clergy.'"—E. de Bonnechose, *Hist. of France, epoch* 2, *bk.* 1, *ch.* 6, *foot-note.*—See, also, Benedictine Orders.

SECULAR GAMES AT ROME, The.—The Ludi Sæculares, or secular games, at Rome, were supposed to celebrate points of time which marked the successive ages of the city. According to tradition, the first age was determined by the death of the last survivor of those who were born in the year of the founding of Rome. Afterwards, the period became a fixed one; but whether it was 100 or 110 years is a debated question. At all events, during the period of the empire, the secular games were celebrated five times (by Augustus, Claudius, Domitian, Severus and Philip) with irregularity, as suited the caprice of the emperors. The last celebration was in the year A. U. 1000—A. D. 247.—C. Merivale, *Hist. of the Romans, ch.* 35, *with foot-note.*

Also in: E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, ch.* 7.

SECURITY, The Act of. See Scotland: A. D. 1703–1704.

SEDAN, The French Catastrophe at. See France: A. D. 1870 (August—September).

SEDAN: The Sovereign Principality and its extinction. See France: A. D. 1641–1642.

SEDGEMOOR, Battle of. See England: A. D. 1685 (May—July).

SEFAVEAN DYNASTY, The. See Persia: A. D. 1499–1887.

SEGESVAR, Battle of (1849). See Austria: A. D. 1848–1849.

SEGNI, The.—The Segni were a tribe in ancient Gaul who occupied a region on the Rhine supposed to be indicated by the name of the modern small town of Sinei or Segnei, a small town in the territory of Namur on the Meuse above Liège.—G. Long, *Decline of the Roman Republic, v.* 4, *ch.* 8.

SEGONTIACI, The.—A tribe of ancient Britons living near the Thames.

SEGONTIUM.—"One of the most important Roman towns in Wales, the walls of which are still visible at Caer Seiont, near Caernarvon, on the coast of the Irish Sea."—T. Wright, *Celt, Roman and Saxon, ch.* 5.—See Britain: A. D. 61.

SEGUSIAVI, The.—One of the tribes of Gaul which occupied the ancient Forez (departments of the Rhone and the Loire) and extended to the left bank of the Saone.—Napoleon III., *Hist. of Cæsar, bk.* 3, *ch.* 2, *foot-note.*

SEISACHTHEIA OF SOLON, The. See Debt, Laws concerning: Ancient Greek.

SEJANUS, The malign influence of. See Rome: A. D. 14–37.

SELAH.—The city in the rocks—Petra—of the Edomites, Idumeans, or Nabatheans. See Nabatheans.

SELDJUKS, OR SELJUKS, The. See Turks: The Seljuks.

SELECTMEN.—In 1665 the General Court or Town Meeting of Plymouth Colony enacted that "'in every Towne of this Jurisdiction there be three or five Celectmen chosen by the Townsmen out of the freemen such as shal be approved by the Court; for the better managing of the afaires of the respective Townships; and that the Celect men in every Towne or the major parte of them are heerby Impowered to heare and determine all debtes and differences arising between pson and pson within theire respective Townships not exceeding forty shillings,' &c. . . . The origin of the title 'Selectmen' it is difficult to determine. It may possibly be referred to the tun-gerefa of the old Anglo-Saxon township, who, with 'the four best men,' was the legal representative of the community, or to the 'probi homines' of more ancient times. The prefix 'select' would seem to indicate the best, the most approved, but, as in the Massachusetts Colony, they were called, as early as 1642, 'selected townsmen,' it is probable that without reference to any historic type they were merely the men appointed, chosen, selected from the townsmen, to have charge of town affairs."—W. T. Davis, *Ancient Landmarks of Plymouth, pp.* 84–85.—See, also, Township and Town-meeting.

SELEUCIA.—Seleucia, about forty-five miles from Babylon, on the Tigris, was one of the capitals founded by Seleucus Nicator. "Many ages after the fall of [the Macedonian or Seleucid Empire in Asia] . . . Seleucia retained the genuine characters of a Grecian colony—arts, military virtue, and the love of freedom. The independent republic was governed by a senate of three hundred nobles; the people consisted of

600,000 citizens; the walls were strong, and, as long as concord prevailed among the several orders of the State, they viewed with contempt the power of the Parthian; but the madness of faction was sometimes provoked to implore the dangerous aid of the common enemy, who was posted almost at the gates of the colony." The Parthian capital, Ctesiphon, grew up at a distance of only three miles from Seleucia. "Under the reign of Marcus, the Roman generals penetrated as far as Ctesiphon and Seleucia. They were received as friends by the Greek colony; they attacked as enemies the seat of the Parthian kings; yet both cities experienced the same treatment. The sack and conflagration of Seleucia, with the massacre of 300,000 of the inhabitants, tarnished the glory of the Roman triumph."—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, ch.* 8.—See, also, CTESIPHON; SELEUCIDÆ; and MEDAIN.

SELEUCIDÆ, The Empire of the.—The struggle for power which broke out after his death among the successors of Alexander the Great (see MACEDONIA: B. C. 323–316 to 297–280) may be regarded as having been brought to a close by the battle of Ipsus. "The period of fermentation was then concluded, and something like a settled condition of things brought about. A quadripartite division of Alexander's dominions was recognised, Macedonia, Egypt, Asia Minor, and Syria (or south-western Asia) becoming thenceforth distinct political entities. . . . Of the four powers thus established, the most important . . . was the kingdom of Syria (as it was called), or that ruled for 247 years by the Seleucidæ. Seleucus Nicator, the founder of this kingdom, was one of Alexander's officers, but served without much distinction through the various campaigns by which the conquest of the East was effected. At the first distribution of provinces (B. C. 323) among Alexander's generals after his death, he received no share; and it was not until B. C. 320, when upon the death of Perdiccas a fresh distribution was made at Triparadisus, that his merits were recognised, and he was given the satrapy of Babylon. . . . Seleucus led the flower of the eastern provinces to the field of Ipsus (B. C. 301), and contributed largely to the victory, thus winning himself a position among the foremost potentates of the day. By the terms of the agreement made after Ipsus, Seleucus was recognised as monarch of all the Greek conquests in Asia, with the sole exceptions of Lower Syria and Asia Minor. The monarchy thus established extended from the Holy Land and the Mediterranean on the west, to the Indus valley and the Bolor mountain-chain upon the east, and from the Caspian and Jaxartes towards the north, to the Persian gulf and Indian Ocean towards the south. It comprised Upper Syria, Mesopotamia, parts of Cappadocia and Phrygia, Armenia, Assyria, Media, Babylonia, Susiana, Persia, Carmania, Sagartia, Hyrcania, Parthia, Bactria, Sogdiana, Aria, Zarangia, Arachosia, Sacastana, Gedrosia, and probably some part of India."—G. Rawlinson, *Sixth Great Oriental Monarchy, ch.* 3.—The original capital of the great Empire of Seleucus was Babylon; but not satisfied with it he founded and built the city of Seleucia, about forty miles from Babylon, on the Tigris. Even there he was not content, and, after the battle of Ipsus, he created, within a few years, the magnificent city of Antioch, in the valley of the Orontes, and made it his royal residence. This removal of the capital from the center of his dominions to the Syrian border is thought to have been among the causes which led to the disintegration of the kingdom. First Bactria, then Parthia, fell away, and the latter, in time, absorbed most of the Seleucid empire.—C. Thirlwall, *Hist. of Greece, ch.* 58–60 (*v.* 7–8).

ALSO IN: J. P. Mahaffy, *The Story of Alexander's Empire.*—B. G. Niebuhr, *Lect's on Ancient Hist., v.* 3.

B. C. 281-224.—Wars with the Ptolemies and civil wars.—Decay of the empire.—"Antiochus Soter, the son of Seleucus, who had succeeded to his father [murdered B. C. 281—see MACEDONIA: B. C. 297–280] at the age of 40, received the surname of Soter [Saviour] from his complete victory [time and place unknown] over the Gauls at the time when they had crossed the Bosporus [see GALATIA]. . . . He reigned little more (?) than twenty years. At the beginning of his reign, Antiochus carried on wars with Antigonus and Ptolemy Ceraunus [see MACEDONIA: B. C. 277–244], which, however, were soon brought to a close. The war with Antigonus had commenced as early as the time of Demetrius; it was a maritime war, in which nothing sufficiently important was done; both parties felt that it was only a useless waste of strength, and soon concluded peace. Antiochus was wise enough altogether to abstain from interfering in the affairs of Europe. In Asia he apparently enlarged the dominion of his father, and his magnificent empire extended from the mountains of Candahar as far as the Hellespont; but many parts of it, which his father had left him in a state of submission, asserted their independence, as e. g., Cappadocia and Pontus under Ariarathes, and so also Armenia and several other countries in the midst of his empire; and he was obliged to be satisfied with maintaining a nominal supremacy in those parts. There can be no doubt that in his reign Bactria also became independent under a Macedonian king. Even Seleucus had no longer ruled over the Indian states, which, having separated from the empire, returned to their own national institutions. With Ptolemy Philadelphus [Egypt] he at first concluded peace, and was on good terms with him; but during the latter years of his reign he was again involved in war with him, although Ptolemy undoubtedly was far more powerful; and this war was protracted until the reign of his son Antiochus. . . . The Egyptians carried on the war on the offensive against Asia Minor, where they already possessed a few places, and principally at sea. The Syrians conquered Damascus, though otherwise the war was unfavourable to them; they did not carry it on with energy, and the Egyptians at that time conquered Ephesus, the coast of Ionia, Caria, Pamphylia, and probably Cilicia also; the Cyclades likewise fell into their hands about that period. . . . On the death of Antiochus Soter (Olymp. 129, 3) [B. C. 252] the government passed into the hands of his surviving son, . . . Antiochus Theos, one of the most detestable Asiatic despots." Peace with Egypt was brought about by the marriage of Antiochus Theos to Berenice, daughter of Ptolemy Philadelphus; but in order to marry her he was obliged to divorce and send away his wife Laudice,

or Laodice. After Ptolemy Philadelphus died, however (B. C. 248), Laodice returned, "recovered her whole influence, and Berenice, with her child, was sent to Antioch"—the royal residence of Antiochus then being at Ephesus. The next year Antiochus, who had been ill for a long time—"in a perpetual state of intoxication"—died, perhaps of poison. Laodice "caused a waxen image of him to be placed in a bed, and thus deceived the courtiers, who were obliged to stand at a respectful distance," while she, "with her sons, took possession of the government, and adopted measures to rid herself of Berenice. But the citizens of Antioch sided with Berenice, and . . . she for a time remained in possession of Antioch. . . . But she was betrayed by the nobles . . . ; her child was dragged from her arms and murdered before her eyes; she then fled into the temple at Daphne, and was herself murdered there in the asylum. The two brothers, Seleucus Callinicus and Antiochus Hierax, then assumed the crown; but they seem to have divided the empire, and Antiochus obtained Asia Minor. . . . Ptolemy Euergetes, the third among the Ptolemies, and the last in the series that deserves praise, now rose in just indignation at the fate of his unhappy sister (Olymp. 133, 3) [B. C. 246]. He marched out with all the forces of his empire, and wherever he went the nations declared in his favour. . . . 'All the Ionian, Cilician, and other towns, which were already in arms to support Berenice,' joined Euergetes, and he traversed the whole of the Syrian empire. . . . He himself proceeded as far as Babylon. Media, Persia, and the upper satrapies, southern Chorassan and Sistan as far as Cabul, all of which belonged to Syria, submitted to him. He was equally successful in Asia Minor: the acropolis of Sardes, a part of Lydia, and Phrygia Major, alone maintained themselves. Even the countries on the coast of Thrace . . . were conquered by the Egyptians. . . . Seleucus Callinicus, in the meantime, probably maintained himself in the mountainous districts of Armenia, in Aderbidjan. 'His brother, Antiochus, deserted him, and negotiated with Ptolemy.' In the conquered countries, Ptolemy everywhere exercised the rights of a conqueror in the harsh Egyptian manner. . . . While he was thus levying contributions abroad, an insurrection broke out in Egypt, which obliged him to return." He, thereupon, divided his conquests, "retaining for himself Syria as far as the Euphrates, and the coast districts of Asia Minor and Thrace, so that he had a complete maritime empire. The remaining territories he divided into two states: the country beyond the Euphrates was given, according to St. Jerome on Daniel (xi. 7 foll.), to one Xanthippus, who is otherwise unknown, and western Asia was left to Antiochus Hierax. It would seem that after this he never visited those countries again. After he had withdrawn, a party hostile to him came forward to oppose him. . . . The confederates formed a fleet, with the assistance of which, and supported by a general insurrection of the Asiatics, who were exasperated against the Egyptians on account of their rapacity, Seleucus Callinicus rallied again. He recovered the whole of upper Asia, and for a time he was united with his brother Antiochus Hierax. . . . Ptolemy being pressed on all sides concluded a truce of ten years with Seleucus on the basis 'uti possidetis.' Both parties seem to have retained the places which they possessed at the time, so that all the disadvantage was on the side of the Seleucidae, for the fortified town of Seleucia, e. g., remained in the hands of the Egyptians, whereby the capital was placed in a dangerous position. 'A part of Cilicia, the whole of Caria, the Ionian cities, the Thracian Chersonesus, and several Macedonian towns likewise continued to belong to Egypt.' During this period, a war broke out between the brothers Seleucus and Antiochus. . . . The war between the two brothers lasted for years: its seat was Asia Minor. . . . 'Seleucus established himself in upper Asia, where the Parthians, who during the war between the brothers had subdued Sistan and lower Chorassan, were in the possession of Media, Babylonia and Persia.'" In the end, Antiochus was overcome, and fled into Thrace. "But there he was taken prisoner by a general of Euergetes, 'and orders were sent from Alexandria to keep him in safe custody'; for in the mean time a peace had been concluded between Seleucus and Ptolemy, by which the Egyptian empire in its immense extent was strengthened again." Antiochus Hierax then escaped and took refuge among the Gauls, but was murdered for the jewels that he carried with him. "Notwithstanding its successful enterprises, Egypt had been shaken by the war to its foundations and had lost its strength. . . . The empire was already in a state of internal decay, and even more so than that of Syria. The death of Euergetes [B. C. 221] decided its downfall. 'But in Syria too the long wars had loosened the connection among the provinces more than ever, and those of Asia Minor, the jewels of the Syrian crown, were separated from the rest. For while Seleucus was in Upper Asia, Achaeus, his uncle, availed himself of the opportunity of making himself an independent satrap in western Asia.' Seleucus did not reign long after this. He was succeeded by his son Seleucus Ceraunus (Olymp. 138, 2) [B. C. 227] who marched against the younger Achaeus, but was murdered by a Gaul named Apaturius, at the instigation of the same Achaeus (Olymp. 139, 1) [B. C. 224]. He had reigned only three years, and resided in western Asia. He was succeeded by his younger brother Antiochus, surnamed the Great. . . . Under Antiochus the Syrian empire revived again and acquired a great extent, especially in the south. Although he was not a great man, his courtiers, not without reason, gave him the surname of the Great, because he restored the empire. This happened at the time when Antigonus Doson [king of Macedonia] died. Achaeus, in Asia Minor, was in a state of insurrection; the satrap of Media was likewise revolting, and the Syrian empire was confined to Syria, Babylonia, and Persia. During this confusion, new sovereigns ascended the thrones everywhere. In Macedonia, Philip succeeded; in Egypt, Ptolemy Philopator; in Media, Molon; and in Bactria a consolidated Macedonian dynasty had already established itself."—B. G. Niebuhr, *Lect's on Ancient Hist., lect.* 103–104 (*v.* 3).

B. C. 224-187.—The reign of Antiochus the Great.—His early successes.—His disastrous war with the Romans.—His diminished kingdom.—His death.—Antiochus the Great first proved his military talents in the war against the rebellious brothers Molo and Alexander, the satraps of Media and Persia (B. C. 220). "He

next renewed the old contest with Egypt for the possession of Cœle-Syria and Palestine, and was forced to cede those provinces to Ptolemy Philopator, as the result of his decisive defeat at Raphia, near Gaza, in the same year in which the battle of the Trasimene lake [between Hannibal and the Romans] was fought (B. C. 217). Meanwhile, Achæus, the governor of Asia Minor, had raised the standard of independence; but after an obstinate resistance he was defeated and taken at Sardis, and put to death by Antiochus (B. C. 214). This success in the West encouraged Antiochus, like his father, to attempt the reconquest of the East, and with greater appearance at least of success. But a seven years' war (B. C. 212–205) only resulted in his acknowledgment of the independence of the Parthian monarchy (B. C. 205). The same year witnessed not only the crisis of the Hannibalic War, but the death of Ptolemy Philopator; and the opportunity offered by the latter event effectually withdrew Antiochus from direct participation in the great conflict. The league which he made with Philip [Philip V., king of Macedonia, who had then just concluded a peace with the Romans, ending the 'First Macedonian War'—see GREECE: B. C. 214–146], instead of being a well-concerted plan for the exclusion of the Romans from Asia, was only intended to leave him at liberty to pursue his designs against Egypt, while Philip bore the brunt of the war with Attalus [king of Pergamus, or Pergamum] and the Romans. During the crisis of the Macedonian War, he prosecuted a vigorous attack upon Cilicia, Cœle-Syria, and Palestine, while the Romans hesitated to engage in a new contest to protect the dominions of their youthful ward [Ptolemy V. Epiphanes, the infant king of Egypt, whose guardians had placed him under the protection of the Roman senate]. At length a decisive victory over the Egyptians at Panium, the hill whence the Jordan rises, was followed by a peace which gave the coveted provinces to Antiochus [see JEWS: B. C. 332–167], while the youthful Ptolemy was betrothed to Cleopatra, the daughter of the Syrian king (B. C. 198). It must not be forgotten that the transference of these provinces from Egypt, which had constantly pursued a tolerant policy towards the Jews, led afterwards to the furious persecution of that people by Antiochus Epiphanes, and their successful revolt under the Maccabees [see JEWS. B. C. 166–40]. The time seemed now arrived for Antiochus to fly to the aid of Philip, before he should be crushed by the Romans; but the Syrian king still clung to the nearer and dearer object of extending his power over the whole of Asia Minor. . . . He collected a great army at Sardis, while his fleet advanced along the southern shores of Asia Minor, so that he was brought into collision both with Attalus and the Rhodians, the allies of Rome. . . . Though the Rhodians succeeded in protecting the chief cities of Caria, and Antiochus was repelled from some important places by the resistance of the inhabitants, he became master of several others, and among the rest of Abydos on the Hellespont. Even the conquest of his ally Philip was in the first instance favourable to his progress; for the hesitating policy of the Romans suffered him to occupy the places vacated by the Macedonian garrisons." It was not until 191 B. C. that the fatuity of the Syrian monarch brought him into collision with the legions of Rome. He had formed an alliance with the Ætolians in Greece, and he had received into his camp the fugitive Carthaginian, Hannibal; but petty jealousies forbade his profiting by the genius of the great unfortunate soldier. He entered Greece with a small force in 192 B. C., occupied the pass of Thermopylæ, and entrenched himself there, waiting reinforcements which did not come to him. Even the Macedonians were arrayed against him. Early in the following year he was attacked in this strong position by the Roman consul Manius Acilius Glabrio. Despite the immense advantages of the position he was defeated overwhelmingly and his army almost totally destroyed (B. C. 191). He fled to Chalcis and from Chalcis to Asia; but he had not escaped the long arm of wrathful Rome, now roused against him. For the first time, a Roman army crossed the Hellespont and entered the Asiatic world, under the command of the powerful Scipios, Africanus and his brother. At the same time a Roman fleet, in co-operation with the navy of Rhodes, swept the coasts of Asia Minor. After some minor naval engagements, a great battle was fought off the promontory of Myonnesus, near Ephesus, in which the Syrians lost half their fleet (B. C. 190). . . . On land Antiochus fared no better. A vast and motley host which he gathered for the defense of his dominions was assailed by L. Scipio at Magnesia, under Mount Sipylus (B. C. 190), and easily destroyed, some 50,000 of its dead being left on the field. This ended the war and stripped Antiochus of all his former conquests in Asia Minor. Much of the territory taken from him was handed over to the king of Pergamum, faithful ally and friend of Rome; some to the republic of Rhodes, and some was left undisturbed in its political state, as organized in the minor states of Cappadocia, Bithynia and the rest. "As the battle of Magnesia was the last, in ancient history, of those unequal conflicts, in which oriental armies yielded like unsubstantial shows to the might of disciplined freedom, so it sealed the fate of the last of the great oriental empires; for the kingdom left to the heirs of Seleucus was only strong enough to indulge them in the luxuries of Antioch and the malignant satisfaction of persecuting the Jews. All resistance ceased in Asia Minor; that great peninsula was ceded as far as the Taurus and the Halys, with whatever remained nominally to Antiochus in Thrace; and, with characteristic levity, he thanked the Romans for relieving him of the government of too large a kingdom. . . . Never, perhaps, did a great power fall so rapidly, so thoroughly, and so ignominiously as the kingdom of the Seleucidæ under this Antiochus the Great. He himself was soon afterwards slain by the indignant inhabitants of Elymaïs at the head of the Persian Gulf, on occasion of the plundering of a temple of Bel, with the treasures of which he had sought to replenish his empty coffers (B. C. 187). . . . The petty princes of Phrygia soon submitted to the power and exactions of the new lords of Western Asia; but the powerful Celtic tribes of Galatia made a stand in the fastnesses of Mount Olympus." They were overcome, however, and the survivors driven beyond the Halys. "That river, fixed by the treaty with Antiochus as the eastern limit of Roman power in Asia, was respected as the present terminus of

their conquests, without putting a bound to their influence." Eumenes, king of Pergamus, "was justly rewarded for his sufferings and services by the apportionment of the greater part of the territories ceded by Antiochus to the aggrandizement of his kingdom. Pergamus became the most powerful state of Western Asia, including nearly the whole of Asia Minor up to the Halys and the Taurus, except Bithynia and Galatia on the one side, and on the other Lycia and the greater part of Caria, which went to recompense the fidelity of the Rhodians; and to these Asiatic possessions were added, in Europe, the Thracian Chersonese and the city of Lysimachia."—P. Smith, *Hist. of the World: Ancient, ch.* 27 (*v.* 2).

Also in: J. P. Mahaffy, *The Story of Alexander's Empire, ch.* 24 *and* 28.—W. Ihne, *Hist. of Rome, bk.* 5, *ch.* 2.—C. Thirlwall, *Hist. of Greece, ch.* 65.

B. C. 150.—Conquest by the Parthians of Media, Persia, Susiana, Babylonia and Assyria. See Persia: B. C. 150–A. D. 226.

B. C. 64.—Pompeius in the East.—Syria absorbed in the dominion of Rome.—In 64, B. C. having finished the Mithridatic War, driving the Pontic king across the Euxine into the Crimea, Pompeius Magnus marched into Syria to settle affairs in that disordered region (see Rome: B. C. 69–63). He had received from the Roman senate and people, under the Manilian Law, an extraordinary commission, with supreme powers in Asia, and by virtue of this authority he assumed to dispose of the eastern kingdoms at will. The last of the Seleucid kings of Syria was deprived of his throne at Pompey's command, and Syria was added to the dominions of Rome. He then turned his attention to Judæa. —G. Long, *Decline of the Roman Republic, v.* 3, *ch.* 9–10.—See Jews: B. C. 166–40.

SELF-DENYING ORDINANCE, The. See England: A. D. 1644–1645.

SELGOVÆ, The.—A tribe which, in Roman times, occupied the modern county of Dumfries, Scotland. See Britain, Celtic Tribes.

SELIM I., Turkish Sultan, A. D. 1512–1520.....**Selim II., Turkish Sultan,** 1566–1574. ....**Selim III., Turkish Sultan,** 1789–1807.

SELINUS, Destruction of (B. C. 409). See Sicily: B. C. 409–405.

SELJUKS. See Turks (Seljuks).

SELLA CURULIS. See Curule Chair.

SELLASIA, Battle of.—The last and decisive battle in what was called the Kleomenic War—fought B. C. 221. The war had its origin in the resistance of Sparta, under the influence of its last heroic king, Kleomenes, to the growing power of the Achaian League, revived and extended by Aratos. In the end, the League, to defeat Kleomenes, was persuaded by Aratos to call in Antigonus Doson, king of Macedonia, and practically to surrender itself, as an instrument in his hands, for the subjugation of Sparta and all Peloponnesus. The deed was accomplished on the field of Sellasia. Kleomenes fled to Egypt; "Sparta now, for the first time since the return of the Hêrakleids, opened her gates to a foreign conqueror."—E. A. Freeman, *Hist. of Federal Govt., ch.* 7, *sect.* 4.

Also in: Plutarch, *Kleomenes.*—See, also, Greece: B. C. 280–146.

SELLI, The. See Hellas.

SEMINARA, Battle of (1503). See Italy: A. D. 1501–1504.

SEMINOLES. See American Aborigines: Seminoles, and Muskhogean Family; also, Florida: A. D. 1816–1818, 1835–1843.

SEMITES, The.—"The 'Semitic Race' owes its name to a confusion of ethnology with philology. A certain family of speech, composed of languages closely related to one another and presupposing a common mother-tongue, received the title of 'Semitic' from the German scholar Eichhorn. There was some justification for such a name. The family of speech consists of Hebrew and Phoenician, of Aramaic, of Assyrian and Babylonian, of Arabian, of South Arabian and of Ethiopic or Ge'ez. Eber, Aram, and Asshur were all sons of Shem, and the South Arabian tribes claimed descent from Joktan. In default of a better title, therefore, 'Semitic' was introduced and accepted in order to denote the group of languages of which Hebrew and Aramaic form part. But whatever justification there may have been for speaking of a Semitic family of languages there was none for speaking of a Semitic race. To do so was to confound language and race, and to perpetuate the old error which failed to distinguish between the two. Unfortunately, however, when scholars began to realise the distinction between language and race, the mischief was already done. 'The Semitic race' had become, as it were, a household term of ethnological science. It was too late to try to displace it; all we can do is to define it accurately and distinguish it carefully from the philological term, 'the Semitic family of speech.' . . . There are members of the Semitic race who do not speak Semitic languages, and speakers of Semitic languages who do not belong to the Semitic race. . . . It is questionable whether the Phoenicians or Canaanites were of purely Semitic ancestry, and yet it was from them that the Israelites learned the language which we call Hebrew. . . . Northern Arabia was the early home of the Semitic stock, and it is in Northern Arabia that we still meet with it but little changed. . . . The Bedawin of Northern Arabia, and to a lesser extent the settled population of the Hijaz, may therefore be regarded as presenting us with the purest examples of the Semitic type. But even the Bedawin are not free from admixture."—A. H. Sayce, *The Races of the Old Testament, ch.* 4.—"The following is a scheme of the divisions of the Semitic race. It is based partly upon the evidence afforded by linguistic affinity, and partly upon geographical and historical distribution:

A.—Northern Semites.

I.	Babylonian:	a. Old Babylonian b. Assyrian c. Chaldæan
II.	Aramæan:	a. Mesopotamian b. Syrian.
III.	Canaanitic:	a. Canaanites b. Phœnicians
IV.	Hebraic:	a. Hebrews b. Moabites c. Ammonites d. Edomites

B.—Southern Semites.

I. Sabæans
II. Ethiopians
III. Arabs.

It should be said with regard to the foregoing classification, that it has been made as general as possible, since it is a matter of great difficulty to make clear-cut divisions on an exact ethnological basis. If a linguistic classification were attempted, a scheme largely different would have to be exhibited. . . . Again it should be observed that the mixture of races which was continually going on in the Semitic world is not and cannot be indicated by our classification. The Babylonians, for example, received a constant accession from Aramæans encamped on their borders, and even beyond the Tigris; but these, as well as non-Semitic elements from the mountains and plains to the east, they assimilated in speech and customs. The same general remark applies to the Aramæans of Northern Mesopotamia and Syria, while the peoples of Southern and Eastern Palestine, and in fact all the communities that bordered on the Great Desert, from the Persian Gulf to the Mediterranean, were continually absorbing individuals or tribes of Arabian stock. Finally, it must be remarked that in some sub-divisions it is necessary to use a geographical instead of a properly racial distinction; and that is, of course, to be limited chronologically. Thus, for instance, it is impossible to devise a single strictly ethnological term for the two great divisions of the Aramæans. It is now pretty generally admitted that the home of the Semitic race, before its separation into the historical divisions, was Northern Arabia. . . . The historical distribution of the several families is thus best accounted for. . . . While among the Southern Semites the various Arab tribes remained for the most part in their desert home for thousands of years as obscure Bedawin, and the Sabæans cultivated the rich soil of the southwest and the southern coast of Arabia, and there developed cities and a flourishing commerce, and the nearly related Ethiopians, migrating across the Red Sea, slowly built up in Abyssinia an isolated civilization of their own, those branches of the race with which we are immediately concerned, after a lengthened residence in common camping grounds, moved northward and westward to engage in more important enterprises. The Babylonians, occupying the region which the Bible makes known to us as the scene of man's creation, and which historical research indicates to have been the seat of the earliest civilization, made their home on the lands of the Lower Euphrates and Tigris, converting them through canalization and irrigation into rich and powerful kingdoms finally united under the rule of Babylon. Before the union was effected, emigrants from among these Babylonians settled along the Middle Tigris, founded the city of Asshur, and later still the group of cities known to history as Nineveh. The Assyrians then, after long struggles, rose to pre-eminence in Western Asia, till after centuries of stern dominion they yielded to the new Babylonian régime founded by the Chaldæans from the shores of the Persian Gulf. The Canaanites, debarred from the riches of the East, turned northwestward at an unknown early date, and while some of them occupied and cultivated the valleys of Palestine, others seized the maritime plain and the western slope of Lebanon. On the coast of the latter region they took advantage of the natural harbours wanting in the former, and tried the resources and possibilities of the sea. As Phœnicians of Sidon and Tyre, they became the great navigators and maritime traders for the nations, and sent forth colonies over the Mediterranean [see PHŒNICIA]. . . . Meanwhile the pasture lands between the Tigris and the Euphrates and between the southern desert and the northern mountains were gradually being occupied by the Aramæans, who advanced with flocks and herds along the Euphrates. . . . While the bulk of the Aramæans adhered to the old pastoral life among the good grazing districts in the confines of the desert, a large number, favoured by their intermediate position between urban and nomadic settlements, addicted themselves to the carrying trade between the East and the West. . . . This remarkable people, however, never attained to political autonomy on a large scale in their Mesopotamian home, to which for long ages they were confined. After the decline of the Hettite principalities west of the Euphrates [see HITTITES], to which they themselves largely contributed, they rapidly spread in that quarter also. They mingled with the non-Semitic Hettite inhabitants of Carchemish and Hamath, formed settlements along the slopes of Amanus and Anti-Lebanon, and created on the northeast corner of Palestine a powerful state with Damascus as the centre, which was long a rival of Israel, and even stood out against the might of Assyria. Thus the Aramæans really acted a more prominent political part to the west than they did to the east of the Euphrates, and accordingly they have been popularly most closely associated with the name 'Syria.' At the same time they did not abandon their old settlements between the Rivers. . . . As the latest of the historical divisions of the race to form an independent community, the Hebraic family made their permanent settlement in and about Palestine [see JEWS]. Their common ancestors of the family of Terah emigrated from Southern Babylonia more than two thousand years before the Christian era. It is highly probable that they were of Aramæan stock."—J. F. McCurdy, *History, Prophecy and the Monuments, bk.* 1, *ch.* 2 (*v.* 1).—"The Hebrews . . . divided the country of Aram [between the Mediterranean and the Euphrates] into several regions; 1st Aram Naharaim, or 'Aram of the two rivers,' that is, the Mesopotamia of the Greeks, between the Euphrates and the Tigris; 2d Aram properly so called, that is, Syria, whose most ancient and important city was Damascus; and 3d Aram Zobah, or the region in which in later times was formed the kingdom of Palmyra."—F. Lenormant and E. Chevalier, *Manual of the Ancient History of the East, bk.* 1, *ch.* 4.—"The Semitic home is distinguished by its central position in geography — between Asia and Africa, and between the Indian Ocean and the Mediterranean, which is Europe; and the rôle in history of the Semitic race has been also intermediary. The Semites have been the great middlemen of the world. Not second-rate in war, they have risen to the first rank in commerce and religion. They have been the carriers between East and West, they have stood between the great ancient civilizations and those which go to make up the modern world; while by a higher gift, for which their conditions neither in place nor in time fully account, they have been mediary between God and man, and proved the religious teachers of the world, through whom have come

its three highest faiths, its only universal religions."—Geo. Adam Smith, *Historical Geography of the Holy Land, p.* 5.—"If we ask what the Semitic peoples have contributed to this organic and living whole which is called civilization, we shall find, in the first place, that, in polity, we owe them nothing at all. Political life is perhaps the most peculiar and native characteristic of the Indo-European nations. These nations are the only ones that have known liberty, that have reconciled the State with the independence of the individual. . . . In art and poetry what do we owe to them? In art nothing. These tribes have but little of the artist; our art comes entirely from Greece. In poetry, nevertheless, without being their tributaries, we have with them more than one bond of union. The Psalms have become in some respects one of our sources of poetry. Hebrew poetry has taken a place with us beside Greek poetry, not as having furnished a distinct order of poetry, but as constituting a poetic ideal, a sort of Olympus where in consequence of an accepted prestige everything is suffused with a halo of light. . . . Here again, however, all the shades of expression, all the delicacy, all the depth is our work. The thing essentially poetic is the destiny of man; his melancholy moods, his restless search after causes, his just complaint to heaven. There was no necessity of going to strangers to learn this. The eternal school here is each man's soul. In science and philosophy we are exclusively Greek. The investigation of causes, knowledge for knowledge's own sake, is a thing of which there is no trace previous to Greece, a thing that we have learned from her alone. Babylon possessed a science, but it had not that pre-eminently scientific principle, the absolute fixedness of natural law. . . . We owe to the Semitic race neither political life, art, poetry, philosophy, nor science. What then do we owe to them? We owe to them religion. The whole world, if we except India, China, Japan, and tribes altogether savage, has adopted the Semitic religions. The civilized world comprises only Jews, Christians, and Mussulmans. The Indo-European race in particular, excepting the Brahmanic family and the feeble relics of the Parsees, has gone over completely to the Semitic faiths. What has been the cause of this strange phenomenon? How happens it that the nations who hold the supremacy of the world have renounced their own creed to adopt that of the people they have conquered? The primitive worship of the Indo-European race . . . was charming and profound, like the imagination of the nations themselves. It was like an echo of nature, a sort of naturalistic hymn, in which the idea of one sole cause appears but occasionally and uncertainly. It was a child's religion, full of artlessness and poetry, but destined to crumble at the first demand of thought. Persia first effected its reform (that which is associated with the name of Zoroaster) under influences and at an epoch unknown to us. Greece, in the time of Pisistratus, was already dissatisfied with her religion, and was turning towards the East. In the Roman period, the old pagan worship had become utterly insufficient. It no longer addressed the imagination; it spoke feebly to the moral sense. The old myths on the forces of nature had become changed into fables, not unfrequently amusing and ingenious, but destitute of all religious value. It is precisely at this epoch that the civilized world finds itself face to face with the Jewish faith. Based upon the clear and simple dogma of the divine unity, discarding naturalism and pantheism by the marvellously terse phrase: 'In the beginning, God created the heaven and the earth,' possessing a law, a book, the depository of grand moral precepts and of an elevated religious poetry, Judaism had an incontestable superiority, and it might have been foreseen then that some day the world would become Jewish, that is to say would forsake the old mythology for Monotheism."—E. Renan, *Studies of Religious History and Criticism, pp.* 154–160.

Primitive Babylonia.—"The Babylonians were . . . the first of the Semites to enter the arena of history, and they did so by virtue of the civilization to which they attained in and through their settlements on the Lower Euphrates and Tigris. . . . The unrivalled fertility of the soil of Babylonia was the result not only of the quality of the soil, but of the superadded benefits of the colossal system of drainage and canalization which was begun by the ingenuity of the first civilized inhabitants. Of the natural elements of fertility, the Euphrates contributed by far the larger share. . . . The . . . formations of clay, mud, and gypsum, comprising elements of the richest soil, are found in such profusion in Babylonia that in the days of ancient civilization it was the most fruitful portion of the whole earth with the possible exception of the valley of the Nile. It was roughly reckoned by Herodotus to equal in productiveness half the rest of Asia. . . . The rise of the Semites in Babylonia, like all other origins, is involved in obscurity. The earliest authentic records, drawn as they are from their own monuments, reveal this gifted race as already in possession of a high degree of civilization, with completed systems of national religion, a language already long past its formative period, and a stage of advancement in art that testifies to the existence of a wealthy class of taste and leisure, to whom their nomadic ancestry must have been little more than a vague tradition. The same records also show this Semitic people to have extended their sway in Western Asia as far as the Mediterranean coastland many centuries before Phœnicians or Hebrews or Hettites came before the world in any national or corporate form. Questions of deep interest arise in connection with such facts as these. It is asked: Did the Babylonian Semites develop the elements of their civilization alone, or did they inherit that of another race? . . . In the absence of direct evidence to the contrary, we are entitled to assume that the same race who in historical times gave proof of high mental endowments reached their unique level of intellectual attainment by a process of self-education. A contrary opinion is held by many scholars of high rank. I refer to the well-known theory that the Semitic Babylonians acquired their civilization from another people who preceded them in the occupation and cultivation of the country [see BABYLONIA, PRIMITIVE]. This hypothetical race is named Sumerian from the term Sumer, generally, but erroneously, supposed to be the designation of Southern Babylonia. With this in the Inscriptions is coupled the name of Akkad, another geographical term properly connoting Northern Babylonia. This appellation has given rise to the name 'Akkadian,'

used by most of these modern authorities to designate a supposed subdivision of the same people, speaking a dialect of the main Sumerian language. . . . The Sumerian theory has played a great rôle in linguistic and ethnological research during the last twenty years. The general aspect of the supposed language led at once to its being classed with the agglutinative families of speech, and the inevitable 'Turanian' conveniently opened its hospitable doors. . . . While we are . . . obliged, until further light shall have been cast upon the subject, to assume that the earliest type of Babylonian culture was mainly of Semitic origin, it would be rash to assert that people of that race were the sole occupants of the lower River country in prehistoric times, or that they received no important contributions to their development from any outside races. . . . It . . . remains for us to assume it to be possible that an antecedent or contemporanous people bore a small share with the Semites in the early development of the country, and that, as a result of their contact with the stronger race, they bequeathed to it some of the elements of the surviving religion, mythology, and popular superstition."—J. F. McCurdy, *History, Prophecy and the Monuments*, *bk.* 2, *ch.* 1 (*v.* 1).—"As to the ancient history of Babylon, it is well to learn to be patient and to wait. The progress of discovery and decipherment is so rapid, that what is true this year is shown to be wrong next year. . . . This is no discredit to the valiant pioneers in this glorious campaign. On the contrary it speaks well for their perseverance and for their sense of truth. I shall only give you one instance to show what I mean by calling the ancient periods of Babylonian history also constructive rather than authentic. My friend Professor Sayce claims 4000 B. C. as the beginning of Babylonian literature. Nabonidus, he tells us (Hibbert Lectures, p. 21), in 550 B. C. explored the great temple of the Sun god at Sippara. This temple was believed to have been founded by Naram Sin, the son of Sargon. Nabonidus, however, lighted upon the actual foundation-stone—a stone, we are told, which had not been seen by any of his predecessors for 3,200 years. On the strength of this the date of 3,200 + 550 years, that is, 3750 B. C., is assigned to Naram Sin, the son of Sargon. These two kings, however, are said to be quite modern, and to have been preceded by a number of so-called Proto-Chaldæan kings, who spoke a Proto-Chaldæan language, long before the Semitic population had entered the land. It is concluded, further, from some old inscriptions on diorite, brought from the Peninsula of Sinai to Chaldæa, that the quarries of Sinai, which were worked by the Egyptians at the time of their third dynasty, say six thousand years ago, may have been visited about the same time by these Proto-Chaldæans. 4000 B. C., we are told, would therefore be a very moderate initial epoch for Babylonian and Egyptian literature. I am the very last person to deny the ingeniousness of these arguments, or to doubt the real antiquity of the early civilization of Babylon or Egypt. All I wish to point out is, that we should always keep before our eyes the constructive character of this ancient history and chronology. To use a foundation-stone, on its own authority, as a stepping-stone over a gap of 3,200 years, is purely constructive chronology, and as such is to be carefully distinguished from what historians mean by authentic history, as when Herodotus or Thucydides tells us what happened during their own lives or before their own eyes."—F. Max Müller, *On the "Enormous Antiquity" of the East* (*Nineteenth Century*, 1891).—"Dr. Tiele rejects the name 'Accadian,' which has been adopted by so many Assyriologists, and is strongly indisposed to admit Turanian affinities. Yet he is so far from accepting the alternative theory of Halévy and Guyard, that this so-called Accadian, or Sumerian, is only another way of writing Assyrian, that he can scarcely comprehend how a man of learning and penetration can maintain such a strange position. He seems to consider a positive decision in the present stage of the inquiry premature; but pronounces the hypothesis which lies at the basis of the Accadian theory, namely, that the peculiarities of the cuneiform writing are explicable only by the assumption that it was originally intended for another language than the Assyrian, to be by far the most probable. He calls this language, which may or may not have been non-Semitic, 'Old Chaldee,' because what was later on called Chaldaea 'was certainly its starting-point in Mesopotamia.' The superiority of this name to 'Accadian' or 'Sumerian' is not very obvious, as the name 'Chaldee' is not found before the ninth century B. C., while the oldest title of the Babylonian kings is 'king of Sumir and Accad.' In the interesting account of the provinces and cities of Babylonia and Assyria, . . . two identifications which have found much favour with Assyriologists are mentioned in a very sceptical way. The 'Ur' of Abraham is generally believed, with Schrader, to be the 'El Mughair' of the Arabs. Dr. Tiele coldly observes that this identification, though not impossible, is not proved. Again, the tower of Babel is identified by Schrader either with Babil on the left side of the river, or with Birs Nimrud (Borsippa) on the right side. Dr. Tiele considers the latter site impossible, because Borsippa is always spoken of as a distinct place, and was too distant from Babylon for the supposed outer wall of the great city to enclose it. He also rejects Schrader's theory that the name Nineveh in later times included Dur Sargon (Khorsabad), Resen, and Calah, as well as Nineveh proper. The history is divided into four periods: 1. The old Babylonian period, from the earliest days down to the time when Assyria was sufficiently strong and independent to contend with Babylon on equal terms. 2. The first Assyrian period down to the accession of Tiglath-pileser II. in 745 B. C. 3. The Second Assyrian Period, from 745 B. C. to the Fall of Nineveh. 4. The New Babylonian Empire. In treating of the first period, Dr. Tiele makes no attempt to deal with the Deluge Tablets as a source of historical knowledge, putting them on one side apparently as purely mythical. He despairs of tracing Babylonian culture to its earliest home. The belief that it originated on the shores of the Persian Gulf seems to him uncertain, but he is not able to fill the gap with any other satisfactory hypothesis. Babylonian history begins for him with Sargon I., whom he regards as most probably either of Semitic descent or a representative of Semitic sovereignty. He is sceptical about the early date assigned to this king by Nabunahid, the thirty-eighth century B. C., and

is disposed to regard the quaint story of his concealment when an infant in a basket of reeds as a solar myth; but he is compelled to admit as solid fact the amazing statements of the inscriptions about his mighty empire 'extending from Elam to the coast of the Mediterranean and the borders of Egypt, nay, even to Cyprus.' So early as 1850 B. C., he thinks, the supremacy of Babylon had been established for centuries."—*Review of Dr. Tiele's History of Babylonia and Assyria* (*Academy, Jan.* 1, 1887).

Also in: *The Earliest History of Babylonia* (*Quarterly Rev., Oct.*, 1894, *reviewing* "*Découvertes en Chaldée, par Ernest de Sarsec*).

The First Babylonian Empire.—"It is with the reign of Hammurabi that the importance of Babylonia — the country owning Babel as its capital — begins. . . . Hammurabi (circ. 2250 B. C.) is the sixth on the Babylonian list [i. e. a list of kings found among the inscriptions recovered from the mounds of ruined cities in Mesopotamia]. The great majority of the inscriptions of his long reign of fifty-five years refer to peaceful works." As, for example, "the famous canal inscription: 'I am Hammurabi, the mighty king, king of Ka-dingirra (Babylon), the king whom the regions obey, the winner of victory for his lord Merodach, the shepherd, who rejoices his heart. When the gods Anu and Bel granted me to rule the people of Sumer and Akkad, and gave the sceptre into my hand, I dug the canal called "Hammurabi, the blessing of the people," which carries with it the overflow of the water for the people of Sumer and Akkad. I allotted both its shores for food. Measures of corn I poured forth. A lasting water supply I made for the people of Sumer and Akkad. I brought together the numerous troops of the people of Sumer and Akkad, food and drink I made for them; with blessing and abundance I gifted them. In convenient abodes I caused them to dwell. Thenceforward I am Hammurabi, the mighty king, the favourite of the great gods. With the might accorded me by Merodach I built a tall tower with great entrances, whose summits are high like . . . at the head of the canal "Hammurabi, the blessing of the people." I named the tower Sinmuballit tower, after the name of my father, my begetter. The statue of Sinmuballit, my father, my begetter, I set up at the four quarters of heaven.' . . . Rings bearing the legend 'Palace of Hammurabi' have been found in the neighbourhood of Bagdad, and presumably indicate the existence of a royal residence there."—E. J. Simcox, *Primitive Civilizations, v.* 1, *pp.* 282–283.—"The canal to which this king boasts of having given his name, the 'Nahar-Hammourabi,' was called in later days the royal canal, 'Nahar Malcha.' Herodotus saw and admired it, its good condition was an object of care to the king himself, and we know that it was considerably repaired by Nebuchadnezzar. When civilization makes up its mind to re-enter upon that country, nothing more will be needed for the re-awakening in it of life and reproductive energy, than the restoration of the great works undertaken by the contemporaries of Abraham and Jacob."—G. Perrot and C. Chipiez, *Hist. of Art in Chaldœa and Assyria, v.* 1, *p.* 40.—"After a reign of fifty-five years, Chammurabi [or Hammurabi] bequeathed the crown of Babylon and the united kingdoms of Babylonia to his son Samsu-iluna (B. C. 2209–2180). This ruler, reigning in the spirit of his father, developed still further the national system of canalization. . . . Five kings after Chammurabi, till 2098 B. C., complete the list of the eleven kings of this first dynasty, who reigned in all 304 years. The epoch made memorable by the deeds and enterprise of Chammurabi is followed by a period of 368 years, of the occurrences of which absolutely nothing is known, except the names and regnal years of another list of eleven kings reigning in the city of Babylon. . . . The foreign non-Semitic race, which for nearly six centuries (c. 1730–1153), from this time onward, held a controlling place in the affairs of Babylonia, are referred to in the inscriptions by the name Kassē. These Kasshites came from the border country between Northern Elam and Media, and were in all probability of the same race as the Elamites. The references to them make them out to be both mountaineers and tent-dwellers. . . . The political sway of the foreign masters was undisputed, but the genius of the government and the national type of culture and forms of activity were essentially unchanged. . . . Through century after century, and millenium after millenium, the dominant genius of Babylonia remained the same. It conquered all its conquerors, and moulded them to its own likeness by the force of its manifold culture, by the appliances as well as the prestige of the arts of peace. . . . The Babylonians were not able to maintain perpetually their political autonomy or integrity, not because they were not brave or patriotic," but because "they were not, first and foremost, a military people. Their energies were mainly spent in trade and manufacture, in science and art. . . . The time which the native historiographers allow to the new [Kasshite] dynasty is 577 years. . . . This Kasshite conquest of Babylonia . . . prevented the consolidation of the eastern branch of the Semites, by alienating from Babylonia the Assyrian colonists. . . . Henceforth there was almost perpetual rivalry and strife between Assyria and the parent country. Henceforth, also, it is Assyria that becomes the leading power in the West."—J. F. McCurdy, *History, Prophecy and the Monuments, bk.* 2, *ch.* 3, *and bk.* 4, *ch.* 1 (*v.* 1).—"The Kassites gave a dynasty to Babylonia which lasted for 576 years (B. C. 1806–1230). The fact that the rulers of the country were Kassites by race, and that their army largely consisted of Kassite troops, caused the neighbouring populations to identify the Babylonians with their conquerors and lords. Hence it is that in the tablets of Tel el-Amarna, the Canaanite writers invariably term the Babylonians the 'Kasi.' The 'Kasi' or Cush, we are told, had overrun Palestine in former years and were again threatening the Egyptian province. In calling Nimrod, therefore, a son of Cush the Book of Genesis merely means that he was a Babylonian. But the designation takes us back to the age of the Tel el-Amarna tablets. It was not a designation which could have belonged to that later age, when the Babylonians were known to the Israelites as the 'Kasdim' only. Indeed there is a passage in the Book of Micah (v. 6) which proves plainly that in that later age 'the land of Nimrod' was synonymous not with Babylonia but with Assyria. The Nimrod of Genesis must have come down to us from the time when the Kassite dynasty still reigned over Babylonia.

. . . Nimrod was not satisfied with his Babylonian dominions. 'Out of that land he went forth into Assyria, and builded Nineveh, and Rehoboth 'Ir (the city boulevards), and Calah and Resen.' . . . The city of Asshur had been long in existence when Nimrod led his Kassite followers to it, and so made its 'high-priests' tributary to Babylon. It stood on the high-road to the west, and it is not surprising, therefore, that the Kassite kings, after making themselves masters of the future kingdom of Assyria, should have continued their victorious career as far as the shores of the Mediterranean. We may conjecture that Nimrod was the first of them who planted his power so firmly in Palestine as to be remembered in the proverbial lore of the country, and to have introduced that Babylonian culture of which the Tel el-Amarna tablets have given us such abundant evidence."—A. H. Sayce, *The Higher Criticism, and the Verdict of the Monuments, ch.* 3.—It was during the Kasshite domination in Babylonia that Ahmes, founder of the eighteenth dynasty in Egypt, expelled the Hyksos intruders from that country; and "his successors, returning upon Asia the attack which they had thence received, subjugating, or rather putting to ransom, all the Canaanites of Judea, Phœnicia, and Syria, crossed the Euphrates and the Tigris [see EGYPT: ABOUT B. C. 1700–1400]. Nineveh twice fell into their power, and the whole Semitic world became vassal to the Pharaohs. The influence of Egypt was real though temporary, but in the reciprocal dealings which were the result of the conquests of the Tutnes [or Thothmes] and the Amenhoteps, the share of the Semites was on the whole the larger. Marriages with the daughters of kings or vassal governors brought into Egypt and established Asiatic types, ideas, and customs on the Theban throne. Amenhotep IV. was purely Semitic; he endeavoured to replace the religion of Ammon by the sun-worship of Syria. In 1887 were discovered the fragments of a correspondence exchanged between the kings of Syria, Armenia, and Babylonia, and the Pharaohs Amenhotep III. and IV. [see EGYPT: ABOUT B. C. 1500–1400]; all these letters are written in cuneiform character and in Semitic or other dialects; it is probable that the answers were drawn up in the same character and in the same languages. For the rest, the subjugated nations had soon recovered. Saryoukin I. had reconstituted the Chaldean empire; the Assyrians, ever at war on their eastern and western frontiers, had more than once crossed the Upper Euphrates and penetrated Asia Minor as far as Troad, where the name Assaracus seems to be a relic of an Assyrian dynasty. The Hittites or Khetas occupied the north of Syria; and when Ramses II., Sesostris, desired in the 15th century to renew the exploits of his ancestors, he was checked at Kadech by the Hittites and forced to retreat after an undecided battle. The great expansion of Egypt was stopped, at least towards the north. The Semitic peoples, on the contrary, were everywhere in the ascendant."—A. Lefèvre, *Race and Language, pp.* 205–206.

The Assyrian Empire.—"According to all appearance it was the Egyptian conquest about sixteen centuries B. C., that led to the partition of Mesopotamia. Vassals of Thothmes and Rameses, called by Berosus the 'Arab kings,' sat upon the throne of Babylon. The tribes of Upper Mesopotamia were farther from Egypt, and their chiefs found it easier to preserve their independence. At first each city had its own prince, but in time one of these petty kingdoms absorbed the rest, and Nineveh became the capital of an united Assyria. As the years passed away the frontiers of the nation thus constituted were pushed gradually southwards until all Mesopotamia was brought under one sceptre. This consummation appears to have been complete by the end of the fourteenth century, at which period Egypt, enfeebled and rolled back upon herself, ceased to make her influence felt upon the Euphrates. Even then Babylon kept her own kings, but they had sunk to be little more than hereditary satraps receiving investiture from Nineveh. Over and over again Babylon attempted to shake off the yoke of her neighbour; but down to the seventh century her revolts were always suppressed, and the Assyrian supremacy re-established after more or less desperate conflicts. During nearly half a century, from about 1060 to 1020 B. C., Babylon seems to have recovered the upper hand. The victories of her princes put an end to what is called the First Assyrian Empire. But after one or two generations a new family mounted the northern throne, and, toiling energetically for a century or so to establish the grandeur of the monarchy, founded the Second Assyrian Empire. The upper country regained its ascendency by the help of military institutions whose details now escape us, although their results may be traced throughout the later history of Assyria. From the tenth century onwards the effects of these institutions become visible in expeditions made by the armies of Assyria, now to the shores of the Persian Gulf or the Caspian, and now through the mountains of Armenia into the plains of Cappadocia, or across the Syrian desert to the Lebanon and the coast cities of Phœnicia. The first princes whose figured monuments—in contradistinction to mere inscriptions—have come down to us, belonged to those days. The oldest of all was Assurnazirpal, whose residence was at Calach (Nimroud). The bas-reliefs with which his palace was decorated are now in the Louvre and the British Museum, most of them in the latter. . . . To Assurnazirpal's son Shalmaneser III. belongs the obelisk of basalt which also stands in the British Museum. . . . Shalmaneser was an intrepid man of war. The inscriptions on his obelisk recall the events of thirty-one campaigns waged against the neighbouring peoples under the leadership of the king himself. . . . Under the immediate successors of Shalmaneser the Assyrian prestige was maintained at a high level by dint of the same lavish bloodshed and truculent energy; but towards the eighth century it began to decline. There was then a period of languor and decadence, some echo of which, and of its accompanying disasters, seems to have been embodied by the Greeks in the romantic tale of Sardanapalus. No shadow of confirmation for the story of a first destruction of Nineveh is to be found in the inscriptions, and, in the middle of the same century, we again find the Assyrian arms triumphant under the leadership of Tiglath Pileser II., a king modelled after the great warriors of the earlier days. This prince seems to have carried his victorious arms as far east as the Indus, and west as the frontiers of Egypt. And

yet it was only under his second successor, Saryoukin, or, to give him his popular name, Sargon, the founder of a new dynasty, that Syria, with the exception of Tyre, was brought into complete submission after a great victory over the Egyptians (721–704). . . . His son Sennacherib equalled him both as a soldier and as a builder. He began by crushing the rebels of Elam and Chaldæa with unflinching severity; in his anger he almost exterminated the inhabitants of Babylon, the perennial seat of revolt; but, on the other hand, he repaired and restored Nineveh. Most of his predecessors had been absentees from the capital, and had neglected its buildings. . . . He chose a site well within the city for the magnificent palace which Mr. Layard has been the means of restoring to the world. This building is now known as Kouyoundjik, from the name of the village perched upon the mound within which the buildings of Sennacherib were hidden. Sennacherib rebuilt the walls, the towers, and the quays of Nineveh at the same time, so that the capital, which had never ceased to be the strongest and most populous city of the empire, again became the residence of the king—a distinction which it was to preserve until the fast approaching date of its final destruction. The son of Sennacherib, Esarhaddon, and his grandson, Assurbanipal [long identified with the Sardanapalus of the Greeks; but Prof. Sayce now finds the Sardanapalus of Greek romance in a rebel king, Assur-dain-pal, who reigned B. C. 827–820, and whose name and history fit the tale], pushed the adventures and conquests of the Assyrian arms still farther. They subdued the whole north of Arabia, and invaded Egypt more than once. . . . There was a moment when the great Semitic Empire founded by the Sargonides touched even the Ægæan, for Cyges, king of Lydia, finding himself menaced by the Cimmerians, did homage to Assurbanipal, and sued for help against those foes to all civilization."—G. Perrot and C. Chipiez, *A History of Art in Chaldæa and Assyria, ch.* 1, *sect.* 5 (*v.* 1). —"The power of Assurbanipal was equal to the task of holding under control the subjects of Assyria at all points. He boasts of having compelled the king of Tyre to drink sea-water to quench his thirst. The greatest opposition he met with was in Elam, but this too he was able to suppress. . . . Assurbanipal says that he increased the tributes, but that his action was opposed by his own brother, whom he had formerly maintained by force of arms in Babylon. This brother now seduced a great number of other nations and princes from their allegiance. . . . The king of Babylon placed himself, so to speak, at their head. . . . The danger was immensely increased when the king set up by Assurbanipal in Elam joined the movement. It was necessary to put an end to this revolt, and this was effected for once without much difficulty. . . . Thereupon the rebellious brother in Babylon has to give way. The gods who go before Assurbanipal have, as he says, thrust the king of Babylon into a consuming fire and put an end to his life. His adherents . . . are horribly punished. . . . The provinces which joined them are subjected to the laws of the Assyrian gods. Even the Arabs, who have sided with the rebels, bow before the king, whilst of his power in Egypt it is said that it extended to the sources of the Nile. His dominion reached even to Asia Minor. . . . Assyria is the first conquering power which we encounter in the history of the world. The most effective means which she brought to bear in consolidating her conquests consisted in the transportation of the principal inhabitants from the subjugated districts to Assyria, and the settlement of Assyrians in the newly acquired provinces. . . . The most important result of the action of Assyria upon the world was perhaps that she limited or broke up the petty sovereignties and the local religions of Western Asia. . . . It was . . . an event which convulsed the world when this power, in the full current of its life and progress, suddenly ceased to exist. Since the 10th century every event of importance had originated in Assyria; in the middle of the 7th she suddenly collapsed. . . . Of the manner in which the ruin of Nineveh was brought about we have nowhere any authentic record. . . . Apart from their miraculous accessories, the one circumstance in which . . . [most of the accounts given] agree, is that Assyria was overthrown by the combination of the Medes and Babylonians. Everything else that is said on the subject verges on the fabulous; and even the fact of the alliance is doubtful, since Herodotus, who lived nearest to the period we are treating of, knows nothing of it, and ascribes the conquest simply to the Medes."—L. von Ranke, *Universal History: The Oldest Historical Group of Nations, ch.* 3.

The last Babylonian Empire and its overthrow.—The story, briefly told, of the alliance by which the Assyrian monarchy is said to have been overthrown, is as follows: About 626 or 625, B. C., a new revolt broke out in Babylonia, and the Assyrian king sent a general named Nabu-pal-usur or Nabopolassar to quell it. Nabu-pal-usur succeeded in his undertaking, and seems to have been rewarded by being made governor of Babylon. But his ambition aimed higher, and he mounted the ancient Babylonian throne, casting off his allegiance to Assyria and joining her enemies. "He was wise enough to see that Assyria could not be completely crushed by one nation, and he therefore made a league with Pharaoh Necho, of Egypt, and asked the Median king, Cyaxares, to give his daughter, Amytes, to Nebuchadnezzar, his son, to wife. Thus a league was made, and about B. C. 609 the kings marched against Assyria. They suffered various defeats, but eventually the Assyrian army was defeated, and Shalman, the brother of the king of Assyria, slain. The united kings then besieged Nineveh. During the siege the river Tigris rose and carried away the greater part of the city wall. The Assyrian king gathered together his wives and property in the palace, and setting fire to it, all perished in the flames. The enemies went into the city and utterly destroyed all they could lay their hands upon. With the fall of Nineveh, Assyria as a power practically ceased to exist." About 608 B. C. Nebuchadnezzar succeeded his father on the throne. "When he had become established in the kingdom he set his various captives, Jews, Phœnicians, Syrians, and Egyptians, at work to make Babylon the greatest city in the world. And as a builder he remains almost unsurpassed." —E. A. Wallis Budge, *Babylonian Life and History, ch.* 5.—"The Babylon of Nebuchadnezzar occupied a square of which each side was nearly fifteen miles in length, and was bisected by the

Euphrates diagonally from northwest to southeast. This square was enclosed by a deep moat, flooded from the river. The clay excavated in digging the moat, moulded into bricks and laid in bitumen, formed the walls of the city. These walls, more than 300 feet high and more than 70 thick, and protected by parapets, afforded a commodious driveway along their top of nearly 60 miles, needing only aerial bridges over the Euphrates river. The waters of the river were forced to flow through the city between quays of masonry which equaled the walls in thickness and height. The walls were pierced at equal intervals for a hundred gates, and each gateway closed with double leaves of ponderous metal, swinging upon bronze posts built into the wall. Fifty broad avenues, crossing each other at right angles, joined the opposite gates of the city, and divided it into a checkerboard of gigantic squares. The river quays were pierced by 25 gates like those in the outer walls. One of the streets was carried across the river upon an arched bridge, another ran in a tunnel beneath the river bed, and ferries plied continually across the water where the other streets abutted. The great squares of the city were not all occupied by buildings. Many of them were used as gardens and even farms, and the great fertility of the soil, caused by irrigation, producing two and even three crops a year, supplied food sufficient for the inhabitants in case of siege. Babylon was a vast fortified province rather than a city. . . . There is a curious fact which I do not remember to have seen noticed, and of which I will not here venture to suggest the explanation. Babylon stands in the Book of Revelation as the emblem of all the abominations which are to be destroyed by the power of Christ. But Babylon is the one city known to history which could have served as a model for John's description of the New Jerusalem: 'the city lying four square,' 'the walls great and high,' the river which flowed through the city, 'and in the midst of the street of it, and on either side of the river the tree of life, bearing twelve manner of fruits;' 'the foundations of the wall of the city garnished with all manner of precious stones,' as the base of the walls inclosing the great palace were faced with glazed and enameled bricks of brilliant colors, and a broad space left that they might be seen,—these characteristics, and they are all unique, have been combined in no other city."—W. B. Wright, *Ancient Cities, pp.* 41–44.—"Undoubtedly, one of the important results already obtained from the study of the native chronicles of Babylon is the establishment, on grounds apart from the question of the authenticity of the Book of Daniel, of the historical character of Belshazzar. The name of this prince had always been a puzzle to commentators and historians. The only native authority on Babylonian history—Berosus—did not appear to have mentioned such a person. . . . According to the extracts from the work of Berosus preserved for us in the writings of these authors, the following is the history of the last King of Babylon. His name was Nabonidus, or Nabonedus, and he first appears as the leader of a band of conspirators who determined to bring about a change in the government. The throne was then occupied by the youthful Laborosoarchod (for this is the corrupt Greek form of the Babylonian Lâbâshi-Marduk), who was the son of Neriglissar, and therefore, through his mother, the grandson of the great Nebuchadnezzar; but, in spite of his tender age, the new sovereign who had only succeeded his father two months before, had already given proof of a bad disposition. . . . When the designs of the conspirators had been carried out, they appointed Nabonidus king in the room of the youthful son of Neriglissar. . . . We next hear that in the seventeenth year of Nabonidus, Cyrus, who had already conquered the rest of Asia, marched upon Babylon [B. C. 538—see PERSIA: B. C. 549–521]. The native forces met the Persians in battle, but were put to flight, with their king at their head, and took refuge behind the ramparts of Borsippa. Cyrus thereupon entered Babylon, we are told, and threw down her walls. . . . Herodotus states that the last king of Babylon was the son of the great Nebuchadnezzar—to give that monarch his true name—for in so doing he bears out, so far as his testimony is of any value, the words of the Book of Daniel, which not only calls Belshazzar son of Nebuchadnezzar, but also introduces the wife of the latter monarch as being the mother of the ill-fated prince who closed the long line of native rulers. Such being the only testimony of secular writers, there was no alternative but to identify Belshazzar with Nabonidus. . . . Yet the name Nabonidus stood in no sort of relation to that of Belshazzar; and the identification of the two personages was, undoubtedly, both arbitrary and difficult. The cuneiform inscriptions brought to Europe from the site of Babylon and other ancient cities of Chaldæa soon changed the aspect of the problem. . . . Nabonidus, or, in the native form, Nabu naïd, that is to say, 'Nebo exalts,' is the name given to the last native king of Babylon in the contemporary records inscribed on clay. This monarch, however, was found to speak of his eldest son as bearing the very name preserved in the Book of Daniel, and hitherto known to us from that source alone. . . . 'Set the fear of thy great godhead in the heart of Belshazzar, my firstborn son, my own offspring; and let him not commit sin, in order that he may enjoy the fulness of life.'. . . 'Belshazzar, my firstborn son, . . . lengthen his days; let him not commit sin. . . .' These passages provide us, in an unexpected manner, with the name which had hitherto been known from the Book of Daniel, and from that document alone; but we were still in the dark as to the reason which could have induced the author to represent Belshazzar as king of Babylon. . . . In 1882 a cuneiform inscription was for the first time interpreted and published by Mr. Pinches; it had been disinterred among the ruins of Babylon by Mr. Hormuzd Rassam. This document proved to contain the annals of the king whose fate we have just been discussing—namely, Nabonidus. Though mutilated in parts, it allowed us to learn some portions of his history, both before and during the invasion of Babylonia by Cyrus; and one of the most remarkable facts that it added to our knowledge was that of the regency—if that term may be used—of the king's son during the absence of the sovereign from the Court and army. Here, surely, the explanation of the Book of Daniel was found: Belshazzar was, at the time of the irruption of the Persians, acting as his father's representative; he was commanding the Babylonian army and presiding over the

Babylonian Court. When Cyrus entered Babylon, doubtless the only resistance he met with was in the royal palace, and there it was probably slight. In the same night Belshazzar was taken and slain."—B. T. A. Evetts, *New Light on the Bible and the Holy Land, ch.* 11, *pt.* 2.—Cyrus the Great, in whose vast empire the Babylonian kingdom was finally swallowed up, was originally "king of Anzan in Elam, not of Persia. Anzan had been first occupied, it would appear, by his great-grandfather Teispes the Achaemenian. The conquest of Astyages and of his capital Ekbatana took place in B. C. 549, and a year or two later Cyrus obtained possession of Persia." Then, B. C. 538, came the conquest of Babylonia, invited by a party in the country hostile to its king, Nabonidos. Cyrus "assumed the title of 'King of Babylon,' thus claiming to be the legitimate descendant of the ancient Babylonian kings. He announced himself as the devoted worshipper of Bel and Nebo, who by the command of Merodach had overthrown the sacrilegious usurper Nabonidos, and he and his son accordingly offered sacrifices to ten times the usual amount in the Babylonian temples, and restored the images of the gods to their ancient shrines. At the same time he allowed the foreign populations who had been deported to Babylonia to return to their homes along with the statues of their gods. Among these foreign populations, as we know from the Old Testament, were the Jews."—A. H. Sayce, *Primer of Assyriology, pp.* 74–78.

Hebraic branch. See Jews, Ammonites; Moabites; and Edomites.

Canaanitic branch. See Jews: Early History; and Phœnicians.

Southern branches. See Arabia; Ethiopia; and Abyssinia.

SEMITIC LANGUAGES.—"There is no stronger or more unchanging unity among any group of languages than that which exists in the Semitic group. The dead and living languages which compose it hardly differ from each other so much as the various Romance or Sclavonic dialects. Not only are the elements of the common vocabulary unchanged, but the structure of the word and of the phrase has remained the same. . . . The Semitic languages form two great branches, each subdivided into two groups. The northern branch comprehends the Aramaic-Assyrian group and the Canaanitish group; the southern . . . includes the Arabic group, properly so called, and the Himyarite group. The name Aramaic is given to two dialects which are very nearly allied— Chaldean and Syriac. . . . The Aramaic which was spoken at the time of Christ was divided into two subdialects: that of Galilee, which resembled the Syriac pronunciation, and that of Jerusalem, of which the pronunciation was more marked and nearer to Chaldean. Jesus and his disciples evidently spoke the dialect of their country. . . . Syriac, in its primitive state, is unknown to us, as also Syro-Chaldean. . . . Assyrian is a discovery of this century. . . . To the Canaanitish group belong Phœnician, Samaritan, the languages of the left bank of the Jordan, notably Moabite, . . . and lastly, Hebrew. The first and the last of these dialects are almost exactly alike. . . . Arabic, being the language of Islam, has deeply penetrated all the Mussulman nations, Turkish, Persian, and Hindustani. . . . Himyarite reigned to the south of Arabic; it was the language of the Queen of Sheba, and is now well known through a great number of inscriptions, and is perhaps still spoken under the name of Ekhili in the district of Marah. . . . It is in Abyssinia that we must seek for the last vestiges of Himyarite. Several centuries before our era, the African coast of the Red Sea had received Semitic colonies, and a language known as Ghez or Ethiopian."—A. Lefèvre, *Race and Language, pp.* 213–223.

SEMNONES, The.—"The Semnones were the chief Suevic clan. Their settlements seem to have been between the Elbe and Oder, coinciding as nearly as possible with Brandenburg, and reaching possibly into Prussian Poland."—Church and Brodribb, *Geog. Notes to The Germany of Tacitus.*—See Alemanni: A. D. 213.

SEMPACH, Battle of (1386). See Switzerland: A. D. 1386–1388.

SEMPRONIAN LAWS.—The laws proposed and carried at Rome by the Gracchi (see Rome: B. C. 133–121), who were of the Sempronian gens, are often so referred to.

SENA, The Druidic oracle of.—A little island called Sena—modern Sein—off the extreme western coast of Brittany, is mentioned by Pomponius Mela as the site of a celebrated oracle, consulted by Gaulish navigators and served by nine virgin priestesses.—E. H. Bunbury, *Hist. of Ancient Geog., ch.* 23, *sect.* 2 (*v.* 2).

SENATE, Canadian. See Canada: A. D. 1867.

SENATE, French. See France: A. D. 1799 (November—December).

SENATE, Roman.—"In prehistoric times, the clans which subsequently united to form cantons had each possessed a monarchical constitution of its own. When the clan governments were merged in that of the canton, the monarchs ('reges') of these clans became senators, or elders, in the new community. In the case of Rome the number of senators was three hundred, because in the beginning, as tradition said, there were three hundred clans. In regal times the king appointed the senators. Probably, at first, he chose one from each clan, honoring in this way some man whose age had given him experience and whose ability made his opinion entitled to consideration. Afterward, when the rigidity of the arrangement by clans was lost, the senators were selected from the whole body of the people, without any attempt at preserving the clan representation. Primarily the senate was not a legislative body. When the king died without having nominated his successor, the senators served successively as 'interreges' ('kings for an interval'), for periods of five days each, until a 'rex' was chosen. . . . This general duty was the first of the senate's original functions. Again, when the citizens had passed a law at the suggestion of the king, the senate had a right ('patrum auctoritas') to veto it, if it seemed contrary to the spirit of the city's institutions. Finally, as the senate was composed of men of experience and ability, the king used to consult it in times of personal doubt or national danger."—A. Tighe, *Development of the Roman Constitution, ch.* 3.—Of the Roman Senate as it became in the great days of the Republic—at the close of the Punic Wars and after—the following is an account: "All the acts of the Roman Republic ran in the name of

the Senate and People, as if the Senate were half the state, though its number seems still to have been limited to Three Hundred members. The Senate of Rome was perhaps the most remarkable assembly that the world has ever seen. Its members held their seats for life; once Senators always Senators, unless they were degraded for some dishonourable cause. But the Senatorial Peerage was not hereditary. No father could transmit the honour to his son. Each man must win it for himself. The manner in which seats in the Senate were obtained is tolerably well ascertained. Many persons will be surprised to learn that the members of this august body, all — or nearly all — owed their places to the votes of the people. In theory, indeed, the Censors still possessed the power really exercised by the Kings and early Consuls, of choosing the Senators at their own will and pleasure. But official powers, however arbitrary, are always limited in practice; and the Censors followed rules established by ancient precedent. . . . The Senate was recruited from the lists of official persons. . . . It was not by a mere figure of speech that the minister of Pyrrhus called the Roman Senate 'an Assembly of Kings.' Many of its members had exercised Sovereign power; many were preparing to exercise it. The power of the Senate was equal to its dignity. . . . In regard to legislation, they [it] exercised an absolute control over the Centuriate Assembly, because no law could be submitted to its votes which had not originated in the Senate. . . . In respect to foreign affairs, the power of the Senate was absolute, except in declaring War or concluding treaties of Peace, — matters which were submitted to the votes of the People. They assigned to the Consuls and Prætors their respective provinces of administration and command; they fixed the amount of troops to be levied every year from the list of Roman citizens, and of the contingents to be furnished by the Italian allies. They prolonged the command of a general or superseded him at pleasure. . . . In the administration of home affairs, all the regulation of religious matters was in their hands. . . . All the financial arrangements of the State were left to their discretion. . . . They might resolve themselves into a High Court of Justice for the trial of extraordinary offences."—H. G. Liddell, *Hist. of Rome, bk.* 4, *ch.* 35 (*v.* 1).

Also in: W. Ihne, *Hist. of Rome, bk.* 6, *ch.* 2. —See, also, Rome: B. C. 146; and Conscript Fathers.

SENATE, United States.—"The Senate is composed of two Senators from each State, and these Senators are chosen by the State Legislatures. The representation is then equal, each State having two Senators and each Senator having one vote; and no difference is made among the States on account of size, population, or wealth. The Senate is not, strictly speaking, a popular body, and the higher qualifications demanded of its members, and the longer period of service, make it the more important body of the two. The Senate is presumedly more conservative in its action, and acts as a safeguard against the precipitate and changing legislation that is more characteristic of the House of Representatives, which, being chosen directly by the people, and at frequent intervals, is more easily affected by and reflects the prevailing temper of the times. The Senate is more intimately connected with the Executive than is the lower body. The President must submit to the Senate for its approval the treaties he has contracted with foreign powers; he must ask the advice and consent of the Senate in the appointment of ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, judges of the Supreme Court, and all other officers of the United States whose appointments have not been otherwise provided for. . . . The Senate has sole power to try all impeachments, but it cannot originate proceedings of impeachment. . . . In case a vacancy occurs when the State Legislature is not in session, the governor may make a temporary appointment; but at the next meeting of the Legislature the vacancy must be filled in the usual way. The presiding officer of the Senate is the Vice-President of the United States. He is elected in the same manner as the President, for were he chosen from the Senate itself, the equality of representation would be broken. He has no vote save when the Senate is equally divided, and his powers are very limited."—W. C. Ford, *The Am. Citizen's Manual, pt.* 1, *ch.* 1.

Also in: *The Federalist, Nos.* 62–66.—J. Story, *Commentaries on the Const., ch.* 10 (*v.* 2).—J. Bryce, *The Am. Commonwealth, ch.* 10–12 (*v.* 1). —See, also, Congress of the United States.

SENATUS-CONSULTUM.—SENATUS-DECRETUM.—"A proposition sanctioned by a majority of the [Roman] Senate, and not vetoed by one of the Tribunes of the Plebs, who might interrupt the proceedings at any stage, was called Senatus-Consultum or Senatus-Decretum, the only distinction between the terms being that the former was more comprehensive, since Senatus-Consultum might include several orders or Decreta."—W. Ramsay, *Manual of Roman Antiq., ch.* 6.

SENCHUS MOR, The.—One of the books of the ancient Irish laws, known as the Brehon Laws.

SENECAS, The. See American Aborigines: Senecas.

SENEFFE, Battle of (1674). See Netherlands (Holland): A. D. 1674–1678.

SENLAC OR HASTINGS, Battle of. See England: A. D. 1066 (October).

SENNACHIES.—One of the names given to the Bards, or Ollamhs, of the ancient Irish.

SENONES, The.—A strong tribe in ancient Gaul whose territory was between the Loire and the Marne. Their chief town was Agedincum — modern Sens.—Napoleon III., *Hist. of Cæsar, bk.* 3, *ch.* 2, *foot-note.*—The Senones were also prominent among the Gauls which crossed the Alps, settled Cisalpine Gaul and contested northern Italy with the Romans. See Rome: B. C. 390–347, and 295–191.

SENS, Origin of. See Senones.

SENTINUM, Battle of (B. C. 295). See Rome: B. C. 343–290, and B. C. 295–191.

SEPARATISTS. See Independents.

SEPHARDIM, The.—Jews descended from those who were expelled from Spain in 1492 are called the Sephardim. See Jews: 8–15th Centuries.

SEPHARVAIM. See Babylonia: The early (Chaldean) monarchy.

SEPHER YETZIRA, The. See Cabala.

SEPOY: The name. See India: A. D. 1600–1702.

SEPOY MUTINY, of 1763, The. See India: A. D. 1757–1772.....**Of 1806.** See India: A. D. 1805–1816.....**Of 1857-1858.** See India: A. D. 1857, to 1857–1858 (July—June).

SEPT, OR CLAN. See Clans.

SEPTA. See Campus Martius.

SEPTEMBER LAWS, The. See France: A. D. 1830–1840.

SEPTEMBER MASSACRES AT PARIS. See France: A. D. 1792 (August—September).

SEPTENNATE IN FRANCE, The. See France: A. D. 1871–1876.

SEPTENNIAL ACT, The. See England: A. D. 1716.

SEPTIMANIA: Under the Goths. See Gothia, in Gaul; also Goths (Visigoths): A. D. 410–419; and 419–451.

A. D. 715-718.—Occupation by the Moslems. See Mahometan Conquest: A. D. 715–732.

A. D. 752-759.—Recovery from the Moslems. See Mahometan Conquest: A. D. 752–759.

10th Century.—The dukes and their successors. See Toulouse: 10–11th Centuries.

SEPTUAGINT, The.—"We have in the Septuagint, a Greek version of the Hebrew Old Testament, the first great essay in translation into Greek, a solitary specimen of the ordinary language spoken and understood in those days [at Alexandria 3d century B. C.]. There is a famous legend of the origin of the work by order of the Egyptian king, and of the perfect agreement of all the versions produced by the learned men who had been sent at his request from Judæa. Laying aside these fables, it appears that the books were gradually rendered for the benefit of the many Jews settled in Egypt, who seem to have been actually forgetting their old language. Perhaps Philadelphus gave an impulse to the thing by requiring a copy for his library, which seems to have admitted none but Greek books."—J. P. Mahaffy, *Story of Alexander's Empire, ch.* 14.

Also in: W. Robertson Smith, *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church, lect.* 4.—F. W. Farrar, *Hist. of Interpretation* (*Bampton Lect's,* 1885), *lect.* 3.

SEQUANA, The.—The ancient name of the river Seine.

SEQUANI, The. See Gauls.

SERAI. See Mongols: A. D. 1238–1391.

SERAPEUM, at Alexandria. See Alexandria: B. C. 282–246, and A. D. 389; also Libraries, Ancient: Alexandria.

SERAPEUM, at Memphis.—"The Serapeum is one of the edifices of Memphis [Egypt] rendered famous by a frequently quoted passage of Strabo, and by the constant mention made of it on the Greek papyri. It had long been sought for, and we had the good fortune to discover it in 1851. Apis, the living image of Osiris revisiting the earth, was a bull who, while he lived, had his temple at Memphis (Mitrahenny), and, when dead, had his tomb at Sakkarah. The palace which the bull inhabited in his lifetime was called the Apieum; the Serapeum was the name given to his tomb."—A. Mariette, *Monuments of Upper Egypt, p.* 88.

SERAPHIM, OR "BLUE RIBBON," The order of the.—"There is no doubt whatever of the antiquity of this Order, yet it is very difficult to arrive at the exact date of the foundation. General opinion, though without positive proof, ascribes its origin, about the year 1280, to King Magnus I. [of Sweden], who is said to have instituted it at the persuasion of the Maltese Knights. Another account ascribes the foundation to Magnus's grandson, Magnus Erichson. . . . King Frederick I. revived the Order, as also those of the Sword and North Star, on the 28th April, 1748."—Sir B. Burke, *The Book of Orders of Knighthood, p.* 329.

SERBONIAN BOG.—"There is a lake between Cœlo-Syria and Egypt, very narrow, but exceeding deep, even to a wonder, two hundred furlongs in length, called Serbon: if any through ignorance approach it they are lost irrecoverably; for the channel being very narrow, like a swadling-band, and compassed round with vast heaps of sand, great quantities of it are cast into the lake, by the continued southern winds, which so cover the surface of the water, and make it to the view so like unto dry land, that it cannot possibly be distinguished; and therefore many, unacquainted with the nature of the place, by missing their way, have been there swallowed up, together with whole armies. For the sand being trod upon, sinks down and gives way by degrees, and like a malicious cheat, deludes and decoys them that come upon it, till too late, when they see the mischief they are likely to fall into, they begin to support and help one another, but without any possibility either of returning back or escaping certain ruin."—Diodorus (*Booth's trans.*), *bk.* 1, *ch.* 3.—According to Dr. Brugsch, the lake Serbon, or Sirbonis, so graphically described by Diodorus, but owing its modern celebrity to Milton's allusion (*Paradise Lost, ii.* 592–4), is in our days almost entirely dried up. He describes it as having been really a lagoon, on the northeastern coast of Egypt, "divided from the Mediterranean by a long tongue of land which, in ancient times, formed the only road from Egypt to Palestine." It is Dr. Brugsch's theory that the exodus of the Israelites was by this route and that the host of Pharaoh perished in the Serbonian quicksands.—H. Brugsch, *Hist. of Egypt, v.* 2, *app.*

SERBS, The. See Balkan and Danubian States, 7th Century (Servia, Croatia, etc.).

SERES. See China: The names of the country.

SERFDOM.—SERFS. See Slavery, Mediæval and Modern.

SERGIUS I., Pope, A. D. 687–701.....Sergius II., Pope, 844–847.... Sergius III., Pope, 904–911.....Sergius IV., Pope, 1009–1012.

SERINGAPATAM: A. D. 1792.—Siege by the English. See India: A. D. 1785–1793.

A. D. 1799.—Final capture by the English.—Death of Sultan Tippoo. See India: A. D. 1798–1805.

SERJEANTS-AT-LAW. See Templars: The Order in England.

SERPUL, Treaty of (1868). See Russia: A. D. 1859–1876.

SERRANO, Ministry and Regency of. See Spain: A. D. 1866–1873.

SERTORIUS, in Spain. See Spain: B. C. 83–72.

SERVI. See Slavery, Mediæval and Modern: England; also, Cattani.

SERVIA. See Balkan and Danubian States.

SERVIAN CONSTITUTION.—The first important modification of the primitive Roman constitution, ascribed to King Servius Tullius. See Comitia Centuriata.

SERVIAN WALL OF ROME, The. See Seven Hills of Rome.

SERVILES, The. See Spain: A. D. 1814–1827.

SERVITES, The.—The order of the "Religious Servants of the Holy Virgin," better known as Servites, was founded in 1233 by seven Florentine merchants. It spread rapidly in its early years, and has a considerable number of houses still existing.

SESQUIPES. See Foot, The Roman.

SESTERTIUS, The. See As.

SESTOS, OR SESTUS, Siege and capture of. See Athens: B. C. 479–478.

SESTUNTII, The. See Britain: Celtic Tribes.

SETTE POZZI, OR MALVASIA, Battle of (1263). See Genoa: A. D. 1261–1299.

SETTLEMENT, Act of. See England: A. D. 1701, and Ireland: A. D. 1660–1665.

SEVASTOS.—The Greek form, in the Byzantine Empire, of the title of "Augustus." "It was divided into four gradations, sevastos, protosevastos, panhypersevastos, and sevastokrator."—G. Finlay, *Hist. Byzantine and Greek Empires*, 716–1453, *bk.* 3, *ch.* 2, *sect.* 1.

SEVEN BISHOPS, The: Sent to the Tower. See England: A. D. 1687–1688.

SEVEN BOROUGHS, The. See Five Boroughs, The.

SEVEN CHAMPIONS OF CHRISTENDOM, The.—St. George, for England, St. Denis, for France, St. James, for Spain, St. Anthony, for Italy, St. Andrew, for Scotland, St. Patrick, for Ireland, and St. David, for Wales, were called, in mediæval times, the Seven Champions of Christendom.

SEVEN CITIES, The Isle of the. See Antilles.

SEVEN CITIES OF CIBOLA. See American Aborigines: Pueblos.

SEVEN DAYS RETREAT, The. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1862 (June—July: Virginia).

SEVEN GATES OF THEBES, The. See Thebes, Greece: The founding of the city.

SEVEN HILLS OF ROME, The.—"The seven hills were not occupied all at once, but one after the other, as they were required. The Palatine held the 'arx' of the primitive inhabitants, and was the original nucleus of the town, round which a wall or earthern rampart was raised by Romulus. The hill of Saturn, afterwards the Capitoline, is said to have been united, after the death of Titus Tatius, by Romulus; who drew a second wall or earthern rampart round the two hills. The Aventine, which was chiefly used as a pasture ground, was added by Ancus Martius, who settled the population of the conquered towns of Politorium, Tellena, and Ficana upon it. According to Livy, the Cælian Hill was added to the city by Tullus Hostilius. The population increasing, it seemed necessary to further enlarge the city. Servius Tullius, Livy tells us, added two hills, the Quirinal and the Viminal, afterwards extending it further to the Esquiline, where, he says, to give dignity to the place, he dwelt himself. The city having reached such an extent, a vast undertaking was planned by the king, Servius, to protect it. A line of wall [the Servian Wall] was built to encircle the seven hills over which the city had extended."—H. M. Westropp, *Early and Imperial Rome*, *pp.* 56–57.

SEVEN ISLANDS, The Republic of the. See Ionian Islands: To 1814.

SEVEN LIBERAL ARTS, The. See Education, Mediæval: Scholasticism.

SEVEN MOUNTS, The. See Palatine Hill; and Quirinal.

SEVEN PINES, Battle of. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1862 (May: Virginia).

SEVEN PROVINCES, The Union of the. See Netherlands: A. D. 1577–1581.

SEVEN REDUCTIONS, The War of the. See Argentine Republic: A. D. 1580–1777.

SEVEN RIVERS, The Land of the. See India: The Immigration and Conquests of the Aryas.

SEVEN WEEKS WAR, The. See Germany: A. D. 1866.

SEVEN WISE MEN OF GREECE.—"The name and poetry of Solon, and the short maxims, or sayings, of Phokylidês, conduct us to the mention of the Seven Wise Men of Greece. Solon was himself one of the seven, and most if not all of them were poets, or composers in verse. To most of them is ascribed also an abundance of pithy repartees, together with one short saying, or maxim, peculiar to each, serving as a sort of distinctive motto. . . . Respecting this constellation of Wise Men—who, in the next century of Grecian history, when philosophy came to be a matter of discussion and argumentation, were spoken of with great eulogy—all the statements are confused, in part even contradictory. Neither the number nor the names are given by all authors alike. Dikæarchus numbered ten, Hermippus seventeen: the names of Solon the Athenian, Thalês the Milesian, Pittakus the Mitylenean, and Bias the Prienean, were comprised in all the lists—and the remaining names as given by Plato were Kleobulus of Lindus in Rhodes, Myson of Chênæ, and Cheilon of Sparta. We cannot certainly distribute among them the sayings, or mottoes, upon which in later days the Amphiktyons conferred the honour of inscription in the Delphian temple: 'Know thyself,'—'Nothing too much,'—'Know thy opportunity,'—'Suretyship is the precursor of ruin.' . . . Dikæarchus, however, justly observed that these seven or ten persons were not wise men, or philosophers, in the sense which those words bore in his day, but persons of practical discernment in reference to man and society,—of the same turn of mind as their contemporary the fabulist Æsop, though not employing the same mode of illustration. Their appearance forms an epoch in Grecian history, inasmuch as they are the first persons who ever acquired an Hellenic reputation grounded on mental competency apart from poetical genius or effect—a proof that political and social prudence was beginning to be appreciated and admired on its own account."—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece, pt.* 2, *ch.* 29.

SEVEN WONDERS OF THE WORLD.
See RHODES, THE COLOSSUS OF.

SEVEN YEARS WAR: Its causes and provocations. See GERMANY: A. D. 1755–1756; and ENGLAND: A. D. 1754–1755.

Campaigns in America. See CANADA: A. D. 1750–1753, to 1760; NOVA SCOTIA: A. D. 1749–1755, and 1755; OHIO (VALLEY): A. D. 1748–1754, 1754, and 1755; CAPE BRETON ISLAND: A. D. 1758–1760.

English Naval Operations. See CANADA: A. D. 1755; ENGLAND: A. D. 1758 (JUNE—AUGUST), and 1759 (AUGUST—NOVEMBER).

Campaigns in Germany. See GERMANY: A. D. 1756, to 1761–1762.

The conflict in India. See INDIA: A. D. 1758–1761.

The Treaties which ended the war.—The Peace of Paris and the Peace of Hubertsburg. —Negotiations for a peace between England, France, and Spain were brought to a close by the signing of preliminaries at Fontainebleau, November 3, 1762. In the course of the next month, a conference for the arrangement of terms between Prussia, Austria and Saxony was begun at Hubertsburg, a hunting-seat of the Elector of Saxony, between Leipsic and Dresden. "The definitive Peace of Paris, between France, Spain, England, and Portugal, was signed February 10th 1763. Both France and England abandoned their allies, and neither Austria nor Prussia was mentioned in the treaty." But it was stipulated that all territories belonging to the Elector of Hanover, the Landgrave of Hesse, and the Count of Lippe Bücheburg should be restored to them. "France ceded to England Nova Scotia, Canada, and the country east of the Mississippi as far as the Iberville. A line drawn through the Mississippi, from its source to its mouth, was henceforth to form the boundary between the possessions of the two nations, except that the town and island of New Orleans were not to be included in this cession. France also ceded the island of Cape Breton, with the isles and coasts of the St. Lawrence, retaining, under certain restrictions, the right of fishing at Newfoundland, and the isles of St. Peter and Miquelon. In the West Indies she ceded Grenada and the Grenadines, and three of the so-called neuter islands, namely, Dominica, St. Vincent, and Tobago, retaining the fourth, St. Lucie. Also in Africa, the river Senegal, recovering Goree; in the East Indies, the French settlements on the coast of Coromandel made since 1749, retaining previous ones. She also restored to Great Britain Natal and Tabanouly, in Sumatra, and engaged to keep no troops in Bengal. In Europe, besides relinquishing her conquests in Germany, she restored Minorca, and engaged to place Dunkirk in the state required by former treaties. Great Britain, on her side, restored Belle Isle, and in the West Indies, Martinique, Guadaloupe, Marie Galante, and La Desirade. Spain ceded to Great Britain Florida and all districts east of the Mississippi, recovering the Havannah and all other British conquests. British subjects were to enjoy the privilege of cutting logwood in the Bay of Honduras. . . . With regard to the Portuguese colonies, matters were to be placed in the same state as before the war. . . . By way of compensation for the loss of Florida, France, by a private agreement, made over to Spain New Orleans and what remained to her of Louisiana. The Peace of Hubertsburg, between Austria, Prussia, and Saxony, was signed February 15th 1763. Marie Theresa renounced all pretensions she might have to any of the dominions of the King of Prussia, and especially those which had been ceded to him by the treaties of Breslau and Berlin; and she agreed to restore to Prussia the town and county of Glatz, and the fortresses of Wesel and Gelders. The Empire was included in the peace, but the Emperor was not even named. . . . In the peace with the Elector of Saxony, Frederick engaged speedily to evacuate that Electorate and to restore the archives, &c.; but he would give no indemnification for losses suffered. The Treaty of Dresden, of 1745, was renewed."—T. H. Dyer, *Hist. of Modern Europe, bk.* 6, *ch.* 6 (*v.* 3).—"Of the Peace-Treaties at Hubertsburg, Paris and other places, it is not necessary that we say almost anything. . . . The substance of the whole lies now in Three Points. . . . The issue, as between Austria and Prussia, strives to be, in all points, simply 'As-you-were'; and, in all outward or tangible points, strictly is so. After such a tornado of strife as the civilised world had not witnessed since the Thirty-Years War. Tornado springing doubtless from the regions called Infernal; and darkening the upper world from south to north, and from east to west for Seven Years long;—issuing in general 'As-you-were'! Yes truly, the tornado was Infernal; but Heaven, too, had silently its purposes in it. Nor is the mere expenditure of men's diabolic rages, in mutual clash as of opposite electricities, with reduction to equipoise, and restoration of zero and repose again after seven years, the one or the principal result arrived at. Inarticulately, little dreamt on at the time by any bystander, the results, on survey from this distance, are visible as Threefold. Let us name them one other time: 1°. There is no taking of Silesia from this man; no clipping him down to the orthodox old limits; he and his Country have palpably outgrown these. Austria gives-up the problem: 'We have lost Silesia!' Yes; and, what you hardly yet know,—and what, I perceive, Friedrich himself still less knows,—Teutschland has found Prussia. Prussia, it seems, cannot be conquered by the whole world trying to do it; Prussia has gone through its Fire-Baptism, to the satisfaction of gods and men; and is a Nation henceforth. In and of poor dislocated Teutschland, there is one of the Great Powers of the World henceforth; an actual Nation. And a Nation not grounding itself on extinct Traditions, Wiggeries, Papistries, Immaculate Conceptions; no, but on living Facts,—Facts of Arithmetic, Geometry, Gravitation, Martin Luther's Reformation, and what it really can believe in:—to the infinite advantage of said Nation and of poor Teutschland henceforth. . . . 2°. In regard to England. Her Jenkins's-Ear Controversy is at last settled. Not only liberty of the Seas, but, if she were not wiser, dominion of them; guardianship of liberty for all others whatsoever: Dominion of the Seas for that wise object. America is to be English, not French; what a result is that, were there no other! Really a considerable Fact in the History of the World. Fact principally due to Pitt, as I believe, according to my best conjecture, and comparison of probabilities and circumstances.

For which, after all, is not everybody thankful, less or more? O my English brothers, O my Yankee half-brothers, how oblivious are we of those that have done us benefit! . . . 3°. In regard to France. It appears, noble old Teutschland, with such pieties and unconquerable silent valours, such opulences human and divine, amid its wreck of new and old confusions, is not to be cut in Four, and made to dance to the piping of Versailles or another. Far the contrary! To Versailles itself there has gone forth, Versailles may read it or not, the writing on the wall: 'Thou art weighed in the balance, and found wanting' (at last even 'found wanting')! France, beaten, stript, humiliated; sinful, unrepentant, governed by mere sinners and, at best, clever fools ('fous pleins d'esprit'),— collapses, like a creature whose limbs fail it; sinks into bankrupt quiescence, into nameless fermentation, generally into dry-rot."—T. Carlyle, *Hist. of Friedrich II., bk.* 20, *ch.* 13 (*v.* 9).—The text of the Treaty of Paris may be found in the *Parliamentary History, v.* 15, *p.* 1291, and in Entick's *Hist. of the Late War, v.* 5, *p.* 438.

The death and misery of the war summed up by Frederick the Great.—"Prussia enumerated 180,000 men, whom she had been deprived of by the war. Her armies had fought 16 pitched battles. The enemy had beside almost totally destroyed three large corps; that of the convoy of Olmutz, that of Maxen, and that of Fouquet at Landshut; exclusive of the garrison of Breslau, two garrisons of Schweidnitz, one of Torgau, and one of Wittenberg, that were taken with these towns. It was further estimated that 20,000 souls perished in the kingdom of Prussia by the ravages of the Russians; 6,000 in Pomerania; 4,000 in the New March and 3,000 in the electorate of Brandenbourg. The Russian troops had fought four grand battles, and it was computed that the war had cost them 120,000 men, including part of the recruits that perished, in coming from the frontiers of Persia and China, to join their corps in Germany. The Austrians had fought ten regular battles. Two garrisons at Schweidnitz and one at Breslau had been taken; and they estimated their loss at 140,000 men. The French made their losses amount to 200,000; the English with their allies to 160,000; the Swedes to 25,000; and the troops of the circles to 28,000. . . . From the general picture which we have sketched, the result is that the governments of Austria, France, and even England, were overwhelmed with debts, and almost destitute of credit; but that the people, not having been sufferers in the war, were only sensible of it from the prodigious taxes which had been exacted by their sovereigns. Whereas, in Prussia, the government was possessed of money, but the provinces were laid waste and desolated, by the rapacity and barbarity of enemies. The electorate of Saxony was, next to Prussia, the province of Germany that had suffered the most; but this country found resources, in the goodness of its soil and the industry of its inhabitants, which are wanting to Prussia throughout her provinces, Silesia excepted. Time, which cures and effaces all ills, will no doubt soon restore the Prussian states to their former abundance, prosperity, and splendor. Other powers will in like manner recover, and other ambitious men will arise, excite new wars, and incur new disasters. Such are the properties of the human mind; no man benefits by example."—Frederick II., *Hist. of the Seven Years War* (*Posthumous Works, v.* 3), *ch.* 17.

SEVERINUS, Pope, A. D. 640, May to August.

SEVERUS, Alexander, Roman Emperor, A. D. 222–235.

SEVERUS, Libius, Roman Emperor (Western), A. D. 461–465.

SEVERUS, Septimius, Roman Emperor, A. D. 193–211. . . . **Campaigns in Britain.** See Britain: A. D. 208–211.

SEVERUS, Wall of. See Roman Walls in Britain.

SEVIER, John, and the early settlement of Tennessee. See Tennessee: A. D. 1769–1772, to 1785–1796.

SEVILLE: Early history of the city.—"Seville was a prosperous port under the Phœnicians; and was singularly favored by the Scipios. In 45 B. C., Julius Cæsar entered the city; he enlarged it, strengthened and fortified it, and thus made it a favorite residence with the patricians of Rome, several of whom came to live there; no wonder, with its perfect climate and brilliant skies. It was then called Hispalis."—E. E. and S. Hale, *The Story of Spain, ch.* 18.

A. D. 712. — Surrender to the Arab-Moors. See Spain: A. D. 711–713.

A. D. 1031-1091. — The seat of a Moorish kingdom. See Spain: A. D. 1031–1086.

A. D. 1248. — Conquest from the Moors by St. Ferdinand of Castile. See Spain: A. D. 1248–1350.

SEVILLE, Treaty of (1730). See Spain: A. D. 1726–1731.

SEVIN, Battle of (1877). See Turks: A. D. 1877–1878.

SEWAN. See Wampum.

SEWARD, William H.—Defeat in the Chicago Convention of 1860. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1860 (April—November). . . . . **In President Lincoln's Cabinet.** See United States of Am.: A. D. 1861 (March), and after. . . . . **The Trent Affair.** See United States of Am.: A. D. 1861 (November). . . . . **The Proclamation of Emancipation.** See United States of Am.: A. D. 1862 (September). . . . . **Attempted assassination.** See United States of Am.: A. D. 1865 (April 14th). . . . . **In President Johnson's Cabinet.** See United States of Am.: A. D. 1865 (May—July).

SFORZA, Francesco, The rise to ducal sovereignty of. See Milan: A. D. 1447–1454.

SHABATZ, Battle of (1806). See Balkan and Danubian States: 14–19th Centuries (Servia).

SHACAYA, The. See American Aborigines: Andesians.

SHAH, OR SCHAH. See Bey; also Chess.

SHAH JAHAN, Moghul Emperor or Padischah of India, A. D. 1628–1658.

SHAH ROKH, Shah of Persia, A. D. 1747–1751.

SHAHAPTIAN FAMILY, The. See American Aborigines: Nez Percés.

SHAHPUR.—One of the capitals of the later Persian empire, the ruins of which exist near Kazerun, in the province of Fars. It was built by Sapor I., the second of the Sassanian kings,

and received his name.—G. Rawlinson, *Seventh Great Oriental Monarchy, ch.* 4.

SHAKERS, The.—"From the time of the first settlements until the age of the Revolution, if there were any communistic societies founded, [in the United States] I have met with no account of them. The first which has had a long life, was that of the Shakers, or Shaking Quakers, as they were at first called, on account of their bodily movements in worship. The members of this sect or society left England in 1774, and have prospered ever since. It has now multiplied into settlements — twelve of them in New York and New England — in regard to which we borrow the following statistics from Dr. Nordhoff's book on communistic societies in the United States, published in 1875. Their property consists of 49,335 acres of land in home farms, with other real estate. The value of their houses and personal property is not given. The population of all the communities consists of 695 male and 1,189 female adults, with 531 young persons under twenty-one, of whom 192 are males and 339 females, amounting in all to 2,415 in 1874. The maximum of population was 5,069, a decline to less than half, for which we are not able to account save on the supposition that there are permanent causes of decay now at work within the communities. . . . The Shakers were at their origin a society of enthusiasts in humble life, who separated from the Quakers about the middle of the eighteenth century. Ann Lee, one of the members, on account of spiritual manifestations believed to have been made to her, became an oracle in the body, and in 1773 she declared that a revelation from heaven instructed her to go to America. The next year she crossed the sea, with eight others, and settled in the woods of Watervliet, near Albany. She preached, and was believed to have performed remarkable cures. From her . . . [was] derived the rule of celibacy. . . . She died in 1784, as the acknowledged head of the church; and had afterward nearly equal honors paid to her with the Saviour. Under the second successor of Ann Lee almost all the societies in New York and New England were founded; and under the third, a woman named Lucy Wright, whose leadership lasted nearly thirty years, those in Ohio and Kentucky. . . . After 1830 the Shakers founded no new society. Dr. Nordhoff gives the leading doctrines of the Shakers, which are, some of them, singular enough. They hold that God is a dual person, male and female; that Adam, created in his image, was dual also; that the same is true of all angels and spirits; and that Christ is one of the highest spirits, who appeared first in the person of Jesus and afterward in that of Ann Lee. There are four heavens and four hells. Noah went to the first heaven, and the wicked of his time to the first hell. The second heaven was called Paradise, and contained the pious Jews until the appearance of Christ. The third, that into which the Apostle Paul was caught, included all that lived until the time of Ann Lee. The fourth is now being filled up, and 'is to supersede all the others.' They hold that the day of judgment, or beginning of Christ's kingdom on earth, began with the establishment of their church, and will go on until it is brought to its completion. . . . In regard to marriage and property they do not take the position that these are crimes; but only marks of a lower order of society. The world will have a chance to become pure in a future state as well as here. They believed in spiritual communication and possession."—T. D. Woolsey, *Communism and Socialism, pp.* 51–56.

Also in: C. Nordhoff, *The Communistic Societies of the U. S., pp.* 117–232.

SHAKESPEARE, and the English Renaissance. See England: 15–16th Centuries.

SHAMANISM. See Lamas.—Lamaism.

SHARON, Plain of.—That part of the lowland of the Palestine seacoast which stretched northward from Philistia to the promontory of Mt. Carmel. It was assigned to the tribe of Dan.

SHARPSBURG, OR ANTIETAM, Battle of. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1862 (September: Maryland).

SHASTAS, The. See American Aborigines: Sastean Family.

SHASU, The.—An Egyptian name "in which science has for a long time and with perfect certainty recognized the Bedouins of the highest antiquity. They inhabited the great desert between Egypt and the land of Canaan and extended their wanderings sometimes as far as the river Euphrates."—H. Brugsch, *Hist. of Egypt under the Pharaohs, ch.* 11.—See, also, Egypt: The Hyksos.

SHAWMUT.—The Indian name of the peninsula on which Boston, Mass., was built. See Massachusetts: A. D. 1630.

SHAWNEES, OR SHAWANESE. See American Aborigines: Shawanese.

SHAYS REBELLION. See Massachusetts: A. D. 1786–1787.

SHEADINGS. See Manx Kingdom, The.

SHEBA.—"The name of Sheba is still to be recognised in the tribe of Benu-es-Sab, who inhabit a portion of Oman" (Southern Arabia).—F. Lenormant, *Manual of the Ancient Hist. of the East, bk.* 7, *ch.* 1.—See, also, Arabia: The ancient succession and fusion of Races.

SHEEPEATERS (Tukuarika). See American Aborigines: Shoshonean Family.

SHEKEL, The.—"Queipo is of opinion that the talent, the larger unit of Egyptian weight for monetary purposes, and for weighing the precious metals, was equal to the weight of water contained in the cube of $\frac{2}{3}$ of the royal or sacred cubit, and thus equivalent to 42.48 kilos, or 113.814 lbs. troy. He considers this to have been the weight of the Mosaic talent taken by the Hebrews out of Egypt. It was divided into fifty minas, each equal to 849.6 grm., or 13,111 English grains; and the mina into fifty shekels, each equal to 14.16 grm., or 218.5 English grains. . . . There appears to be satisfactory evidence from existing specimens of the earliest Jewish coins that the normal weight of the later Jewish shekel of silver was 218.5 troy grains, or 14.16 grammes."—H. W. Chisholm, *On the Science of Weighing and Measuring, ch.* 2.

SHELBURNE MINISTRY, and the negotiation of peace between England and the United States. See England: A. D. 1782–1783; and United States of Am.: A. D. 1782 (September—November).

SHENANDOAH, The Confederate Cruiser. See Alabama Claims: A. D. 1862–1865.

SHENANDOAH VALLEY: A. D. 1716.—Possession taken by the Virginians. See Virginia: A. D. 1710–1716.

A. D. 1744.—Purchase from the Six Nations. See VIRGINIA: A. D. 1744.

A. D. 1861-1864.—Campaigns in the Civil War. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1861-1862 (DECEMBER—APRIL: VIRGINIA); 1862 (MAY—JUNE: VIRGINIA), (SEPTEMBER: MARYLAND), (OCTOBER—NOVEMBER: VIRGINIA); A. D. 1864 (MAY—JUNE: VIRGINIA), (JULY: VIRGINIA—MARYLAND), and (AUGUST—OCTOBER: VIRGINIA).

SHENIR, Battle of.—A crushing defeat of the army of king Hazael of Damascus by Shalmanezer, king of Assyria, B. C. 841.

SHEPHELAH, The.—The name given by the Jews to the tract of low-lying coast which the Philistines occupied.

SHEPHERD KINGS. See EGYPT: THE HYKSOS.

SHERIDAN, General Philip H.: In the Battle of Stone River. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1862-1863 (DECEMBER—JANUARY: TENNESSEE).....**At Chickamauga, and in the Chattanooga Campaign.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1863 (AUGUST—SEPTEMBER: TENNESSEE) ROSECRANS' ADVANCE, and (OCTOBER—NOVEMBER: TENNESSEE).....**Raid to Richmond.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1864 (MAY: VIRGINIA).....**Raid to Trevillian Station.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1864 (MAY—JUNE: VIRGINIA).....**Campaign in the Shenandoah.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1864 (AUGUST—OCTOBER: VIRGINIA)..... **Battle of Five Forks.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1865 (MARCH—APRIL: VIRGINIA).

SHERIFF.—SCIRGEREFA.—"The Scirgerefa is, as his name denotes, the person who stands at the head of the shire, 'pagus' or county: he is also called Scirman or Scirigman. He is properly speaking the holder of the county-court, scirgemot, or folcmot, and probably at first was its elected chief. But as this gerefa was at first the people's officer, he seems to have shared the fate of the people, and to have sunk in the scale as the royal authority gradually rose: during the whole of our historical period we find him exercising only a concurrent jurisdiction, shared in and controlled by the ealdorman on the one hand and the bishop on the other. . . . The sheriff was naturally the leader of the militia, posse comitatus, or levy of the free men, who served under his banner, as the different lords with their dependents served under the royal officers. . . . In the earliest periods, the office was doubtless elective, and possibly even to the last the people may have enjoyed theoretically, at least, a sort of concurrent choice. But I cannot hesitate for a moment in asserting that under the consolidated monarchy, the scirgerefa was nominated by the king, with or without the acceptance of the county-court, though this in all probability was never refused."—J. M. Kemble, *The Saxons in Eng., bk.* 2, *ch.* 5 (*v.* 2).

ALSO IN: R. Gneist, *Hist. of the Eng. Const., ch.* 4.—See, also, SHIRE; and EALDORMAN.

SHERIFFMUIR, Battle of. See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1715.

SHERMAN, General W. T.: At the first Battle of Bull Run. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1861 (JULY: VIRGINIA).....**Removal from command in Kentucky.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1862 (JANUARY—FEBRUARY: KENTUCKY—TENNESSEE).....**Battle of Shiloh.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1862 (FEBRUARY—APRIL: TENNESSEE).....**The second attempt against Vicksburg.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1862 (DECEMBER: ON THE MISSISSIPPI).....**The final Vicksburg campaign.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1863 (APRIL—JULY: ON THE MISSISSIPPI).....**The capture of Jackson.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1863 (JULY: MISSISSIPPI).....**The Chattanooga Campaign.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1863 (OCTOBER—NOVEMBER).....**Meridian expedition.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1863-1864 (DECEMBER—APRIL: TENNESSEE—MISSISSIPPI).....**Atlanta campaign.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1864 (MAY: GEORGIA), and (MAY—SEPTEMBER: GEORGIA).....**March to the Sea.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1864 (SEPTEMBER—OCTOBER: GEORGIA), and (NOVEMBER—DECEMBER: GEORGIA).....**The last campaign.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1865 (FEBRUARY—MARCH: THE CAROLINAS), and (APRIL 26TH).

SHERMAN SILVER ACT, and its repeal. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1890-1893.

SHERSTONE, Battle of.—The second battle fought between Cnut, or Canute, and Edmund Ironsides for the English crown. It was in Wiltshire, A. D. 1016.

SHERWOOD FOREST.—"The name of Sherwood or Shirewood is, there can be no reasonable doubt," says Mr. Llewellyn Jewett, "derived from the open-air assemblies, or folk-moots, or witenagemotes of the shire being there held in primitive times." The Forest once covered the whole county of Nottingham and extended into both Yorkshire and Derbyshire, twenty-five miles one way by eight or ten the other. It was a royal forest and favorite hunting resort of both Saxon and Norman kings; but is best known as the scene of the exploits of the bold outlaw Robin Hood. Few vestiges of the great forest now remain.—J. C. Brown, *The Forests of Eng.*

SHESHATAPOOSH INDIANS, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: ALGONQUIAN FAMILY.

SHETLAND, OR ZETLAND, ISLES: 8-13th Centuries.—The Northmen in possession. See NORMANS.—NORTHMEN: 8-9TH CENTURIES, and 10-13TH CENTURIES.

SHEYENNES, OR CHEYENNES, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: ALGONQUIAN FAMILY.

SHI WEI, The. See MONGOLS: ORIGIN, &C.

SHIAHS, OR SHIAS, The. See ISLAM; also PERSIA: A. D. 1499-1887.

SHIITES, Sultan Selim's massacre of the. See TURKS: A. D. 1481-1520.

SHILOH, OR PITTSBURG LANDING, Battle of. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1862 (FEBRUARY—APRIL: TENNESSEE).

SHINAR. See BABYLONIA: PRIMITIVE.

SHIP OF THE LINE.—In the time of wooden navies, "a ship carrying not less than 74 guns upon three decks, and of sufficient size to be placed in line of battle," was called a "ship of the line," or a "line-of-battle ship."

SHIP-MONEY. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1634-1637.

SHIPKA PASS, Struggle for the. See TURKS: A. D. 1877-1878.

SHIPWRECK, Law of. See LAW: ADMIRALTY.

SHIRE.—SHIREMOOT.—"The name scir or shire, which marks the division immediately superior to the hundred, merely means a subdivision or share of a larger whole, and was early used in connexion with an official name to designate the territorial sphere appointed to the particular magistracy denoted by that name. So the diocese was the bishop's scire. . . . The historical shires or counties owe their origin to different causes. . . . The sheriff or scir-gerefa, the scir-man of the laws of Ini, was the king's steward and judicial president of the shire. . . . The sheriff held the shiremoot, according to Edgar's law, twice in the year. Although the ealdorman and bishop sat in it to declare the law secular and spiritual, the sheriff was the constituting officer."—*W. Stubbs, Const. Hist. of Eng., ch. 5, sects.* 48–50 (*v.* 1).—See, also, KNIGHTS OF THE SHIRE; EALDORMAN; and GAU.

SHOE-STRING DISTRICT, The. See GERRYMANDERING.

SHOGUN. See JAPAN: SKETCH OF HISTORY.

SHOSHONES, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: SHOSHONEAN FAMILY.

SHREWSBURY, Battle of. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1403.

SHREWSBURY SCHOOL. See EDUCATION, MODERN: EUROPEAN COUNTRIES.—ENGLAND.

SHULUH, The. See LIBYANS.

SHUMIR, OR SUMIR. See BABYLONIA: THE EARLY (CHALDEAN) MONARCHY.

SHUPANES.—GRAND SHUPANES.—The princes, ultimately kings, of the early Servian people.—L. Ranke, *Hist. of Servia, ch.* 1.—See BALKAN AND DANUBIAN STATES, 9TH CENTURY (SERVIA).

SHUSHAN. See SUSA.

SIAM.—"The people known to Europeans as the 'Siamese,' but who call themselves 'Thai,' that is 'Free Men,' have exercised the greatest civilising influence on the aboriginal populations of the interior. Within the historic period Siam has also generally held the most extensive domain beyond the natural limits of the Menam basin. Even still, although hemmed in on one side by the British possessions, on the other by the French protectorate of Camboja, Siam comprises beyond the Menam Valley a considerable part of the Malay Peninsula, and draws tribute from numerous people in the Mekong and Salwen basins. But this State, with an area about half as large again as that of France, has a population probably less than 6,000,000. . . . The inhabitants of Siam, whether Shans, Laos, or Siamese proper, belong all alike to the same Thai stock, which is also represented by numerous tribes in Assam, Manipur, and China. The Shans are very numerous in the region of the Upper Irrawaddi and its Chinese affluents, in the Salwen Valley and in the portion of the Sittang basin included in British territory. . . . The Lovas, better known by the name of Laos or Laotians, are related to the Shans, and occupy the north of Siam. . . . They form several 'kingdoms,' all vassals of the King of Siam. . . . The Siamese, properly so called, are centred chiefly in the Lower Menam basin and along the seaboard. Although the most civilised they are not the purest of the Thai race. . . . Siam or Sayam is said by some natives to mean 'Three,' because the country was formerly peopled by three races now fused in one nation. Others derive it from saya, 'independent,' sama, 'brown,' or samo, 'dark'. . . . The Siamese are well named 'Indo-Chinese,' their manners, customs, civil and religious institutions, all partaking of this twofold character. Their feasts are of Brahmanical origin, while their laws and administration are obviously borrowed from the Chinese. . . . About one-fourth of the inhabitants of Siam had from various causes fallen into a state of bondage about the middle of the present century. But since the abolition of slavery in 1872, the population has increased, especially by Chinese immigration. . . . The 'Master of the World,' or 'Master of Life,' as the King of Siam is generally called, enjoys absolute power over the lives and property of his subjects. . . . A second king, always nearly related to the first, enjoys the title and a few attributes of royalty. But he exercises no power. . . . British having succeeded to Chinese influence, most of the naval and military as well as of the custom-house officers are Englishmen."—É. Reclus, *The Earth and its Inhabitants: Asia, v.* 3, *ch.* 21.—The former capital of Siam was Ayuthia, a city founded A. D. 1351, and now in ruins. "Anterior to the establishment of Ayuthia . . . the annals of Siam are made up of traditional legends and fables, such as most nations are fond of substituting in the place of veracious history. . . . There are accounts of intermarriages with Chinese princesses, of embassies and wars with neighbouring States, all interblended with wonders and miraculous interpositions of Indra and other divinities; but from the time when the city of Ayuthia was founded by Phaja-Uthong, who took the title of Phra-Rama-Thibodi, the succession of sovereigns and the course of events are recorded with tolerable accuracy."—Sir J. Bowring, *Kingdom and People of Siam, v.* 1, *ch.* 2.—"For centuries the Siamese government paid tribute to China; but since 1852 this tribute has been refused. In 1855 the first commercial treaty with a European power (Great Britain) was concluded."—G. G. Chisholm, *The Two Hemispheres, p.* 523.

ALSO IN: A. R. Colquhoun, *Amongst the Shans, introd. by T. de La Couperie, and sup. by H. S. Hallett.*

SIBERIA: The Russian conquest.—Siberia was scarcely known to the Russians before the middle of the 16th century. The first conquest of a great part of the country was achieved in the latter part of that century by a Cossack adventurer named Yermac Timoseef, who began his attack upon the Tartars in 1578. Unable to hold what he had won, Yermac offered the sovereignty of his conquests to the Czar of Muscovy, who took it gladly and sent reinforcements. The conquests of Yermac were lost for a time after his death, but soon recovered by fresh bodies of Muscovite troops sent into the country. "This success was the forerunner of still greater acquisitions. The Russians rapidly extended their conquests; wherever they appeared, the Tartars were either reduced or exterminated; new towns were built and colonies planted. Before a century had elapsed, that vast tract of country now called Siberia, which stretches from the confines of Europe to the Eastern Ocean, and from the Frozen Sea to the frontiers of China, was annexed to the Russian dominions."—W. Coxe, *Russian Discoveries between Asia and Am., pt.* 2, *ch.* 1.

SIBUZATES, The. See AQUITAINE: THE ANCIENT TRIBES.

SIBYLS.—SIBYLLINE BOOKS.—"Tarquinius [Tarquinius Superbus, the last of the kings of Rome] built a mighty temple, and consecrated it to Jupiter, and to Juno, and to Minerva, the greatest of the gods of the Etruscans. At this time there came a strange woman to the king and offered him nine books of the prophecies of the Sibyl for a certain price. When the king refused them, the woman went and burnt three of the books, and came back and offered the six at the same price which she had asked for the nine; but they mocked at her and would not take the books. Then she went away and burnt three more, and came back and asked still the same price for the remaining three. At this the king was astonished, and asked of the augurs what he should do. They said that he had done wrong in refusing the gift of the gods, and bade him by all means to buy the books that were left. So he bought them; and the woman who sold them was seen no more from that day forwards. Then the books were put into a chest of stone, and were kept under ground in the Capitol, and two men were appointed to keep them, and were called the two men of the sacred books."—T. Arnold, *Hist. of Rome, ch.* 4.—"Collections of prophecies similar to the Sibylline books are met with not only among the Greeks, but also among the Italians—Etruscans as well as those of Sabellian race. The Romans had the prophecies of the Marcii ('Carmina Marciana,' Hartung, 'Religion der Römer,' i. 139); prophetic lines ('sortes') of the nymph Albunea had come down to Rome from Tibur in a miraculous manner (Marquardt, 'Röm. Alterth., iv. 299). There existed likewise Etruscan 'libri fatales' (Livy, v. 45; Cicero, 'De Divin., i. 44, 100), and prophecies of the Etruscan nymph Begoe (quæ artem scripserat fulguritorum apud Tuscos. Lactant, 'Instit.,' i. 6, 12). Such books as these were kept in the Capitol, together with the Sibylline books, in the care of the Quindecemveri sacris faciundis. They are all called without distinction 'libri fatales' and 'Sibylline' books, and there seems to have been little difference between them."—W. Ihne, *Hist. of Rome, bk.* 1, *ch.* 8, *foot-note* (*v.* 1).—"Every schoolboy is familiar with the picturesque Roman legend of the Sibyl. It is variously told in connection with the elder and the later Tarquin, the two Etruscan kings of Rome; and the scene of it is laid by some in Cumæ, where Tarquinius Superbus spent the last years of his life in exile—and by others in Rome. . . . The original books of the Cumæan Sibyl were written in Greek, which was the language of the whole of the south of Italy at that time. The oracles were inscribed upon palm leaves; to which circumstance Virgil alludes in his description of the sayings of the Cumæan Sibyl being written upon the leaves of the forest. They were in the form of acrostic verses. . . . It is supposed that they contained not so much predictions of future events, as directions regarding the means by which the wrath of the gods, as revealed by prodigies and calamities, might be appeased. They seem to have been consulted in the same way as Eastern nations consult the Koran and Hafiz. . . . The Cumæan Sibyl was not the only prophetess of the kind. There were no less than ten females, endowed with the gift of prevision, and held in high repute, to whom the name of Sibyl was given. We read of the Persian Sibyl, the Libyan, the Delphic, the Erythræan, the Hellespontine, the Phrygian, and the Tiburtine. With the name of the last-mentioned Sibyl tourists make acquaintance at Tivoli. . . . Clement of Alexandria does not scruple to call the Cumæan Sibyl a true prophetess, and her oracles saving canticles. And St. Augustine includes her among the number of those who belong to the 'City of God.' And this idea of the Sibyls' sacredness continued to a late age in the Christian Church. She had a place in the prophetic order beside the patriarchs and prophets of old."—H. Macmillan, *Roman Mosaics, ch.* 3.—"Either under the seventh or the eighth Ptolemy there appeared at Alexandria the oldest of the Sibylline oracles, bearing the name of the Erythræan Sibyl, which, containing the history of the past and the dim forebodings of the future, imposed alike on the Greek, Jewish, and Christian world, and added almost another book to the Canon. When Thomas of Celano composed the most famous hymn of the Latin Church he did not scruple to place the Sibyl on a level with David; and when Michel Angelo adorned the roof of the Sixtine Chapel, the figures of the weird sisters of Pagan antiquity are as prominent as the seers of Israel and Judah. Their union was the result of the bold stroke of an Alexandrian Jew."—A. P. Stanley, *Lect's on the Hist. of the Jewish Church, lect.* 47 (*v.* 3).

ALSO IN: Dionysius, *History, bk.* 4, *sect.* 62.—See, also, CUMÆ.

SICAMBRI, SIGAMBRI, OR SUGAMBRI. See USIPETES; also, FRANKS: ORIGIN, and A. D. 253.

SICARII, The. See JEWS: A. D. 66–70.

SICELIOTES AND ITALIOTES.—The inhabitants of the ancient Greek colonies in southern Italy (Magna Graecia) and Sicily were known as Siceliotes and Italiotes, to distinguish them from the native Siceli and Itali.—H. G. Liddell, *Hist. of Rome, bk.* 3, *ch.* 25 (*v.* 1).

SICELS.—SICANIANS. See SICILY: THE EARLY INHABITANTS.

SICILIAN VESPERS, The. See ITALY (SOUTHERN): A. D. 1282–1300.

SICILIES, The Two. See TWO SICILIES.

SICILY: The early inhabitants.—The date of the first known Greek settlement in Sicily is fixed at B. C. 735. It was a colony led from the Eubœan city of Chalcis and from the island of Naxos, which latter gave its name to the town which the emigrants founded on the eastern coast of their new island home. "Sicily was at this time inhabited by at least four distinct races: by Sicanians, whom Thucydides considers as a tribe of the Iberians, who, sprung perhaps from Africa, had overspread Spain and the adjacent coasts, and even remote islands of the Mediterranean; by Sicels, an Italian people, probably not more foreign to the Greeks than the Pelasgians, who had been driven out of Italy by the progress of the Oscan or Ausonian race, and in their turn had pressed the Sicanians back toward the southern and western parts of the island, and themselves occupied so large a portion of it as to give their name to the whole. Of the other races, the Phœnicians were in possession of several points on the coast, and of some neighbour-

ing islets, from which they carried on their commerce with the natives. The fourth people, which inhabited the towns of Eryx and Egesta, or Segesta, at the western end of the island, and bore the name of Elymians, was probably composed of different tribes, varying in their degrees of affinity to the Greeks. . . . The Sicels and the Phœnicians gradually retreated before the Greeks. . . . But the Sicels maintained themselves in the inland and on the north coast, and the Phœnicians, or Carthaginians, who succeeded them, established themselves in the west, where they possessed the towns of Motya, Solus, and Panormus, destined, under the name of Palermo, to become the capital of Sicily."—C. Thirlwall, *Hist. of Greece, ch.* 12.

Also in: G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece, pt.* 2, *ch.* 22. —E. A. Freeman, *Hist. of Sicily, ch.* 2.—See, also, Œnotrians.

Phœnician and Greek colonies.—"Sicilian history begins when the great colonizing nations of antiquity, the Phœnicians and the Greeks, began to settle in Sicily. . . . It was a chief seat for the planting of colonies, first from Phœnicia and then from Greece. It is the presence of these Phœnician and Greek colonies which made the history of Sicily what it was. These settlements were of course made more or less at the expense of the oldest inhabitants of the island, those who were there before the Phœnicians and Greeks came to settle. . . . Phœnician and Greek settlers could occupy the coasts, but only the coasts; it was only at the corners that they could at all spread from sea to sea. A great inland region was necessarily left to the older inhabitants. But there was no room in Sicily, as there was in Asia, for the growth of great barbarian powers dangerous to the settlers. Neither Phœnician nor Greek was ever able to occupy or conquer the whole island; but neither people stood in any fear of being conquered or driven out, unless by one another. But instead of conquest came influence. Both Phœnicians and Greeks largely influenced the native inhabitants. In the end, without any general conquest, the whole island became practically Greek. . . . Carthage at a later time plays so great a part in Sicilian history that we are tempted to bring it in before its time, and to fancy that the Phœnician colonies in Sicily were, as they are sometimes carelessly called, Carthaginian colonies. This is not so; the Phœnician cities in Sicily did in after times become Carthaginian dependencies: but they were not founded by Carthage. We cannot fix an exact date for their foundation, nor can we tell for certain how far they were settled straight from the old Phœnicia and how far from the older Phœnician cities in Africa. But we may be sure that their foundation happened between the migration of the Sikels in the 11th century B. C. and the beginning of Greek settlement in the 8th. And we may suspect that the Phœnician settlements in the east of Sicily were planted straight from Tyre and Sidon, and those in the west from the cities in Africa. We know that all round Sicily the Phœnicians occupied small islands and points of coast which were fitted for their trade, but we may doubt whether they anywhere in Eastern Sicily planted real colonies, cities with a territory attached to them. In the west they seem to have done so. For, when the Greeks began to advance in Sicily, the Phœnicians withdrew to their strong posts in the western part of the island, Motya, Solous, and Panormos. There they kept a firm hold till the time of Roman dominion. The Greeks could never permanently dislodge them from their possessions in this part. Held, partly by Phœnicians, partly by Sikans and Elymians who had been brought under Phœnician influence, the northwestern corner of Sicily remained a barbarian corner. . . . The greatest of all Phœnician settlements in Sicily lay within the bay of which the hill of Solous is one horn, but much nearer to the other horn, the hill of Herkte, now Pellegrino. Here the mountains fence in a wonderfully fruitful plain, known in after times as the Golden Shell (conca d'oro). In the middle of it there was a small inlet of the sea, parted into two branches, with a tongue of land between them, guarded by a small peninsula at the mouth. There could be no better site for Phœnician traders. Here then rose a Phœnician city, which, though on the north coast of Sicily, looks straight towards the rising sun. It is strange that we do not know its Phœnician name; in Greek it was called Panormos, the All-haven, a name borne also by other places. This is the modern Palermo, which, under both Phœnicians and Saracens, was the Semitic head of Sicily, and which remained the capital of the island under the Norman kings. . . . Thus in Sicily the East became West and the West East. The men of Asia withdrew before the men of Europe to the west of the island, and thence warred against the men of Europe to the east of them. In the great central island of Europe they held their own barbarian corner. It was the land of Phœnicians, Sikans, and Elymians, as opposed to the eastern land of the Greeks and their Sikel subjects and pupils. . . . For a long time Greek settlement was directed to the East rather than to the West. And it was said that, when settlement in Italy and Sicily did begin, the earliest Greek colony, like the earliest Phœnician colony, was the most distant. It was believed that Kyme, the Latin Cumæ in Campania, was founded in the 11th century B. C. The other plantations in Italy and Sicily did not begin till the 8th. Kyme always stood by itself, as the head of a group of Greek towns in its own neighbourhood and apart from those more to the south, and it may very well be that some accident caused it to be settled sooner than the points nearer to Greece. But it is not likely to have been settled 300 years earlier. Most likely it was planted just long enough before the nearer sites to suggest their planting. Anyhow, in the latter half of the 8th century B. C. Greek settlement to the West, in Illyria, Sicily, and Italy, began in good earnest. It was said that the first settlement in Sicily came of an accident. Chalkis in Euboia was then one of the chief sea-faring towns of Greece. Theokles, a man of Chalkis, was driven by storm to the coast of Sicily. He came back, saying that it was a good land and that the people would be easy to conquer. So in 735 B. C. he was sent forth to plant the first Greek colony in Sicily. The settlers were partly from Chalkis, partly from the island of Naxos. So it was agreed that the new town should be called Naxos, but that Chalkis should count as its metropolis. So the new Naxos arose on the eastern coast of Sicily, on a peninsula made by the lava. It looked up at the great hill of Tauros, on which Taormina now stands. The

Greek settlers drove out the Sikels and took so much land as they wanted. They built and fortified a town, and part of their walls may still be seen. . . . Naxos, as the beginning of Greek settlement in Sicily, answers to Ebbsfleet, the beginning of English settlement in Britain."—E. A. Freeman, *The Story of Sicily, ch.* 1–4.

Also in: The same, *Hist. of Sicily, ch.* 3–4 (*v.*1).

B. C. 480.—Carthaginian invasion.—Battle of Himera.—During the same year in which Xerxes invaded Greece (B. C. 480), the Greeks in Sicily were equally menaced by an appalling invasion from Carthage. The Carthaginians, invited by the tyrant of Himera, who had been expelled from that city by a neighbor tyrant, sent 300,000 men it is said, to reinstate him, and to strengthen for themselves the slender footing they already had in one corner of the island. Gelo, the powerful tyrant of Syracuse, came promptly to the aid of the Himerians, and defeated the Carthaginians with terrible slaughter. Hamilcar the commander was among the slain. Those who escaped the sword were nearly all taken prisoners and made slaves. The fleet which brought them over was destroyed, and scarcely a ship returned to Carthage to bear the deplorable tidings.—C. Thirlwall, *Hist. of Greece, ch.* 15.

Also in: G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece, pt.* 2, *ch.* 43.

B. C. 415-413.—Siege of Syracuse by the Athenians.—Its disastrous failure. See Syracuse: B. C. 415–413.

B. C. 409-405.—Carthaginian invasion.—The quarrels of the city of Egesta, in Sicily, with its neighbors, brought about the fatal expedition from Athens against Syracuse, B. C. 415. Six years later, in the same protracted quarrel, Egesta appealed to Carthage for help, against the city of Selinus, and thus invited the first of the Hannibals to revenge terribly the defeat and death of his grandfather Hamilcar, at Himera, seventy years before. Hannibal landed an army of more than one hundred thousand savage mercenaries in Sicily, in the spring of 409 B. C. and laid siege to Selinus with such vigor that the city was carried by storm at the end of ten days and most of its inhabitants slain. The temples and walls of the town were destroyed and it was left a deserted ruin. "The ruins, yet remaining, of the ancient temples of Selinus, are vast and imposing; characteristic as specimens of Doric art during the fifth and sixth centuries B. C. From the great magnitude of the fallen columns, it has been supposed that they were overthrown by an earthquake. But the ruins afford distinct evidence that these columns have been first undermined, and then overthrown by crowbars. This impressive fact, demonstrating the agency of the Carthaginian destroyers, is stated by Niebuhr." From Selinus, Hannibal passed on to Himera and, having taken that city in like manner, destroyed it utterly. The women and children were distributed as slaves; the male captives were slain in a body on the spot where Hamilcar fell—a sacrifice to his shade. A new town called Therma was subsequently founded by the Carthaginians on the site of Himera. Having satisfied himself with revenge, Hannibal disbanded his army, glutted with spoil, and returned home. But three years later he invaded Sicily again, with an armament even greater than before, and the great city of Agrigentum was the first to fall before his arms. "Its population was very great; comprising, according to one account, 20,000 citizens, among an aggregate total of 200,000 males—citizens, metics, and slaves; according to another account, an aggregate total of no less than 800,000 persons; numbers unauthenticated, and not to be trusted further than as indicating a very populous city. . . . Its temples and porticos, especially the spacious temple of Zeus Olympus—its statues and pictures—its abundance of chariots and horses—its fortifications—its sewers—its artificial lake of near a mile in circumference, abundantly stocked with fish—all these placed it on a par with the most splendid cities of the Hellenic world." After a siege of some duration Agrigentum was evacuated and most of its inhabitants escaped. The Carthaginians stripped it of every monument of art, sending much away to Carthage and destroying more. Hannibal had died of a pestilence during the siege and his colleague Imilkon succeeded him in command. Having quartered his army at Agrigentum during the winter, he attacked the cities of Gela and Kamarina in the spring, and both were believed to have been betrayed to him by the tyrant of Syracuse, Dionysius, who had then just established himself in power. A treaty of peace was presently concluded between Dionysius and Imilkon, which gave up all the south of Sicily, as well as Selinus, Himera, and Agrigentum, to the Carthaginians, and made Gela and Kamarina tributary to them. The Carthaginian army had been half destroyed by pestilence and the disease, carried home by its survivors, desolated Carthage and the surrounding country.—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece, pt.* 2, *ch.* 81–82, *with foot-note.*

Also in: E. A. Freeman, *Hist. of Sicily, ch.* 9 (*v.* 3).

B. C. 397-396.—Dionysius, the Tyrant of Syracuse, and his war with the Carthaginians. See Syracuse: B. C. 397–396.

B. C. 394-384.—Conquests and dominion of Dionysius. See Syracuse: B. C. 394–384.

B. C. 383.—War with Carthage.—Dionysius, the Syracusan despot, was the aggressor in a fresh war with Carthage which broke out in 383, B. C. The theatre of war extended from Sicily to southern Italy, where Dionysius had made considerable conquests, but only two battles of serious magnitude were fought—both in Sicily. Dionysius was the victor in the first of these, which was a desperate and sanguinary struggle, at a place called Kabala. The Carthaginian commander, Magon, was slain, with 10,000 of his troops, while 5,000 were made captive. The survivors begged for peace and Dionysius dictated, as a first condition, the entire withdrawal of their forces from Sicily. While negotiations were in progress, Magon's young son, succeeding to his father's command, so reorganized and reinspirited his army as to be able to attack the Syracusans and defeat them with more terrific slaughter than his own side had experienced a few days before. This battle, fought at Kronium, reversed the situation, and forced Dionysius to purchase a humiliating peace at heavy cost.—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece, pt.* 2, *ch.* 83.

B. C. 344.—Fall of the Tyranny of Dionysius at Syracuse. See Syracuse: B. C. 344.

B. C. 317-289.—Syracuse under Agathokles. See Syracuse: B. C. 317–289.

B. C. 278-276.—Expedition of Pyrrhus. See Rome: B. C. 282–275.

B. C. 264-241.—The Mamertines in Messene.—First war of Rome and Carthage.—Evacuation of the island by the Carthaginians.—The Romans in possession. See PUNIC WAR: THE FIRST.

B. C. 216-212.—Alliance with Hannibal and revolt against Rome.—The Roman siege of Syracuse. See PUNIC WAR: THE SECOND.

B. C. 133-103.—Slave wars. See SLAVE WARS IN SICILY.

A. D. 429-525.—Under the Vandals, and the Goths.—"Sicily, which had been for a generation subjected, first to the devastations and then to the rule of the Vandal king [in Africa], was now by a formal treaty, which must have been nearly the last public act of Gaiseric [or Genseric, who died A. D. 477] ceded to Odovacar [or Odoacer, who extinguished the Western Roman Empire and was the first barbarian king of Italy], all but a small part, probably at the western end of the island, which the Vandal reserved to himself. A yearly tribute was to be the price of this concession; but, in the decay of the kingdom under Gaiseric's successors, it is possible that this tribute was not rigorously enforced, as it is also almost certain that the reserved portion of the island, following the example of the remainder, owned the sway of Odovacar."—T. Hodgkin, *Italy and Her Invaders, bk.* 4, *ch.* 4.—Under Theodoric the Ostrogoth, who overthrew Odoacer and reigned in Italy from 493 until 525, Sicily was free both from invasion and from tribute and shared with Italy the benefits and the trials of the Gothic supremacy.—Same, *bk.* 4, *ch.* 9.

A. D. 535.—Recovered by Belisarius for the Emperor Justinian. See ROME: A. D. 535–553.

A. D. 550.—Gothic invasion. See ROME: A. D. 535–553.

A. D. 827-878.—Conquest by the Saracens.—The conquest of Sicily from the Byzantine empire, by the Saracens, was instigated in the first instance and aided by an influential Syracusan named Euphemios, whom the Emperor Michael had undertaken to punish for abduction of a nun. Euphemios invited the African Saracens to the island, and Ziadet Allah, the Aglabite sovereign who had established himself in power at Cairowan or Kairwan, felt strong enough to improve the opportunity. In June 827 the admiral of the Moslems formed a junction with the ships which Euphemios had set afloat, and the Saracens landed at Mazara. The Byzantines were defeated in a battle near Platana and the Saracens occupied Girgenti. Having gained this foothold they waited some time for reinforcements, which came, at last, in a naval armament from Spain and troops from Africa. "The war was then carried on with activity: Messina was taken in 831; Palermo capitulated in the following year; and Enna was besieged, for the first time, in 836. The war continued with various success, as the invaders received assistance from Africa, and the Christians from Constantinople. The Byzantine forces recovered possession of Messina, which was not permanently occupied by the Saracens until 843. . . . At length, in the year 859, Enna was taken by the Saracens. Syracuse, in order to preserve its commerce from ruin, had purchased peace by paying a tribute of 50,000 byzants; and it was not until the reign of Basil I., in the year 878, that it was compelled to surrender, and the conquest of Sicily was completed by the Arabs. Some districts, however, continued, either by treaty or by force of arms, to preserve their municipal independence, and the exclusive exercise of the Christian religion, within their territory, to a later period."—G. Finlay, *Hist. of the Byzantine Empire, from* 716 *to* 1057, *bk.* 1, *ch.* 3, *sect.* 1.—"Syracuse preserved about fifty years [after the landing of the Saracens in Sicily] the faith which she had sworn to Christ and to Cæsar. In the last and fatal siege her citizens displayed some remnant of the spirit which had formerly resisted the powers of Athens and Carthage. They stood above twenty days against the battering-rams and catapultæ, the mines and tortoises of the besiegers; and the place might have been relieved, if the mariners of the imperial fleet had not been detained at Constantinople in building a church to the Virgin Mary. . . . In Sicily the religion and language of the Greeks were eradicated; and such was the docility of the rising generation that 15,000 boys were circumcised and clothed on the same day with the son of the Fatimite caliph. The Arabian squadrons issued from the harbours of Palermo, Biserta, and Tunis; a hundred and fifty towns of Calabria and Campania were attacked and pillaged; nor could the suburbs of Rome be defended by the name of the Cæsars and apostles. Had the Mahometans been united, Italy must have fallen an easy and glorious accession to the empire of the prophet."—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, ch.* 52.—A hundred and fifty years after the fall of Syracuse Basil II. undertook its recovery, but death overcame him in the midst of his plans. "Ten years later, the Byzantine general Maniakes commenced the reconquest of Sicily in a manner worthy of Basil himself, but the women and eunuchs who ruled at Constantinople procured his recall; affairs fell into confusion, and the prize was eventually snatched from both parties by the Normans of Apulia."—E. A. Freeman, *Hist. and Conquests of the Saracens, lect.* 5.

A. D. 1060-1090.—Norman conquest. See ITALY (SOUTHERN): A. D. 1000–1090.

A. D. 1127-1194.—Union with Apulia in the kingdom of Naples or the Two Sicilies.—Prosperity and peace. See ITALY (SOUTHERN): A. D. 1081–1194.

A. D. 1146.—Introduction of Silk-culture and manufacture. See BYZANTINE EMPIRE: A. D. 1146.

A. D. 1194-1266.—Under the Hohenstaufen. See ITALY (SOUTHERN): A. D. 1183–1250.

A. D. 1266.—Invasion and conquest of the kingdom of the Sicilies by Charles of Anjou. See ITALY (SOUTHERN): A. D. 1250–1268.

A. D. 1282-1300.—The Massacre of the Sicilian Vespers.—Separation from the kingdom of Naples.—Transfer to the House of Aragon. See ITALY (SOUTHERN): A. D. 1282–1300.

A. D. 1313.—Alliance with the Emperor against Naples. See ITALY: A. D. 1310–1313.

A. D. 1442.—Reunion of the crowns of Sicily and Naples, or the Two Sicilies, by Alphonso of Aragon. See ITALY: A. D. 1412–1447.

A. D. 1458.—Separation of the crown of Naples from those of Aragon and Sicily. See ITALY: A. D. 1447–1480.

A. D. 1530.—Cession of Malta to the Knights of St. John. See HOSPITALLERS OF ST. JOHN: A. D. 1530–1565.

A. D. 1532-1553.—Frightful ravages of the Turks along the coast. See ITALY: A. D. 1528–1570.

A. D. 1713.—Ceded by Spain to the Duke of Savoy. See UTRECHT: A. D. 1712–1714.

A. D. 1718-1719.—Retaken by Spain, again surrendered, and acquired by Austria in exchange for Sardinia. See SPAIN: A. D. 1713–1725; and ITALY: A. D. 1715–1735.

A. D. 1734-1735.—Occupation by the Spaniards.—Cession to Spain, with Naples, forming a kingdom for Don Carlos. See FRANCE: A. D. 1733–1735.

A. D. 1749-1792.—Under the Spanish-Bourbon régime. See ITALY: A. D. 1749–1792.

A. D. 1805-1806.—Held by the King, expelled from Naples by the French. See FRANCE: A. D. 1805–1806 (DECEMBER—SEPTEMBER).

A. D. 1821.—Revolutionary insurrection. See ITALY: A. D. 1820–1821.

A. D. 1848-1849.—Patriotic rising.—A year of independence.—Subjugation of the insurgents by King "Bomba." See ITALY: A. D. 1848–1849.

A. D. 1860-1861.—Liberation by Garibaldi.—Absorption in the new kingdom of Italy. See ITALY: A. D. 1859–1861.

SICULI, The. See SICILY: THE EARLY INHABITANTS.

SICYON, OR SIKYON.—"Sicyon was the starting point of the Ionic civilization which pervaded the whole valley of the Asopus [a river which flows from the mountains of Argolis to the Gulf of Corinth, in northeastern Peloponnesus]; the long series of kings of Sicyon testifies to the high age with which the city was credited. At one time it was the capital of all Asopia as well as of the shore in front of it, and the myth of Adrastus has preserved the memory of this the historic glory of Sicyon. The Dorian immigration dissolved the political connection between the cities of the Asopus. Sicyon itself had to admit Dorian families." The ascendancy which the Dorian invaders then assumed was lost at a later time. The old Ionian population of the country, dwelling on the shores of the Corinthian gulf, engaged in commerce and fishing, acquired superior wealth and were trained to superior enterprise by their occupation. In time they overthrew the Doric state, under the lead of a family, the Orthagoridæ, which established a famous tyranny in Sicyon (about 670 B. C.). Myron and Clisthenes, the first two tyrants of the house, acquired a great name in Greece by their wealth, by their liberal encouragement of art and by their devotion to the sanctuaries at Olympus and at Delphi.—E. Curtius, *Hist. of Greece, bk.* 2, *ch.* 1 (*v.* 1).—See, also, TYRANTS, GREEK.

B. C. 280-146.—The Achaian League. See GREECE: B. C. 280–146.

SIDNEY, Algernon, The execution of. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1681–1683.

SIDNEY, Sir Philip, The death of. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1585–1586.

SIDON, The suicidal burning of.—About 346 B. C., Ochus, king of Persia, having subdued a revolt in Cyprus, proceeded against the Phœnician cities, which had joined in it. Sidon was betrayed to him by its prince, and he intimated his intention to take signal revenge on the city; whereupon the Sidonians "took the desperate resolution, first of burning their fleet that no one might escape—next, of shutting themselves up with their families, and setting fire each man to his own house. In this deplorable conflagration 40,000 persons are said to have perished; and such was the wealth destroyed, that the privilege of searching the ruins was purchased for a large sum of money."—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece, pt.* 2, *ch.* 90.

SIDONIANS, The. See PHŒNICIANS.

SIEBENBÜRGEN.—The early name given to the principality of Transylvania, and having reference to seven forts erected within it.—J. Samuelson, *Roumania, p.* 182.

SIENA: The mediæval factions.—"The way in which this city conducted its government for a long course of years [in the Middle Ages] justified Varchi in calling it 'a jumble, so to speak, and chaos of republics, rather than a well-ordered and disciplined commonwealth.' The discords of Siena were wholly internal. They proceeded from the wrangling of five factions, or Monti, as the people of Siena called them. The first of these was termed the Monte de' Nobili; for Siena had originally been controlled by certain noble families. . . . The nobles split into parties among themselves. . . . At last they found it impossible to conduct the government, and agreed to relinquish it for a season to nine plebeian families chosen from among the richest and most influential. This gave rise to the Monte de' Nove. . . . In time, however, their insolence became insufferable. The populace rebelled, deposed the Nove, and invested with supreme authority 12 other families of plebeian origin. The Monte de' Dodici, created after this fashion, ran nearly the same course as their predecessors, except that they appear to have administered the city equitably. Getting tired of this form of government, the people next superseded them by 16 men chosen from the dregs of the plebeians, who assumed the title of Riformatori. This new Monte de' Sedici or de' Riformatori showed much integrity in their management of affairs, but, as is the wont of red republicans, they were not averse to bloodshed. Their cruelty caused the people, with the help of the surviving patrician houses, together with the Nove and the Dodici, to rise and shake them off. The last governing body formed in this diabolical five-part fugue of crazy statecraft received the name of Monte del Popolo, because it included all who were eligible to the Great Council of the State. Yet the factions of the elder Monti still survived; and to what extent they had absorbed the population may be gathered from the fact that, on the defeat of the Riformatori, 4,500 of the Sienese were exiled. It must be borne in mind that with the creation of each new Monte a new party formed itself in the city, and the traditions of these parties were handed down from generation to generation. At last, in the beginning of the 16th century, Pandolfo Petrucci, who belonged to the Monte de' Nove, made himself in reality, if not in name, the master of Siena, and the Duke of Florence later on in the same century [1557] extended his dominion over the republic."—J. A. Symonds, *Renaissance in Italy: The Age of the Despots, ch.* 3.

A. D. 1460.—War with Florence and victory at Montaperti. See FLORENCE: A. D. 1248–1278.

SIENPI, The. See GOTHS (VISIGOTHS): A. D. 376.

SIERRA LEONE.—"During the war of the [American] Revolution a large number of blacks, chiefly runaway slaves, ranged themselves under the British banner. At the close of the war a large number of these betook themselves to Nova Scotia with the view of making that their future home; while others followed the army, to which they had been attached, to London. It was soon ascertained that the climate of Nova Scotia was too severe for those who had gone there; and those who followed the army to London, when that was disbanded, found themselves in a strange land, without friends and without the means of subsistence. In a short time they were reduced to the most abject want and poverty; and it was in view of their pitiable condition that Dr. Smeathman and Granville Sharp brought forward the plan of colonizing them on the coast of Africa. They were aided in this measure by the Government. The first expedition left England in 1787, and consisted of 400 blacks and about 60 whites, most of whom were women of the most debased character. . . . On their arrival at Sierra Leone a tract of land of 20 miles square was purchased from the natives of the country, and they immediately commenced a settlement along the banks of the river. In less than a year their number was reduced more than one half, owing, in some measure, to the unhealthiness of the climate, but more perhaps to their own irregularities. Two years afterward they were attacked by a combination of natives, and had nigh been exterminated. About this time the 'Sierra Leone Company' was formed to take charge of the enterprise. Among its directors were enrolled the venerable names of Wilberforce, Clarkson, Thornton, and Granville Sharp. The first agent sent out by the Company to look after this infant colony found the number of settlers reduced to about 60. In 1791 upward of 1,100 colored emigrants were taken from Nova Scotia to Sierra Leone. About the same time as many as a hundred whites embarked in England for the same place. . . . In 1798 it is said that Free-town had attained to the dimensions of a full-grown town. . . . About the same time the colony was farther reinforced by the arrival of more than 500 Maroons from the Island of Jamaica. These Maroons were no better in character than the original founders of the colony, and no little disorder arose from mixing up such discordant elements. These were the only emigrations of any consequence that ever joined the colony of Sierra Leone from the Western hemisphere. Its future accessions . . . came from a different quarter. In 1807 the slave-trade was declared piracy by the British Government, and a squadron was stationed on the coast for the purpose of suppressing it. About the same time the colony of Sierra Leone was transferred to the Government, and has ever since been regarded as a Crown colony. The slaves taken by the British cruisers on the high seas have always been taken to this colony and discharged there; and this has been the main source of its increase of population from that time."—J. L. Wilson, *Western Africa, pt. 4, ch. 2.*

SIEVERSHAUSEN, Battle of (1553). See GERMANY: A. D. 1552–1561.

SIEYES, Abbé, and the French Revolution. See FRANCE: A. D. 1789 (JUNE); 1790; 1791 (OCTOBER); 1795 (OCTOBER—DECEMBER); 1799 (NOVEMBER), and (NOVEMBER—DECEMBER).

SIFFIN, Battle of. See MAHOMETAN CONQUEST: A. D. 661.

SIGAMBRI, OR SICAMBRI. See USIPETES; also, FRANKS: ORIGIN, and A. D. 253.

SIGEBERT I., King of the Franks (Austrasia), A. D. 561–575.....SIGEBERT II., King of the Franks (Austrasia), 633–650.

SIGEL, General Franz. — Campaign in Missouri and Arkansas. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1861 (JULY—SEPTEMBER: MISSOURI); 1862 (JANUARY—MARCH: MISSOURI—ARKANSAS).....**Command in the Shenandoah.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1864 (MAY—JUNE: VIRGINIA).

SIGISMUND, OR SIGMUND, King of Hungary, A. D. 1386–1437; King of Germany, 1410–1437; Emperor, 1433–1437; King of Bohemia, 1434–1437.....Sigismund, King of Sweden, 1592–1604.....Sigismund I., King of Poland, 1507–1548.....Sigismund II., King of Poland, 1548–1574.....Sigismund III., King of Poland, 1587–1632.

SIGNORY, The Florentine. See FLORENCE: A. D. 1378–1427.

SIGURD I., King of Norway, A. D. 1122–1130.....Sigurd II., King of Norway, 1136–1155.

SIKANS. — SIKELS. See SICILY: THE EARLY INHABITANTS.

SIKHS, The.—"The founder of the Sikh religion was Nanak [or Nanuk], son of a petty Hindu trader named Kalu. Nanak was born in the vicinity of Lahor in the year 1469. A youth much given to reflection, he devoted himself at an early period of his life to a study of the rival creeds then prevailing in India, the Hindu and the Muhammadan. Neither satisfied him. . . . After wandering through many lands in search of a satisfying truth, Nanak returned to his native country with the conviction that he had failed. He had found, he said, many scriptures and many creeds; but he had not found God. Casting off his habit of an ascetic, he resumed his father's trade, married, became the father of a family, and passed the remainder of his life in preaching the doctrine of the unity of one invisible God, of the necessity of living virtuously, and of practising toleration towards others. He died in 1539, leaving behind him a reputation without spot, and many zealous and admiring disciples eager to perpetuate his creed. The founder of a new religion, Nanak, before his death, had nominated his successor — a man of his own tribe named Angad. Angad held the supremacy for twelve years, years which he employed mainly in committing to writing the doctrines of his great master and in enforcing them upon his disciples. Angad was succeeded by Ummar Das, a great preacher. He, and his son-in-law and successor, Ram Das, were held in high esteem by the emperor Akbar. But it was the son of Ram Das, Arjun, who established on a permanent basis the new religion. . . . He fixed the seat of the chief Guru, or high priest of the religion, and of his principal followers, at Amritsar, then an obscure hamlet, but which, in consequence of the selection, speedily rose into im-

portance. Arjun then regulated and reduced to a systematic tax the offerings of his adherents, to be found even then in every city and village in the Panjab and the cis-satlaj territories. . . . The real successor of Arjun was his son, Hur Govind. Hur Govind founded the Sikh nation. Before his time the followers of the Guru had been united by no tie but that of obedience to the book. Govind formed them into a community of warriors. He did away with many of the restrictions regarding food, authorised his followers to eat flesh, summoned them to his standard, and marched with them to consolidate his power. A military organisation based upon a religious principle, and directed by a strong central authority, will always become powerful in a country the government of which is tainted with decay. The ties which bound the Mughul empire together were already loosening under the paralysing influence of the bigotry of Aurangzile, when, in 1675, Govind, fourth in succession to the Hur Govind to whom I have adverted, assumed the mantle of Guru of the Sikhs. . . . Govind still further simplified the dogmas of the faith. Assembling his followers, he announced to them that thenceforward the doctrines of the 'Khalsa,' the saved or liberated, alone should prevail. There must be no human image or resemblance of the One Almighty Father; caste must cease to exist; before Him all men were equal; Muhammadanism was to be rooted out; social distinctions, all the solaces of superstition, were to exist no more; they should call themselves 'Singh' and become a nation of soldiers. The multitude received Govind's propositions with rapture. By a wave of the hand he found himself the trusted leader of a confederacy of warriors in a nation whose institutions were decaying. About 1695, twelve years before the death of Aurangzile, Govind put his schemes into practice. He secured many forts in the hill-country of the Panjab, defeated the Mughul troops in several encounters, and established himself as a thorn in the side of the empire." But more than half a century of struggle with Moghul, Afghan and Mahratta disputants was endured before the Sikhs became masters of the Panjab. When they had made their possession secure, they were no longer united. They were "divided into 12 confederacies or misls, each of which had its chief equal in authority to his brother chiefs, . . . and it was not until 1784 that a young chieftain named Maha Singh gained, mainly by force of arms, a position which placed him above his fellows." The son of Maha Singh was Ranjit Singh, or Runjet Singh, who established his sovereignty upon a solid footing, made terms with his English neighbors (see INDIA: A. D. 1805–1816), and extended his dominions by the capture of Multan in 1818, by the conquest of Kashmere in 1819–20, and by the acquisition of Peshawar in 1823.—G. B. Malleson, *The Decisive Battles of India, ch.* 11.—The wars of the Sikhs with the English, in 1845–6, and 1848–9, the conquest and annexation of their country to British India, and the after-career in exile of Dhuleep Singh, the heir, are related under INDIA: A. D. 1845–1849, and 1849–1893.

ALSO IN: J. D. Cunningham, *Hist. of the Sikhs.*—Sir L. Griffin, *Ranjit Singh.*

SIKSIKAS, OR SISIKAS. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: BLACKFEET.

SIKYON. See SICYON.

SILBURY HILL. See ABURY.

SILCHESTER, Origin of. See CALLEVA.

SILESIA: Origin of the name. See LYGIANS.

9th Century.—Included in the kingdom of Moravia. See MORAVIA: 9TH CENTURY.

A. D. 1355.—Declared an integral part of Bohemia. See BOHEMIA: A. D. 1355.

A. D. 1618.—Participation in the Bohemian revolt. See GERMANY: A. D. 1618–1620.

A. D. 1633.—Campaign of Wallenstein. See GERMANY: A. D. 1632–1634.

A. D. 1648.—Religious concessions in the Peace of Westphalia. See GERMANY: A. D. 1648.

A. D. 1706.—Rights of the Protestants asserted and enforced by Charles XII. of Sweden. See SCANDINAVIAN STATES (SWEDEN): A. D. 1701–1707.

A. D. 1740-1741.—Invasion and conquest by Frederick the Great. See AUSTRIA: A. D. 1740–1741.

A. D. 1742.—Ceded to Prussia by the Treaty of Breslau. See AUSTRIA: A. D. 1742 (JUNE).

A. D. 1748.—Cession to Prussia confirmed. See AIX-LA-CHAPELLE: A. D. 1748.

A. D. 1757.—Overrun by the Austrians.—Recovered by Frederick the Great. See GERMANY: A. D. 1757 (JULY—DECEMBER).

A. D. 1758.—Again occupied by the Austrians. See GERMANY: A. D. 1758.

A. D. 1760-1762.—Last campaigns of the Seven Years War. See GERMANY: A. D. 1760; and 1761–1762.

A. D. 1763.—Final surrender to Prussia. See SEVEN YEARS WAR: A. D. 1763.

SILESIAN WARS, The First and Second.—The part which Frederick the Great took in the War of the Austrian Succession, in 1740–1741, when he invaded and took possession of Silesia, and in 1743–1745 when he resumed arms to make his conquest secure, is commonly called the First Silesian War and the Second Silesian War. See AUSTRIA: A. D. 1740–1741; 1743–1744; and 1744–1745.

The Third.—The Seven Years War has been sometimes so-called. See PRUSSIA: A. D. 1755–1756.

SILINGI, The. See SPAIN: A. D. 409–414.

SILISTRIA: A. D. 1828-1829.—Siege and capture by the Russians. See TURKS: A. D. 1826–1829.

SILK MANUFACTURE; transferred from Greece to Sicily and Italy. See BYZANTINE EMPIRE: A. D. 1146.

SILLERY, The Mission at. See CANADA: A. D. 1637–1657.

SILO, King of Leon and the Asturias, or Oviedo, A. D. 774–783.

SILOAM INSCRIPTION, The.—A very ancient and most important inscription which was discovered in 1880 on the wall of a rock-cut channel leading into the so-called Pool of Siloam, at Jerusalem. It relates only to the excavating of the tunnel which carries water to the Pool, "yet its importance epigraphically and philologically is immense. . . . It shows us that several centuries must have elapsed, during which the modifications of form which distinguish the

Phoenician, the Moabite and the Hebrew scripts gradually developed, and that the Hebrews, therefore, would probably have been in possession of the art of writing as early at least as the time of Solomon."—C. R. Conder, *Syrian Stone-Lore, p.* 118.

SILPHIUM. See CYRENAICA.

SILURES, The.— An ancient tribe in southern Wales, supposed by some to represent a mixture of the Celtic and pre-Celtic inhabitants of Britain. See IBERIANS, THE WESTERN; also, BRITAIN, TRIBES OF CELTIC. The conquest of the Silures was effected by Claudius. See BRITAIN: A. D. 43–53.

SILVER-GRAYS. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1850.

SILVER QUESTION, in America, The. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1873, 1878, 1890–1893; also MONEY AND BANKING: A. D. 1848–1893, and 1853–1874.

In India, The. See INDIA: A. D. 1893.

SIMNEL, Lambert, Rebellion of. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1487–1497.

SIMPACH, Battle of. See AUSTRIA: A. D. 1743.

SIN.—SINÆ. See CHINA: THE NAMES OF THE COUNTRY.

SINDH. See SCINDE.

SINDMAN, The. See COMITATUS.

SINGARA, Battle of (A. D. 348). See PERSIA: A. D. 226–627.

SINGIDUNUM. See BELGRADE.

SINIM. See CHINA: THE NAMES, ETC.

SINITES, The.— A Canaanite tribe.

SINSHEIM, Battle of (1674). See NETHERLANDS (HOLLAND): A. D. 1674–1678.

SION. See JERUSALEM: CONQUEST AND OCCUPATION BY DAVID.

SIOUX, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: SIOUAN FAMILY.

SIOUX WAR. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1876.

SIPPARA, The exhumed Library of. See LIBRARIES, ANCIENT: BABYLONIA AND ASSYRIA.

SIRBONIS LAKE. See SERBONIAN BOG.

SIRIS.—SIRITIS.—THURII.—METAPONTIUM.—TARENTUM.—"Between the point [on the Tarentine gulf, southeastern Italy] where the dominion of Sybaris terminated on the Tarentine side, and Tarentum itself, there were two considerable Grecian settlements—Siris, afterwards called Herakleia, and Metapontium. The fertility and attraction of the territory of Siris, with its two rivers, Akiris and Siris, were well-known even to the poet Archilochus (660 B. C.), but we do not know the date at which it passed from the indigenous Chonians, or Chaonians into the hands of Greek settlers. . . . At the time of the invasion of Greece by Xerxes, the fertile territory of Siritis was considered as still open to be colonised; for the Athenians, when their affairs appeared desperate, had this scheme of emigration in reserve as a possible resource. . . . At length, after the town of Thurii had been founded by Athens [B. C. 443, under the administration of Perikles; the historian Herodotus and the orator Lycias being among the settlers], in the vicinity of the dismantled Sybaris, the Thurians tried to possess themselves of the Siritid territory, but were opposed by the Tarentines. According to the compromise concluded between them, Tarentum was recognised as the metropolis of the colony, but joint possession was allowed both to Tarentines and Thurians. The former transferred the site of the city, under the new name Herakleia, to a spot three miles from the sea, leaving Siris as the place of maritime access to it. About twenty-five miles eastward of Siris, on the coast of the Tarentine gulf, was situated Metapontium, a Greek town, . . . planted on the territory of the Chonians, or Œnotrians; but the first colony is said to have been destroyed by an attack of the Samnites, at what period we do not know. It had been founded by some Achæan settlers. . . . The fertility of the Metapontine territory was hardly less celebrated than that of the Siritid. Farther eastward of Metapontium, again at the distance of about twenty-five miles, was situated the great city of Taras, or Tarentum, a colony from Sparta founded after the first Messenian war, seemingly about 707 B. C. . . . The Tarentines . . . stand first among the Italiots, or Italian Greeks, from the year 400 B. C. down to the supremacy of the Romans."—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece, pt.* 2, *ch.* 22.

SIRKARS, OR CIRCARS, The Northern. See INDIA: A. D. 1758–1761.

SIRMIUM.—Sirmium (modern Mitrovitz, on the Save) was the Roman capital of Pannonia, and an important center of all military operations in that region.

Ruined by the Huns. See HUNS: A. D. 441–446.

Captured by the Avars. See AVARS.

SISECK, Siege and Battle of (1592). See HUNGARY: A. D. 1567–1604.

SISINNIUS, Pope, A. D. 708, January to February.

SISSETONS, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: SIOUAN FAMILY.

SISTOVA, Treaty of (1791). See TURKS: A. D. 1776–1792.

SITABALDI HILLS, Battle of the (1817). See INDIA: A. D. 1816–1819.

SITVATOROK, Treaty of (1606). See HUNGARY: A. D. 1595–1606.

SIX ACTS, The. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1816–1820.

SIX ARTICLES, The. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1539.

SIX HUNDRED, The Charge of the. See RUSSIA: A. D. 1854 (OCTOBER—NOVEMBER).

SIX NATIONS OF INDIANS. See FIVE NATIONS.

SIXTEEN OF THE LEAGUE, in Paris, The. See FRANCE: A. D. 1584–1589.

SIXTUS IV., Pope, A. D. 1471–1484..... Sixtus V., Pope, 1585–1590.

SKALDS. See SCALDS.

SKINNERS. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1780 (AUGUST—SEPTEMBER).

SKITTAGETAN FAMILY, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: SKITTAGETAN FAMILY.

SKOBELEFF, General, Campaigns of. See RUSSIA: A. D. 1869–1881; and TURKS: A. D. 1877–1878.

SKODRA (Scutari). See ILLYRIANS.

SKRÆLINGS, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: ESKIMAUAN FAMILY.

SKUPTCHINA.—The Servian parliament or legislature.

SKYTALISM. See Scytalism.

SLAVE: Origin of the servile signification of the word.— The term slave, in its signification of a servile state, is derived undoubtedly from the name of the Slavic or Sclavic people. "This conversion of a national into an appellative name appears to have arisen in the eighth century, in the Oriental France [Austrasia], where the princes and bishops were rich in Sclavonian captives, not of the Bohemian (exclaims Jordan), but of Sorabian race. From thence the word was extended to general use, to the modern languages, and even to the style of the last Byzantines."—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, ch.* 55, *foot-note.*—See, also, Avars; and Slavonic Peoples.

SLAVE OR MAMELUKE DYNASTY OF INDIA, The. See India: A. D. 977–1290.

SLAVE RISING UNDER SPARTACUS. See Spartacus; and Rome: B. C. 78–68.

SLAVE TRADE, First measures for the suppression of the. See Slavery, Negro: A. D. 1792–1807.

SLAVE WARS IN SICILY AND ITALY. —After the Romans became masters of Sicily the island was filled rapidly with slaves, of which a vast number were being continually acquired in the Roman wars of conquest. Most of these slaves were employed as shepherds and herdsmen on great estates, the owners of which gave little attention to them, simply exacting in the most merciless fashion a satisfactory product. The result was that the latter, half perishing from hunger and cold, were driven to desperation, and a frightful rising among them broke out, B. C. 133. It began at Enna, and its leader was a Syrian called Eunus, who pretended to supernatural powers. The inhabitants of Enna were massacred, and that town became the stronghold of the revolt. Eunus crowned himself and assumed the royal name of Antiochus. Agrigentum, Messana and Tauromenium fell into the hands of the insurgents, and more than a year passed before they were successfully resisted. When, at last, they were overcome, it was only at the end of most obstinate sieges, particularly at Tauromenium and Enna, and the vengeance taken was without mercy. In Italy there were similar risings at the same time, from like causes, but these latter were quickly suppressed. Thirty years later a second revolt of slaves was provoked, both in southern Italy and in Sicily,—suppressed promptly in the former, but growing to seriousness in the latter. The Sicilian slaves had two leaders, Salvius and Athenio; but the former established his ascendancy and called himself king Triphon. The rebellion was suppressed at the cost of two heavy battles.—H. G. Liddell, *Hist. of Rome, bk.* 5, *ch.* 48, *and bk.* 6, *ch.* 55.

Also in: G. Long, *Decline of the Roman Republic, ch.* 9.

SLAVERY.

Ancient.

Among the Oriental races.—"From the writings of the Old Testament a fairly distinct conception can be formed of slavery among the Hebrews. Many modern critics hold the picture presented in the Book of Genesis, of the patriarchial age, its slavery included, to be not a transcript of reality, but an idealisation of the past. Whether this is so or not, can only be properly decided by the historico-critical investigations of specialists. Although the Hebrews are described as having shown extreme ferocity in the conquest of Canaan, their legislation as to slavery was, on the whole, considerate and humane. Slaves were not numerous among them, at least after the exile. Hebrew slavery has naturally been the subject of much research and controversy. The best treatise regarding it is still that of Mielziner. Slavery in the great military empires, which arose in ancient times in anterior Asia, was doubtless of the most cruel character; but we have no good account of slavery in these countries. The histories of Rawlinson, Duncker, Ranke, Ed. Meyer, and Maspero, tell us almost nothing about Chaldean, Assyrian, and Medo-Persian slavery. Much more is known as to slavery, and the condition of the labouring classes, in ancient Egypt, although of even this section of the history there is much need for an account in which the sources of information, unsealed by modern science, will be fully utilised. While in Egypt there were not castes, in the strict sense of the term, classes were very rigidly defined. There were troops of slaves, and as population was superabundant, labour was so cheap as to be employed to an enormous extent uselessly. It may suffice to refer to Wilkinson, Rawlinson, and Buckle. It does not seem certain that the Vedic Aryans had slaves before the conquest of India. Those whom they conquered became the Sudras, and a caste system grew up, and came to be represented as of divine appointment. The two lower castes of the Code of Manu have now given place to a great many. There was not a slave caste, but individuals of any caste might become slaves in exceptional circumstances. Even before the rise of Buddhism there were ascetics who rejected the distinction of castes. Buddhism proclaimed the religious equality of Brahmans and Sudras, but not the emancipation of the Sudras."—R. Flint, *History of the Philosophy of History: France, etc., pp.* 128–129.

Also in: E. J. Simcox, *Primitive Civilizations.*

Among the Greeks.—"The institution of slavery in Greece is very ancient; it is impossible to trace its origin, and we find it even in the very earliest times regarded as a necessity of nature, a point of view which even the following ages and the most enlightened philosophers adopted. In later times voices were heard from time to time protesting against the necessity of the institution, showing some slight conception of the idea of human rights, but these were only isolated opinions. From the very earliest times the right of the strongest had established the custom that captives taken in war, if not killed or ransomed, became the slaves of the conquerors, or were sold into slavery by them. . . . Besides the wars, piracy, originally regarded as by no means dishonourable, supplied the slave markets; and though in later times endeavours were made to set a limit to it, yet the trade in human

beings never ceased, since the need for slaves was considerable, not only in Greece, but still more in Oriental countries. In the historic period the slaves in Greece were for the most part barbarians, chiefly from the districts north of the Balkan peninsula and Asia Minor. The Greek dealers supplied themselves from the great slave markets held in the towns on the Black Sea and on the Asiatic coast of the Archipelago, not only by the barbarians themselves, but even by Greeks, in particular the Chians, who carried on a considerable slave trade. These slaves were then put up for sale at home; at Athens there were special markets held for this purpose on the first of every month. . . . A large portion of the slave population consisted of those who were born in slavery; that is, the children of slaves or of a free father and slave mother, who as a rule also became slaves, unless the owner disposed otherwise. We have no means of knowing whether the number of these slave children born in the houses in Greece was large or small. At Rome they formed a large proportion of the slave population, but the circumstances in Italy differed greatly from those in Greece, and the Roman landowners took as much thought for the increase of their slaves as of their cattle. Besides these two classes of slave population, those who were taken in war or by piracy and those who were born slaves, there was also a third, though not important, class. In early times even free men might become slaves by legal methods; for instance foreign residents, if they neglected their legal obligations, and even Greeks, if they were insolvent, might be sold to slavery by their creditors [see DEBT: ANCIENT GREEK], a severe measure which was forbidden by Solon's legislation at Athens, but still prevailed in other Greek states. Children, when exposed, became the property of those who found and educated them, and in this manner many of the hetaerae and flute girls had become the property of their owners. Finally, we know that in some countries the Hellenic population originally resident there were subdued by foreign tribes, and became the slaves of their conquerors, and their position differed in but few respects from that of the barbarian slaves purchased in the markets. Such native serfs were the Helots at Sparta, the Penestae in Thessaly, the Clarotae in Crete, etc. We have most information about the position and treatment of the Helots; but here we must receive the statements of writers with great caution, since they undoubtedly exaggerated a good deal in their accounts of the cruelty with which the Spartans treated the Helots. Still, it is certain that in many respects their lot was a sad one. . . . The rights assigned by law to the master over his slaves were very considerable. He might throw them in chains, put them in the stocks, condemn them to the hardest labour — for instance, in the mills — leave them without food, brand them, punish them with stripes, and attain the utmost limit of endurance; but, at any rate at Athens, he was forbidden to kill them. . . . Legal marriages between slaves were not possible, since they possessed no personal rights; the owner could at any moment separate a slave family again, and sell separate members of it. On the other hand, if the slaves were in a position to earn money, they could acquire fortunes of their own; they then worked on their own account, and only paid a certain proportion to their owners, keeping the rest for themselves, and when they had saved the necessary amount they could purchase their freedom, supposing the owner was willing to agree, for he was not compelled. . . . The protection given to slaves by the State was very small, but here again there were differences in different states. . . . It would be impossible to make a guess at the number of slaves in Greece. Statements on the subject are extant, but these are insufficient to give us any general idea. There can be no doubt that the number was a very large one; it was a sign of the greatest poverty to own no slaves at all, and Aeschines mentions, as a mark of a very modest household, that there were only seven slaves to six persons. If we add to these domestic slaves the many thousands working in the country, in the factories, and the mines, and those who were the property of the State and the temples, there seems no doubt that their number must have considerably exceeded that of the free population."—H. Blümner, *The Home Life of the Ancient Greeks, ch.* 15.

ALSO IN: C. C. Felton, *Greece, Ancient and Modern, lect.* 2–3, *third course* (*v.* 2).

Among the Romans.—Slavery, under the Roman Empire, "was carried to an excess never known elsewhere, before or since [see ROME: B. C. 159–133]. Christianity found it permeating and corrupting every domain of human life, and in six centuries of conflict succeeded in reducing it to nothing. . . . Christianity, in the early ages, never denounced slavery as a crime; never encouraged or permitted the slaves to rise against their masters and throw off the yoke; yet she permeated the minds of both masters and slaves with ideas utterly inconsistent with the spirit of slavery. Within the Church, master and slave stood on an absolute equality."—W. R. Brownlow, *Lect's on Slavery and Serfdom in Europe, lect.* 1–2.

Mediæval and Modern.

Villeinage.—Serfdom.—"The persons employed in cultivating the ground during the ages under review [the 7th to the 11th centuries, in Europe] may be divided into three classes: I. 'Servi,' or slaves. This seems to have been the most numerous class, and consisted either of captives taken in war, or of persons the property in whom was acquired in some one of the various methods enumerated by Du Cange, voc. Servus, vol. vi. p. 447. The wretched condition of this numerous race of men will appear from several circumstances. 1. Their masters had absolute dominion over their persons. They had the power of punishing their slaves capitally, without the intervention of any judge. This dangerous right they possessed not only in the more early periods, when their manners were fierce, but it continued as late as the 12th century. . . . Even after this jurisdiction of masters came to be restrained, the life of a slave was deemed to be of so little value that a very slight compensation atoned for taking it away. If masters had power over the lives of their slaves, it is evident that almost no bounds would be set to the rigour of the punishments which they might inflict upon them. . . . The cruelty of these was, in many instances, excessive. Slaves might be put to the rack on very slight occasions. The laws with respect to these points are to be found in Potgiesserus, lib. iii. cap. 7. 2. and are shocking to

humanity. 2. If the dominion of masters over the lives and persons of their slaves was thus extensive, it was no less so over their actions and property. They were not originally permitted to marry. Male and female slaves were allowed, and even encouraged, to cohabit together. But this union was not considered as a marriage. . . . When the manners of the European nations became more gentle, and their ideas more liberal, slaves who married without their master's consent were subjected only to a fine. . . . 3. All the children of slaves were in the same condition with their parents, and became the property of their master. . . . 4. Slaves were so entirely the property of their masters that they could sell them at pleasure. While domestic slavery continued, property in a slave was sold in the same manner with that which a person had in any other moveable. Afterwards slaves became 'adscripti glebæ,' and were conveyed by sale, together with the farm or estate to which they belonged. . . . 5. Slaves had a title to nothing but subsistence and clothes from their master; all the profits of their labour accrued to him. . . . 6. Slaves were distinguished from freemen by a peculiar dress. Among all the barbarous nations, long hair was a mark of dignity and of freedom; slaves were for that reason, obliged to shave their heads. . . . II. 'Villani.' They were likewise 'adscripti glebæ,' or 'villæ,' from which they derived their name, and were transferable along with it. Du Cange, voc. Villanus. But in this they differed from slaves, that they paid a fixed rent to their master for the land which they cultivated, and, after paying that, all the fruits of their labour and industry belonged to themselves in property. This distinction is marked by Pierre de Fontain's Conseil. Vie de St. Louis par Joinville, p. 119, édit. de Du Cange. Several cases decided agreeably to this principle are mentioned by Muratori, ibid, p. 773. III. The last class of persons employed in agriculture were freemen. . . . Notwithstanding the immense difference between the first of these classes and the third, such was the spirit of tyranny which prevailed among the great proprietors of lands . . . that many freemen, in despair, renounced their liberty, and voluntarily surrendered themselves as slaves to their powerful masters. This they did in order that their masters might become more immediately interested to afford them protection, together with the means of subsisting themselves and their families. . . . It was still more common for freemen to surrender their liberty to bishops or abbots, that they might partake of the security which the vassals and slaves of churches and monasteries enjoyed. . . . The number of slaves in every nation of Europe was immense. The greater part of the inferior class of people in France were reduced to this state at the commencement of the third race of kings. Esprit des Loix, liv. xxx. c. ii. The same was the case in England. Brady, Pref. to Gen. Hist. . . . The humane spirit of the christian religion struggled long with the maxims and manners of the world, and contributed more than any other circumstance to introduce the practice of manumission. . . . The formality of manumission was executed in a church, as a religious solemnity. . . . Another method of obtaining liberty was by entering into holy orders, or taking the vow in a monastery. This was permitted for some time; but so many slaves escaped by this means out of the hands of their masters that the practice was afterwards restrained, and at last prohibited, by the laws of almost all the nations of Europe. . . . Great . . . as the power of religion was, it does not appear that the enfranchisement of slaves was a frequent practice while the feudal system preserved its vigour. . . . The inferior order of men owed the recovery of their liberty to the decline of that aristocratical policy."—W. Robertson, *Hist. of the Reign of Charles V., notes 9 and 20.*

Also in: A. Gurowski, *Slavery in History, ch.* 15-20.—T. Smith, *Arminius, pt.* 3, *ch.* 5.—See, also, Dedititius.

England.—Villeinage.—"Chief of all causes [of slavery] in early times and among all peoples was capture in war. The peculiar nature of the English conquests, the frequent wars between the different kingdoms and the private expeditions for revenge or plunder would render this a fruitful means whereby the number of slaves would increase on English soil. In this way the Romanized Briton, the Welshman, the Angle and Saxon and the Dane would all go to swell the body of those without legal status. In those troubled times any were liable to a reduction to slavery; the thegn might become a thrall, the lord might become the slave of one who had been in subjection under him, and Wulfstan, in that strong sermon of his to the English [against Slavery — preserved by William of Malmesbury], shows that all this actually took place. It was at the time of the Danish invasion and the sermon seems to point clearly to a region infested by Danes, a region in which was the seat of Wulfstan's labors, for he was Archbishop of York from 1002 to 1023. Wulfstan's graphic picture does not seem to be corroborated by the evidence of the Domesday Survey. Mr. Seebohm's map shows that in the west and southwest there appears the greatest percentage in that record; that in Gloucestershire nearly one fourth of the population, twenty-four per cent., were in a state of slavery; that in Cornwall, Devon, and Stafford the proportion was only one to every five; in central England about one to every seven; in the east, Essex, Surrey, Cambridge and Herts one to every nine; in East Anglia and Wessex one to every twenty-five, while in the northerly districts in Nottinghamshire one to two hundred is given, and in York, Rutland, Huntingdon and Lincoln no slaves at all are recorded. From this it is evident that the Danish invasion was less serious from this point of view than had been the original conquest. Domesday records the social condition 500 years after the settlement, and many influences, with Christianity as the primary, were at work to alter the results of that movement. The main inference to be drawn is that the continued warfare along the Welsh marches replenished the supply in the west, while in the east the slave element was rapidly decreasing and in the north, notwithstanding the Danish invasion, there was rather a commingling of peoples than a subjection of the one by the other. A second cause was the surrender into slavery of the individual's own body either by himself or a relative. This could be voluntary, the free act of the individual or his relatives, or it could be forced, resulting from the storm and stress of evil days. This surrender was one of the most unfortunate phases of the Anglo-Saxon servitude

and indicates to us the growing increase of the traffic in slaves; and the personal subjection was largely the outcome of that which was common to all peoples, the demand for slaves. Even as early as the time of Strabo, in the half century following Cæsar's conquest, the export of slaves began in Britain and before the Norman Conquest the sale of slaves had become a considerable branch of commerce. The insular position of England, her numerous ports, of which Bristol was one of the chief, gave rise during the Saxon occupation to a traffic in the slaves of all nations, and we know that slaves were publicly bought and sold throughout England and from there transported to Ireland or the continent. It was the prevalence of this practice and the wretched misery which it brought upon so many human beings, as well as the fact that it was against the precepts if not the laws of the church, that led Wulfstan, the Wilberforce of his time, to bring about the cessation of the slave trade at Bristol. From this place lines of women and children, gathered together from all England, were carried into Ireland and sold. . . . Besides this sale into slavery for purposes of traffic, which as a regular commerce was not prohibited until after the Norman conquest, many seem to have submitted themselves to the mastery of another through the need of food, which a year of famine might bring. A charter in the Codex Diplomaticus tells us of those men who bowed their heads for their meat in the evil days. Kemble thinks that such cases might have been frequent and Simeon of Durham, writing of the year 1069 when there was a dreadful famine in England, which raged particularly in the north, says that many sold themselves into slavery, that they might receive the needed support. . . . Even so late as the so-called laws of Henry I, such an act was recognized and a special procedure provided. . . . In addition to all those thus born into slavery or reduced to that condition in the ways above noted, there was another class made up of such as were reduced to slavery unwillingly as a penalty for debt or crime; these were known as 'witetheowas' or 'wite-fæstanmen.'. . . The legal condition of the slave was a particularly hard one; as a thing, not as a person, he was classed with his lord's goods and cattle and seems to have been rated according to a similar schedule, to be disposed of at the lord's pleasure like his oxen or horses. . . . They had no legal rights before the law and could bear no arms save the cudgel, the 'billum vel strublum,' as the laws of Henry I call it. Yet the position of the slave appears to have improved in the history of Anglo-Saxon law. . . . Hardly any part of the work of the Church was of greater importance than that which related to the moral and social elevation of the slave class. Its influence did much to mitigate their hard lot, both directly and indirectly."—C. McL. Andrews, *The Old English Manor, pp.* 181–188.—The Domesday Survey "attests the existence [in England, at the time of the Norman Conquest] of more than 25,000 servi, who must be understood to be, at the highest estimate of their condition, landless labourers; over 82,000 bordarii; nearly 7,000 cotarii and cotseti, whose names seem to denote the possession of land or houses held by service of labour or rent paid in produce; and nearly 110,000 villani. Above these were the liberi homines and sokemanni, who seem to represent the medieval and modern freeholder. The villani of Domesday are no doubt the ceorls of the preceding period, the men of the township, the settled cultivators of the land, who in a perfectly free state of society were the owners of the soil they tilled, but under the complicated system of rights and duties which marked the close of the Anglo-Saxon period had become dependent on a lord, and now under the prevalence of the feudal idea were regarded as his customary tenants; irremoveable cultivators, who had no proof of their title but the evidence of their fellow ceorls. For two centuries after the Conquest the villani are to be traced in the possession of rights both social and to a certain extent political. . . . They are spoken of by the writers of the time as a distinct order of society, who, although despicable for ignorance and coarseness, were in possession of considerable comforts, and whose immunities from the dangers of a warlike life compensated for the somewhat unreasoning contempt with which they were viewed by clerk and knight. During this time the villein could assert his rights against every oppressor but his master; and even against his master the law gave him a standing-ground if he could make his complaint known to those who had the will to maintain it. But there can be little doubt that the Norman knight practically declined to recognise the minute distinctions of Anglo-Saxon dependence, and that the tendency of both law and social habit was to throw into the class of native or born villeins the whole of the population described in Domesday under the heads of servi, bordarii and villani."—W. Stubbs, *Const. Hist. of Eng., ch.* 11, *sect.* 132.—"It has become a commonplace to oppose medieval serfdom to ancient slavery, one implying dependence on the lord of the soil and attachment to the glebe, the other being based on complete subjection to an owner. . . . If, from a general survey of medieval servitude we turn to the actual condition of the English peasantry, say in the 13th century, the first fact we have to meet will stand in very marked contrast to our general proposition. The majority of the peasants are villains, and the legal conception of villainage has its roots not in the connexion of the villain with the soil, but in his personal dependence on the lord. . . . As to the general aspect of villainage in the legal theory of English feudalism there can be no doubt. The 'Dialogus de Scaccario' gives it in a few words: the lords are owners not only of the chattels but of the bodies of their 'ascripticii,' they may transfer them wherever they please, 'and sell or otherwise alienate them if they like.' Glanville and Bracton, Fleta and Britton follow in substance the same doctrine, although they use different terms. They appropriate the Roman view that there is no difference of quality between serfs and serfs: all are in the same abject state. Legal theory keeps a very firm grasp of the distinction between status and tenure, between a villain and a free man holding in villainage, but it does not admit of any distinction of status among serfs: 'servus,' 'villanus' and 'nativus' are equivalent terms as to personal condition, although this last is primarily meant to indicate something else besides condition, namely, the fact that a person has come to it by birth. . . . Manorial lords could remove peasants from their holdings at their will and pleasure. An appeal to the courts was of no avail.

. . . Nor could the villain have any help as to the amount and nature of his services; the King's Courts will not examine any complaint in this respect, and may sometimes go so far as to explain that it is no business of theirs to interfere between the lord and his man. . . . Even as to his person, the villain was liable to be punished and put into prison by the lord, if the punishment inflicted did not amount to loss of life or injury to his body. . . . It is not strange that in view of such disabilities Bracton thought himself entitled to assume equality of condition between the English villain and the Roman slave, and to use the terms 'servus,' 'villanus,' and 'nativus' indiscriminately."—P. Vinogradoff, *Villainage in England, ch.* 1.—"Serfdom is met with for the last time in the statute-book of England under Richard II. By reason of the thriving condition of the towns, many villeins who had betaken themselves thither, partly with the consent of their owners and partly in secret, became free. If a slave remained a year and a day in a privileged town without being reclaimed in the interval, he became free. The wars carried on against France, the fact that serf-labour had become more expensive than that of free-men, thus rendering emancipation an 'economical' consideration, and finally, frequent uprisings, contributed to diminish the number of these poor helots. How rapidly serfdom must have fallen away may be inferred from the fact that the rebels under Wat Tyler, in 1381, clamored for the removal of serfdom; the followers of Jack Cade, in 1450, for everything else save the abolition of slavery. . . . The few purchasable slaves under the Tudors were met with only on the property of the churches, the monasteries, and the bishoprics. This slavery was often of a voluntary nature. On the king's domains bondmen were only emancipated by Elizabeth in 1574. The last traces of personal slavery, and of a subject race permanently annexed to the soil, are met with in the reign of James I. As a rule, it may be assumed that, with the Tudors, serfdom disappeared in England."—E. Fischel, *The English Constitution, bk.* 1, *ch.* 3.

Also in: F. Hargrave, *Argument in the Case of James Sommersett (Howell's State Trials, v.* 20).—W. R. Brownlow, *Slavery and Serfdom in Europe, lect.* 3-4.—See, also, Manors.

France.—Villeinage.—On the condition of the servile classes in Gaul during the first five or six centuries after the barbarian conquest, see Gaul: 5-10th Centuries.—"In the Salic laws, and in the Capitularies, we read not only of Servi, but of Tributarii, Lidi, and Coloni, who were cultivators of the earth, and subject to residence upon their lord's estate, though not destitute of property or civil rights. Those who appertained to the demesne lands of the crown were called Fiscalini. . . . The number of these servile cultivators was undoubtedly great, yet in those early times, I should conceive, much less than it afterwards became. . . . The accumulation of overgrown private wealth had a natural tendency to make slavery more frequent. . . . As the labour either of artisans or of free husbandmen was but sparingly in demand, they were often compelled to exchange their liberty for bread. In seasons, also, of famine, and they were not unfrequent, many freemen sold themselves to slavery. . . . Others became slaves, as more fortunate men became vassals, to a powerful lord, for the sake of his protection. Many were reduced into this state through inability to pay those pecuniary compositions for offences which were numerous and sometimes heavy in the barbarian codes of law; and many more by neglect of attendance on military expeditions of the king, the penalty of which was a fine called Heribann, with the alternative of perpetual servitude. . . . The characteristic distinction of a villein was his obligation to remain upon his lord's estate. . . . But, equally liable to this confinement, there were two classes of villeins, whose condition was exceedingly different. In England, at least from the reign of Henry II., one only, and that the inferior species, existed; incapable of property, and destitute of redress, except against the most outrageous injuries. . . . But by the customs of France and Germany, persons in this abject state seem to have been called serfs, and distinguished from villeins, who were only bound to fixed payments and duties. . . . Louis Hutin, in France, after innumerable particular instances of manumission had taken place, by a general edict in 1315, reciting that his kingdom is denominated the kingdom of the Franks, that he would have the fact to correspond with the name, emancipates all persons in the royal domains upon paying a just composition, as an example for other lords possessing villeins to follow. Philip the Long renewed the same edict three years afterwards; a proof that it had not been carried into execution. . . . It is not generally known, I think, that predial servitude was not abolished in all parts of France till the revolution. In some places, says Pasquier, the peasants are taillables à volonté, that is, their contribution is not permanent, but assessed by the lord with the advice of prud'hommes, resseants sur les lieux, according to the peasant's ability. Others pay a fixed sum. Some are called serfs de poursuite, who cannot leave their habitations, but may be followed by the lord into any part of France for the taille upon their goods. . . . Nor could these serfs, or gens de mainmorte, as they were sometimes called, be manumitted without letters patent of the king, purchased by a fine.—Recherches de la France, l. iv., c. 5. Dubos informs us that, in 1615, the Tiers État prayed the king to cause all serfs (hommes de pooste) to be enfranchised on paying a composition, but this was not complied with, and they existed in many parts when he wrote."—H. Hallam, *The Middle Ages, ch.* 2, *pt.* 2, *and foot-note* (*v.* 1).—"The last traces of serfdom could only be detected [at the time of the Revolution] in one or two of the eastern provinces annexed to France by conquest; everywhere else the institution had disappeared; and indeed its abolition had occurred so long before that even the date of it was forgotten. The researches of archæologists of our own day have proved that as early as the 13th century serfdom was no longer to be met with in Normandy."—A. de Tocqueville, *State of Society in France before the Revolution of* 1789, *bk.* 2, *ch.* 1.

Germany.—"As the great distinction in the German community was between the nobles and the people, so amongst the people was the distinction between the free and the servile. Next to those who had the happiness to be freeborn were the Freedmen, whom the indulgence or caprice of their masters relieved from the more galling miseries of thraldom. But though the

Freedman was thus imperfectly emancipated, he formed a middle grade between the Freeman and the Slave. He was capable of possessing property; but was bound to pay a certain rent, or perform a certain service, to the lord. He was forbidden to marry without the lord's assent; and he and his children were affixed to the farm they cultivated. . . . This mitigated servitude was called 'Lidum,' and the Freedman, Lidus, Leud, or Latt. The Lidus of an ecclesiastical master was called Colonus. . . . A yet lower class were the Slaves, or Serfs [Knechte] who were employed in menial or agricultural services; themselves and their earnings being the absolute property of their master, and entirely at his disposal. The number of these miserable beings was gradually increased by the wars with the Sclavonic nations, and the sale of their prisoners was one great object of traffic in the German fairs and markets. But a variety of causes combined to wear out this abominable system; and as civilization advanced, the severities of slavery diminished; so that its extinction was nearly accomplished before the 14th century." —Sir R. Comyn, *Hist. of the Western Empire, ch.* 27 (*v.* 2).—"The following table will show that the abolition of serfdom in most parts of Germany took place very recently. Serfdom was abolished—1. In Baden, in 1783. 2. In Hohenzollern, in 1804. 3. In Schleswig and Holstein, in 1804. 4. In Nassau, in 1808. 5. In Prussia, Frederick William I. had done away with serfdom in his own domains so early as 1717. The code of the Great Frederick . . . was intended to abolish it throughout the kingdom, but in reality it only got rid of it in its hardest form, the 'leibeigenschaft,' and retained it in the mitigated shape of 'erbunterthänigkeit.' It was not till 1809 that it disappeared altogether [see GERMANY: A. D. 1807–1808]. 6. In Bavaria serfdom disappeared in 1808. 7. A decree of Napoleon, dated from Madrid in 1808, abolished it in the Grand-duchy of Berg, and in several other smaller territories, such as Erfurt, Baireuth, &c. 8. In the kingdom of Westphalia, its destruction dates from 1808 and 1809. 9. In the principality of Lippe Detmold, from 1809. 10. In Schomburg Lippe, from 1810. 11. In Swedish Pomerania, from 1810, also. 12. In Hessen Darmstadt, from 1809 and 1811. 13. In Wurtemberg, from 1817. 14. In Mecklenburg, from 1820. 15. In Oldenburgh, from 1814. 16. In Saxony for Lusatia, from 1832. 17. In Hohenzöllern-Sigmaringen, only from 1833. 18. In Austria, from 1811. So early as in 1782, Joseph II. had destroyed 'leibeigenschaft;' but serfage in its mitigated form of 'erbunterthänigkeit,' lasted till 1811."—A. de Tocqueville, *State of Society in France before* 1789, *note D.*

Hungary and Austria: A. D. 1849.—Completed emancipation of the peasantry. See AUSTRIA: A. D. 1849–1859.

Ireland: 12th Century.—The Bristol Slave-trade. See BRISTOL: 12TH CENTURY.

Moslem relinquishment of Christian slavery. See BARBARY STATES: A. D. 1816.

Papal doctrine of the condemnation of the Jews to perpetual bondage. See JEWS: 13–14TH CENTURIES.

Poland.—"The statements of the Polish nobles and their historians, to the effect that the peasant was always the hereditary property of the lord of the manor are false. This relation between eleven million men and barely half a million masters is an abuse of the last two hundred years, and was preceded by one thousand years of a better state of things. Originally the noble did not even possess jurisdiction over the peasant. It was wielded by the royal castellans, and in exceptional cases was bestowed on individual nobles, as a reward for distinguished services. . . . Those peasants were free who were domiciled according to German law, or who dwelt on the land which they themselves had reclaimed. It was owing to the feudal lords' need of labourers, that the rest of the peasants were bound to the soil and could not leave the land without permission. But the peasant did not belong to the lord, he could not be sold. . . . The fact that he could possess land prevented him from ever becoming a mere serf. . . . It is remarkable that the Polish peasant enjoyed these privileges at a time when villeinage existed in all the rest of Europe, and that his slavery began when other nations became free. Villeinage ceased in Germany as early as the 12th and 13th centuries, except in Mecklenburg, Pomerania, and Lusetia, which had had a Slavonic population. . . . In Poland it began in the 16th century. The kings were forced to promise that they would grant the peasant no letters of protection against his lord [Alexander, 1505; Sigismund I., 1543; Sigismund III., 1588]. Henceforth the lord was to have the right of punishing his disobedient subjects at his own discretion. . . . Without the repeal of a single statute favourable to the peasants, it became a fundamental principle of the constitution, that 'Henceforth no temporal court in existence can grant the peasant redress against his lord, though property, honour, or life be at stake.' The peasant was thus handed over to an arbitrary power, which had no limit, except that which the excess of an evil imposes on the evil itself. . . . There was no help for the peasant save in the mercy of his lord or in his own despair. The result was those terrible insurrections of the peasants—the very threat of which alarmed the nobles—the ruin of landed property, and the failure of those sources from which a nation should derive its prosperity and its strength."—Count von Moltke, *Poland: an Historical Sketch, ch.* 4.

Rome, Italy, and the Church.—"It is perhaps hardly surprising that the city of Rome should, even down to the 16th century, have patronised slavery, and it was only natural that the rest of Italy should follow the example of the metropolis of Christianity. The popes were wont to issue edicts of slavery against whole towns and provinces: thus for instance did Boniface VIII. against the retainers of the Colonnas [see PAPACY: A. D. 1294–1348]; Clement V. against the Venetians; Sixtus IV. against the Florentines [also Gregory XI. against the Florentines—see FLORENCE: A. D. 1375–1378]; Julius II. against the Bolognese and Venetians; and the meaning of it was, that any one who could succeed in capturing any of the persons of the condemned was required to make slaves of them. The example of Rome encouraged the whole of Italy, and especially Venice, to carry on a brisk trade in foreign, and especially female slaves. The privilege which had sprung up in Rome and lasted for some years, by virtue of which a slave taking refuge on the Capitol became free, was abolished in 1548 by Paul III.

upon the representation of the Senate. Rome, of all the great powers of Europe, was the last to retain slavery. Scholasticism having undertaken in the 13th century to justify the existing state of things, a theological sanction was discovered for slavery; Ægidius of Rome, taking Thomas Aquinas as his authority, declared that it was a Christian institution, since original sin had deprived man of any right to freedom."—J. I. von Döllinger, *Studies in European History, p.* 75.—See, also, CATTANI.

Russia.—Serfdom and Emancipation.—"In the earliest period of Russian history the rural population was composed of three distinct classes. At the bottom of the scale stood the slaves, who were very numerous. Their numbers were continually augmented by prisoners of war, by freemen who voluntarily sold themselves as slaves, by insolvent debtors, and by certain categories of criminals. Immediately above the slaves were the free agricultural labourers, who had no permanent domicile, but wandered about the country and settled temporarily where they happened to find work and satisfactory remuneration. In the third place, distinct from these two classes, and in some respects higher in the social scale, were the peasants properly so called. These peasants proper, who may be roughly described as small farmers or cottiers, were distinguished from the free agricultural labourers in two respects: they were possessors of land in property or usufruct, and they were members of a rural Commune. . . . If we turn now from these early times to the 18th century, we find that the position of the rural population has entirely changed in the interval. The distinction between slaves, agricultural labourers, and peasants has completely disappeared. All three categories have melted together into a common class, called serfs, who are regarded as the property of the landed proprietors or of the State. 'The proprietors [in the words of an imperial ukaze of April 15, 1721] sell their peasants and domestic servants not even in families, but one by one, like cattle, as is done nowhere else in the whole world.'" At the beginning of the 18th century, while the peasantry had "sunk to the condition of serfs, practically deprived of legal protection and subject to the arbitrary will of the proprietors, . . . they were still in some respects legally and actually distinguished from the slaves on the one hand and the 'free wandering people' on the other. These distinctions were obliterated by Peter the Great and his immediate successors. . . . To effect his great civil and military reforms, Peter required an annual revenue such as his predecessors had never dreamed of, and he was consequently always on the look-out for some new object of taxation. When looking about for this purpose, his eye naturally fell on the slaves, the domestic servants, and the free agricultural labourers. None of these classes paid taxes. . . . He caused, therefore, a national census to be taken, in which all the various classes of the rural population . . . should be inscribed in one category; and he imposed equally on all the members of this category a poll-tax, in lieu of the former land-tax, which had lain exclusively on the peasants. To facilitate the collection of this tax the proprietors were made responsible for their serfs; and the 'free wandering people' who did not wish to enter the army were ordered, under pain of being sent to the galleys, to inscribe themselves as members of a Commune or as serfs to some proprietor. . . . The last years of the 18th century may be regarded as the turning-point in the history of serfage. Up till that time the power of the proprietors had steadily increased, and the area of serfage had rapidly expanded. Under the Emperor Paul we find the first decided symptoms of a reaction. . . . With the accession of Alexander I. in 1801 commenced a long series of abortive projects of a general emancipation, and endless attempts to correct the more glaring abuses; and during the reign of Nicholas no less than six committees were formed at different times to consider the question. But the practical result of all these efforts was extremely small."—D. M. Wallace, *Russia, ch.* 29.—"The reign of Alexander II. [who succeeded Nicholas in 1855], like that of Alexander I., began with an outburst of reform enthusiasm in the educated classes. . . . The serfage question, which Nicholas had always treated most tenderly, was raised in a way that indicated an intention of dealing with it boldly and energetically. Taking advantage of a petition presented by the Polish landed proprietors of the Lithuanian provinces, praying that their relations with their serfs might be regulated in a more satisfactory way—meaning, of course, in a way more satisfactory for the proprietors—the Emperor authorized committees to be formed in that part of the country 'for ameliorating the condition of the peasants,' and laid down the general principles according to which the amelioration was to be effected. . . . This was a decided step, and it was immediately followed by one still more significant. His Majesty, without consulting his ordinary advisers, ordered the Minister of the Interior to send to the Governors all over European Russia copies of the instructions forwarded to the Governor-General of Lithuania, praising the supposed generous, patriotic intentions of the Lithuanian landed proprietors, and suggesting that, perhaps, the landed proprietors of other provinces might express a similar desire. The hint was, of course, taken, and in all provinces where serfage existed emancipation committees were formed. . . . There were, however, serious difficulties in the way. The emancipation was not merely a humanitarian question, capable of being solved instantaneously by an Imperial ukase. It contained very complicated problems, affecting deeply the economic, social, and political future of the nation. . . . It was universally admitted that the peasants should not be ejected from their homes, though their homesteads belonged legally to the proprietors; but there was great diversity of opinion as to how much land they should in future enjoy, by what tenure they should in future hold it, and how the patriarchal, undefined authority of the landlords should be replaced. . . . The main point at issue was whether the serfs should become agricultural labourers dependent economically and administratively on the landlords, or should be transformed into a class of independent communal proprietors. The Emperor gave his support to the latter proposal, and the Russian peasantry acquired privileges such as are enjoyed by no other peasantry in Europe."—*Alexander II. (Eminent Persons: Biog's, reprinted from The Times).*—"On the 3d of March, 1861 (Feb. 19,

O. S.), the emancipation act was signed. The rustic population then consisted of 22,000,000 of common serfs, 3,000,000 of appanage peasants, and 23,000,000 of crown peasants. The first class were enfranchised by that act; and a separate law has since been passed in favor of these crown peasants and appanage peasants, who are now as free in fact as they formerly were in name. A certain portion of land, varying in different provinces according to soil and climate, was affixed to every 'soul'; and government aid was promised to the peasants in buying their homesteads and allotments. The serfs were not slow to take this hint. Down to January 1, 1869, more than half the enfranchised male serfs have taken advantage of this promise; and the debt now owing from the people to the crown (that is, to the bondholders) is an enormous sum." —W. H. Dixon, *Free Russia, ch.* 51.—"Emancipation has utterly failed to realize the ardent expectations of its advocates and promoters. The great benefit of the measure was purely moral. It has failed to improve the material condition of the former serfs, who on the whole are [1888] worse off than they were before the Emancipation. The bulk of our peasantry is in a condition not far removed from actual starvation — a fact which can neither be denied nor concealed even by the official press."— Stepniak, *The Russian Peasantry, ch.* 1.

Also in: A. Leroy-Beaulieu, *The Empire of the Tsars, pt.* 1, *bk.* 7.

Modern: Indians.

Barbarity of the Spaniards in America, and humane labors of Las Casas.—"When Columbus came to Hispaniola on his second voyage [1493], with 17 ships and 1,500 followers, he found the relations between red men and white men already hostile, and in order to get food for so many Spaniards, foraging expeditions were undertaken, which made matters worse. This state of things led Columbus to devise a notable expedient. In some of the neighbouring islands lived the voracious Caribs. In fleets of canoes they would swoop upon the coasts of Hispaniola, capture men and women by the score, and carry them off to be cooked and eaten. Now Columbus wished to win the friendship of the Indians about him by defending them against these enemies, and so he made raids against the Caribs, took some of them captive, and sent them as slaves to Spain, to be taught Spanish and converted to Christianity, so that they might come back to the islands as interpreters, and thus be useful aids in missionary work. It was really, said Columbus, a kindness to these cannibals to enslave them and send them where they could be baptized and rescued from everlasting perdition; and then again they could be received in payment for the cargoes of cattle, seeds, wine, and other provisions which must be sent from Spain for the support of the colony. Thus quaintly did the great discoverer, like so many other good men before and since, mingle considerations of religion with those of domestic economy. It is apt to prove an unwholesome mixture. Columbus proposed such an arrangement to Ferdinand and Isabella, and it is to their credit that, straitened as they were for money, they for some time refused to accept it. Slavery, however, sprang up in Hispaniola before any one could have fully realized the meaning of what was going on. As the Indians were unfriendly and food must be had, while foraging expeditions were apt to end in plunder and bloodshed, Columbus tried to regulate matters by prohibiting such expeditions and in lieu thereof imposing a light tribute or tax upon the entire population of Hispaniola above 14 years of age. As this population was dense, a little from each person meant a good deal in the lump. The tribute might be a small piece of gold or of cotton, and was to be paid four times a year. . . . If there were Indians who felt unable to pay the tribute, they might as an alternative render a certain amount of personal service in helping to plant seeds or tend cattle for the Spaniards. No doubt these regulations were well meant, and if the two races had been more evenly matched, perhaps they might not so speedily have developed into tyranny. As it was, they were like rules for regulating the depredations of wolves upon sheep. Two years had not elapsed before the alternative of personal service was demanded from whole villages of Indians at once. By 1499 the island had begun to be divided into repartimientos, or shares. One or more villages would be ordered, under the direction of their native chiefs, to till the soil for the benefit of some specified Spaniard or partnership of Spaniards; and such a village or villages constituted the repartimiento of the person or persons to whom it was assigned. This arrangement put the Indians into a state somewhat resembling that of feudal villenage; and this was as far as things had gone when the administration of Columbus came abruptly to an end." Queen Isabella disapproved, at first, of the repartimiento system, "but she was persuaded to sanction it, and presently in 1503 she and Ferdinand issued a most disastrous order. They gave discretionary power to Ovando [who succeeded Columbus in the governorship] to compel Indians to work, but it must be for wages. They ordered him, moreover, to see that Indians were duly instructed in the Christian faith. . . . The way in which Ovando carried out the order about missionary work was characteristic. As a member of a religious order of knights, he was familiar with the practice of encomienda, by which groups of novices were assigned to certain preceptors to be disciplined and instructed in the mysteries of the order. The word encomienda means 'commandery' or 'preceptory,' and so it came to be a nice euphemism for a hateful thing. Ovando distributed Indians among the Spaniards in lots of 50 or 100 or 500, with a deed worded thus: 'To you, such a one, is given an encomienda of so many Indians, and you are to teach them the things of our holy Catholic Faith.' In practice, the last clause was disregarded as a mere formality, and the effect of the deed was simply to consign a parcel of Indians to the tender mercies of some Spaniard, to do as he pleased with them. If the system of repartimientos was in effect serfdom or villenage, the system of encomiendas was unmitigated slavery. Such a cruel and destructive slavery has seldom, if ever, been known. The work of the Indians was at first largely agricultural, but as many mines of gold were soon discovered they were driven in gangs to work in the mines. . . . In 1509 Ovando was recalled. . . . Under his successor, Diego Columbus, there was little improvement. The case had become a hard one to deal with. There

were now what are called 'vested rights,' the rights of property in slaves, to be respected. But in 1510 there came a dozen Dominican monks, and they soon decided, in defiance of vested rights, to denounce the wickedness they saw about them." Generally, the Spaniards who enjoyed the profit of the labor of the enslaved Indians hardened their hearts against this preaching, and were enraged by it; but one among them had his conscience awakened and saw the guiltiness of the evil thing. This was Bartolomé de Las Casas, who had joined the colonists at Hispaniola in 1502 and who had entered the priesthood in 1510. He owned slaves, whom he now set free, and he devoted himself henceforth to labors for the reformation of the system of slavery in the Spanish colonies. In 1516 he won the ear of Cardinal Ximenes, who appointed a commission of Hieronymite friars "to accompany Las Casas to the West Indies, with minute instructions and ample powers for making investigations and enforcing the laws. Ximenes appointed Las Casas Protector of the Indians, and clothed him with authority to impeach delinquent judges or other public officials. The new regulations, could they have been carried out, would have done much to mitigate the sufferings of the Indians. They must be paid wages, they must be humanely treated and taught the Christian religion. But as the Spanish government needed revenue, the provision that Indians might be compelled to work in the mines was not repealed. The Indians must work, and the Spaniards must pay them. Las Casas argued correctly that so long as this provision was retained the work of reform would go but little way. Somebody, however, must work the mines; and so the talk turned to the question of sending out white labourers or negroes. . . . At one time the leading colonists of Hispaniola had told Las Casas that if they might have license to import each a dozen negroes, they would coöperate with him in his plans for setting free the Indians and improving their condition. . . . He recalled this suggestion of the colonists, and proposed it as perhaps the least odious way out of the difficulty. It is therefore evident that at that period in his life he did not realize the wickedness of slavery so distinctly in the case of black men as in the case of red men. . . . In later years he blamed himself roundly for making any such concessions. Had he 'sufficiently considered the matter,' he would not for all the world have entertained such a suggestion for a moment. . . . The extensive development of negro slavery in the West Indies . . . did not begin for many years after the period in the career of Las Casas with which we are now dealing, and there is nothing to show that his suggestion or concession was in any way concerned in bringing it about." The fine story of the life and labours of Las Casas,— of the colony which he attempted to found on the Pearl Coast of the mainland, composed of settlers who would work for themselves and not require slaves, and which was ruined through the wicked lawlessness of other men,— of the terrible barbarians of the "Land of War" whom he transformed into peaceful and devoted Christians,— cannot be told in this place. His final triumphs in the conflict with slavery were: 1. In 1537, the procuring from Pope Paul III. of a brief "forbidding the further enslavement of Indians under penalty of excommunication." 2. In 1542, the promulgation of the New Laws by Charles V., the decisive clause in which was as follows: "'We order and command that henceforward for no cause whatever, whether of war, rebellion, ransom, or in any other manner, can any Indian be made a slave.' This clause was never repealed, and it stopped the spread of slavery. Other clauses went further, and made such sweeping provisions for immediate abolition that it proved to be impossible to enforce them. . . . The matter was at last compromised by an arrangement that encomiendas should be inheritable during two lives, and should then escheat to the crown. This reversion to the crown meant the emancipation of the slaves. Meanwhile such provisions were made . . . that the dreadful encomienda reverted to the milder form of the repartimiento. Absolute slavery was transformed into villenage. In this ameliorated form the system continued."—J. Fiske, *The Discovery of America, ch.* 11 (*v.* 2).

Also in: Sir A. Helps, *Spanish Conquest in Am.*—The same, *Life of Las Casas.*—G. E. Ellis, *Las Casas* (*Narrative and Critical Hist. of Am., v.* 2, *ch.* 5).—H. H. Bancroft, *Hist. of the Pacific States, v.* 1, *ch.* 5.

Negro.

A. D. 1442-1501.—Its beginning in Europe and its establishment in Spanish America.—"The peculiar phase of slavery that will be brought forward in this history is not the first and most natural one, in which the slave was merely the captive in war, 'the fruit of the spear,' as he has figuratively been called, who lived in the house of his conqueror and laboured at his lands. This system culminated among the Romans; partook of the fortunes of the Empire; was gradually modified by Christianity and advancing civilization; declined by slow and almost imperceptible degrees into serfage and vassalage; and was extinct, or nearly so, when the second great period of slavery suddenly uprose. This second period was marked by a commercial character. The slave was no longer an accident of war. He had become the object of war. He was no longer a mere accidental subject of barter. He was to be sought for, to be hunted out, to be produced; and this change accordingly gave rise to a new branch of commerce. Slavery became at once a much more momentous question than it ever had been, and thenceforth, indeed, claims for itself a history of its own."—Sir A. Helps, *The Spanish Conquest in Am., and its Relation to the Hist. of Slavery, bk.* 1, *ch.* 1.—"The first negroes imported into Europe after the extinction of the old pagan slavery were brought in one of the ships of Prince Henry of Portugal, in the year 1442. There was, however, no regular trade in negroes established by the Portuguese; and the importation of human beings fell off, while that of other articles of commerce increased, until after the discovery of America. Then the sudden destruction of multitudes of Indians in war, by unaccustomed labour, by immense privations, and by diseases new to them, produced a void in the labour market which was inevitably filled up by the importation of negroes. Even the kindness and the piety of the Spanish monarchs tended partly to produce this result. They forbade the enslaving of Indians, and they con-

trived that the Indians should live in some manner apart from the Spaniards; and it is a very significant fact that the great 'Protector of the Indians,' Las Casas, should, however innocently, have been concerned with the first large grant of licenses to import negroes into the West India Islands. Again, the singular hardihood of the negro race, which enabled them to flourish in all climates, and the comparative debility of the Indians, also favoured this result. The anxiety of the Catholic Church for proselytes combined with the foregoing causes to make the bishops and monks slow to perceive the mischief of any measure which might tend to save or favour large communities of docile converts."—The same, *bk.* 21, *ch.* 5 (*v.* 4).—The first notice of the introduction of negro slaves in the West Indies appears in the instructions given in 1501 to Ovando, who superseded Columbus in the government.—The same, *bk.* 3, *ch.* 1 (*v.* 1).

A. D. 1562-1567.—John Hawkins engages England in the traffic. See AMERICA: A. D. 1562–1567.

A. D. 1609-1755.—In colonial New York.—"From the settlement of New York by the Dutch in 1609, down to its conquest by the English in 1664, there is no reliable record of slavery in that colony. That the institution was coeval with the Holland government, there can be no historical doubt. During the half-century that the Holland flag waved over the New Netherlands, slavery grew to such proportions as to be regarded as a necessary evil. . . . The West India Company had offered many inducements to its patroons. And its pledge to furnish the colonists with 'as many blacks as they conveniently could,' was scrupulously performed. . . . When New Netherlands became an English colony, slavery received substantial official encouragement, and the slave became the subject of colonial legislation. . . . Most of the slaves in the Province of New York, from the time they were first introduced, down to 1664, had been the property of the West India Company. As such they had small plots of land to work for their own benefit, and were not without hope of emancipation some day. But under the English government the condition of the slave was clearly defined by law and one of great hardships. On the 24th of October, 1684, an Act was passed in which slavery was for the first time regarded as a legitimate institution in the Province of New York under the English government." After the mad excitement caused by the pretended Negro Plot of 1741 (see NEW YORK: A. D. 1741) "the legislature turned its attention to additional legislation upon the slavery question. Severe laws were passed against the Negroes. Their personal rights were curtailed until their condition was but little removed from that of the brute creation. We have gone over the voluminous records of the Province of New York, and have not found a single act calculated to ameliorate the condition of the slave."—G. W. Williams, *Hist. of the Negro Race in America, v.* 1, *ch.* 13.—A census of the slaves in the Province of New York was made in 1755, the record of which has been preserved for all except the most important counties of New York, Albany and Suffolk. It shows 67 slaves then in Brooklyn.—*Doc. Hist. of N. Y., v.* 3.

A. D. 1619.—Introduction in Virginia. See VIRGINIA: A. D. 1619.

A. D. 1638-1781.—Beginning and ending in Massachusetts.—In the code of laws called the Body of Liberties, adopted by the General Court of Massachusetts in 1641, there is the following provision (Article 91): "There shall never be any Bond Slavery, Villinage, or Captivity amongst us, unless it be lawful Captives taken in just Wars, and such strangers as willingly sell themselves, or are sold to us. And these shall have all the liberties and Christian usages which the law of God, established in Israel concerning such persons, doth morally require. This exempts none from servitude who shall be judged thereto by authority." (*Mass. Hist. Soc. Coll., v.* 28, *p.* 231.)—"No instance has been discovered of a sale by one man of himself to another, although the power of doing this was recognized in the Body of Liberties. But of sales by the way of punishment for crime, under a sentence of a court, there are several instances recorded. . . . Of captives taken in war and sold into slavery by the colony, the number appears to have been larger, though it is not easy to ascertain in how many instances it was done. As a measure of policy, it was adopted in the case of such as were taken in the early Indian wars. . . . It was chiefly confined to the remnants of the Pequod tribe, and to such as were taken in the war with King Philip [see NEW ENGLAND: A. D. 1637, and 1676–1678]. . . . If now we recur to negro slavery, it does not appear when it was first introduced into the colony. . . . When Josslyn was here in 1638, he found Mr. Maverick the owner of three negro slaves. He probably acquired them from a ship which brought some slaves from the West Indies in that year. And this is the first importation of which we have any account. But Maverick was not properly a member of Winthrop's Company. He came here before they left England, and had his establishment, and lived by himself, upon Noddle's Island. . . . The arrival of a Massachusetts ship with two negroes on board, whom the master had brought from Africa for sale, in 1645, four years after the adoption of the Body of Liberties, furnished an opportunity to test the sincerity of its framers, in seeking to limit and restrict slavery in the colony. . . . Upon information that these negroes had been forcibly seized and abducted from the coast of Africa by the captain of the vessel, the magistrates interposed to prevent their being sold. But though the crime of man-stealing had been committed, they found they had no cognizance of it, because it had been done in a foreign jurisdiction. They, however, went as far towards reaching the wrong done as they could; and not only compelled the shipmaster to give up the men, but sent them back to Africa, at the charge of the colony. . . . And they made this, moreover, an occasion, by an act of legislation of the General Court, in 1646, 'to bear witness,' in the language of the act, 'against the heinous and crying sin of man-stealing, as also to prescribe such timely redress for what is past, and such a law for the future, as may sufficiently deter all others belonging to us to have to do in such vile and most odious courses, justly abhorred of all good and just men.'. . . In 1767 a bill to restrain the importing of slaves passed the popular branch of the General Court, but failed in the Council. Nor would it have availed if it had passed both branches, because it would have been vetoed by the Governor,

acting under instructions from the Crown. This was shown in 1774, when such a bill did pass both branches of the General Court, and was thus vetoed. These successive acts of legislation were a constantly recurring illustration of the truth of the remark of a modern writer of standard authority upon the subject, that—'though the condition of slavery in the colonies may not have been created by the imperial legislature, yet it may be said with truth that the colonies were compelled to receive African slaves by the home government.' . . . The action of the government [of Massachusetts] when reorganized under the advice of the Continental Congress, was shown in September, 1776, in respect to several negroes who had been taken in an English prize-ship and brought into Salem to be sold. The General Court, having learned these facts, put a stop to the sale at once. And this was accompanied by a resolution on the part of the House—'That the selling and enslaving the human species is a direct violation of the natural rights alike vested in them by their Creator, and utterly inconsistent with the avowed principles on which this and the other States have carried on their struggle for liberty.' . . . In respect to the number of slaves living here at any one time, no census seems to have been taken of them prior to 1754. . . . In 1708, Governor Dudley estimates the whole number in the colony at 550; 200 having arrived between 1698 and 1707. Dr. Belknap thinks they were the most numerous here about 1745. And Mr. Felt, upon careful calculation, computes their number in 1754 at 4,489. . . . In 1755, Salem applied to the General Court to suppress slavery. Boston did the same in 1766, in 1767, and . . . in 1772. In 1773 the action of the towns was more general and decided." In 1780, the then free state of Massachusetts framed and adopted a constitution, the opening declaration of which was that "'all men are born free and equal, and have certain natural, essential, and unalienable rights.' . . . When [the next year] the highest judicial tribunal in the State was called upon to construe and apply this clause, they gave a response which struck off the chains from every slave in the commonwealth."—E. Washburn, *Slavery as it once Prevailed in Mass.* (*Lowell Inst. Lect's*, 1869: *Mass. and its Early Hist., lect.* 6).

Also in: W. B. Weeden, *Economic and Social Hist. of N. Eng., ch.* 12 *and* 22 (*v.* 2).—*Letters and Doc's relating to Slavery in Mass.* (*Mass. Hist. Soc. Coll., Fifth Series, v.* 3).

A. D. 1652.—First Antislavery enactment in Rhode Island. See Rhode Island: A. D. 1651–1652.

A. D. 1658.—Introduction of slavery in Cape Colony. See South Africa: A. D. 1486–1806.

A. D. 1669-1670.—Provided for in Locke's Fundamental Constitutions for the Carolinas. See North Carolina: A. D. 1669–1693.

A. D. 1680.—Early importance in South Carolina. — Indian slavery also established. See South Carolina: A. D. 1680.

A. D. 1685-1772.—Black slaves in England. —"The extensive proprietary interests which, during last century, English merchants and members of the English aristocracy held in the American colonies and the West Indies, involved the possession also on their part of many slaves. Many of these black slaves were trained to act as household servants and personal attendants, and in this capacity accompanied their owners when travelling. The presence of black slaves in this country was therefore not an unfamiliar sight; but it will perhaps startle many readers to know that in 1764, according to the estimate of the 'Gentleman's Magazine' of the period, there were upwards of 20,000 black slaves domiciled in London alone, and that these slaves were openly bought and sold on 'Change.' The newspapers of the day represent these slaves as being upon the whole rather a trouble to their owners. For one thing, they ceased to consider themselves 'slaves' in this so-called 'free country'; hence they were often unwilling to work, and when forced to labour were generally sullen, spiteful, treacherous, and revengeful. They also frequently, as we shall find from the press advertisements of the day, made their escape, necessitating rewards being offered for their recapture. For instance, in the 'London Gazette' for March, 1685, there is an advertisement to the effect that a black boy of about 15 years of age, named John White, ran away from Colonel Kirke on the 15th inst. 'He has a silver collar about his neck, upon which is the colonel's coat of arms and cipher; he has upon his throat a great scar,' &c. A reward is offered for bringing him back. In the 'Daily Post' of August 4, 1720, is a similar notice. . . . Again, in the 'Daily Journal' for September 28, 1728, is an advertisement for a runaway black boy. It is added that he had the words 'My Lady Bromfield's black in Lincoln's Inn Fields' engraved on a collar round his neck. . . . That a collar was considered as essential for a black slave as for a dog is shown by an advertisement in the 'London Advertiser' for 1756, in which Matthew Dyer, working-goldsmith at the Crown in Duck Lane, Orchard Street, Westminster, intimates to the public that he makes 'silver padlocks for Blacks or Dogs; collars,' &c. . . . In the 'Tatler' for 1709, a black boy, 12 years of age, 'fit to wait on a gentleman,' is offered for sale at Dennis's Coffee-house, in Finch Lane, near the Royal Exchange. From the 'Daily Journal' of September 28, 1728, we learn that a negro boy, 11 years of age, was similarly offered for sale at the Virginia Coffee-house. . . . Again, in the 'Public Ledger' for December 31, 1761, we have for sale 'A healthy Negro Girl, aged about 15 years; speaks good English, works at her needle, washes well, does household work, and has had the small-pox.' So far these sales seem to have been effected privately; but later on we find that the auctioneer's hammer is being brought into play. In 1763, one John Rice was hanged for forgery at Tyburn, and following upon his execution was a sale of his effects by auction, 'and among the rest a negro boy.' He brought £32. The 'Gentleman's Magazine' of the day, commenting upon the sale of the black boy, says that this was 'perhaps the first custom of the kind in a free country.' . . . The 'Stamford Mercury' for [1771] bears record that 'at a sale of a gentleman's effects at Richmond, a Negro Boy was put up and sold for £32.' The paper adds: 'A shocking instance in a free country!' The public conscience had indeed for many years been disturbed on this question, the greater number in England holding that the system of slavery as tolerated in London and the country generally should be declared illegal. From an early period in last century the subject had not only been debated in the

public prints and on the platform, but had been made matter of something like judicial decision. At the first, legal opinion was opposed to the manumission of slaves brought by their masters to this country. In 1729, Lord Talbot, Attorney-general, and Mr. Yorke, Solicitor-general, gave an opinion which raised the whole question of the legal existence of slaves in Great Britain and Ireland. The opinion of these lawyers was that the mere fact of a slave coming into these countries from the West Indies did not render him free, and that he could be compelled to return again to those plantations. Even the rite of baptism did not free him — it could only affect his spiritual, not his temporal, condition. It was on the strength of this decision that slavery continued to flourish in England until, as we have seen, there were at one time as many as 20,000 black slaves in London alone. Chief-justice Holt had, however, expressed a contrary opinion to that above given; and after a long struggle the matter was brought to a final issue in the famous case of the negro Somersett. On June 22, 1772, it was decided by Lord Mansfield, in the name of the whole bench, that 'as soon as a slave set foot on the soil of the British Islands, he became free.' From that day to the present this has remained the law of our land as regards slavery. The poet Cowper expressed the jubilant feeling of the country over Lord Mansfield's dictum when he sung: . . . 'Slaves cannot breathe in England; if their lungs receive our air, that moment they are free.'"—*Black Slaves in Eng.* (*Chambers's Journal, Jan.* 31, 1891).

Also in: H. Greeley, *Hist. of the Struggle for Slavery Extension or Restriction, pp.* 2–3.

A. D. 1688-1780.—Beginning and growth of Antislavery sentiment among the Quakers.—Emancipation in Pennsylvania.—"So early as the year 1688, some emigrants from Kriesheim in Germany, who had adopted the principles of William Penn, and followed him into Pennsylvania, urged in the yearly meeting of the Society there, the inconsistency of buying, selling, and holding men in slavery, with the principles of the Christian religion. In the year 1696, the yearly meeting for that province took up the subject as a public concern, and the result was, advice to the members of it to guard against future importations of African slaves, and to be particularly attentive to the treatment of those, who were then in their possession. In the year 1711, the same yearly meeting resumed the important subject, and confirmed and renewed the advice, which had been before given. From this time it continued to keep the subject alive; but finding at length, that, though individuals refused to purchase slaves, yet others continued the custom, and in greater numbers that it was apprehended would have been the case after the public declarations which had been made, it determined, in the year 1754, upon a fuller and more serious publication of its sentiments; and therefore it issued, in the same year, . . . [a] pertinent letter to all the members within its jurisdiction. . . . This truly Christian letter, which was written in the year 1754, was designed, as we collect from the contents of it, to make the sentiments of the Society better known and attended to on the subject of the Slave-trade. It contains . . . exhortations to all the members within the yearly meeting of Pennsylvania and the Jerseys, to desist from purchasing and importing slaves, and, where they possessed them, to have a tender consideration of their condition. But that the first part of the subject of this exhortation might be enforced, the yearly meeting for the same provinces came to a resolution in 1755, That if any of the members belonging to it bought or imported slaves, the overseers were to inform their respective monthly meetings of it, that 'these might treat with them, as they might be directed in the wisdom of truth.' In the year 1774, we find the same yearly meeting legislating again on the same subject. By the preceding resolution they, who became offenders, were subjected only to exclusion from the meetings for discipline, and from the privilege of contributing to the pecuniary occasions of the Society; but by the resolution of the present year, all members concerned in importing, selling, purchasing, giving, or transferring Negro or other slaves, or otherwise acting in such manner as to continue them in slavery beyond the term limited by law or custom, were directed to be excluded from membership or disowned. . . . In the year 1776, the same yearly meeting carried the matter still further. It was then enacted, That the owners of slaves, who refused to execute proper instruments for giving them their freedom, were to be disowned likewise."—T. Clarkson, *Hist. of the Abolition of the Slave-Trade, v.* 1, *ch.* 5.—In 1780 Pennsylvania adopted an act for the gradual emancipation of all slaves within its territory, being the first among the States to perform that great act of justice.—W. C. Bryant and S. H. Gay, *Popular Hist. of the U. S., v.* 3, *ch.* 7.

A. D. 1698-1776.—England and the Slave-trade.—The Assiento contract with Spain.—After the opening of the slave trade to the English by Hawkins, in 1562–1564, "the traffic in human flesh speedily became popular. A monopoly of it was granted to the African Company, but it was invaded by numerous interlopers, and in 1698 the trade was thrown open to all British subjects. It is worthy of notice that while by the law of 1698 a certain percentage was exacted from other African cargoes for the maintenance of the forts along that coast, cargoes of negroes were especially exempted, for the Parliament of the Revolution desired above all things to encourage the trade. Nine years before, a convention had been made between England and Spain for supplying the Spanish West Indies with slaves from the island of Jamaica, and it has been computed that between 1680 and 1700 the English tore from Africa about 300,000 negroes, or about 15,000 every year. The great period of the English slave trade had, however, not yet arrived. It was only in 1713 that it began to attain its full dimensions. One of the most important and most popular parts of the Treaty of Utrecht was the contract known as the Assiento, by which the British Government secured for its subjects during thirty years an absolute monopoly of the supply of slaves to the Spanish colonies. The traffic was regulated by a long and elaborate treaty, guarding among other things against any possible scandal to the Roman Catholic religion from the presence of heretical slave-traders, and it provided that in the 30 years from 1713 to 1743 the English should bring into the Spanish West Indies no less than 144,000 negroes, or 4,800 every year; that during the first 25 years of the contract they might import a still greater number

on paying certain moderate duties, and that they might carry the slave trade into numerous Spanish ports from which it had hitherto been excluded. The monopoly of the trade was granted to the South Sea Company, and from this time its maintenance, and its extension both to the Spanish dominions and to her own colonies, became a central object of English policy. A few facts will show the scale on which it was pursued From Christmas 1752 to Christmas 1762 no less than 71,115 negroes were imported into Jamaica. In a despatch written at the end of 1762, Admiral Rodney reports that in little more than three years 40,000 negroes had been introduced into Guadaloupe. In a discussion upon the methods of making the trade more effectual, which took place in the English Parliament in 1750, it was shown that 46,000 negroes were at this time annually sold to the English colonies alone. A letter of General O'Hara, the Governor of Senegambia, written in 1766, estimates at the almost incredible figure of 70,000 the number of negroes who during the preceding fifty years had been annually shipped from Africa. A distinguished modern historian, after a careful comparison of the materials we possess, declares that in the century preceding the prohibition of the slave trade by the American Congress, in 1776, the number of negroes imported by the English alone, into the Spanish, French, and English colonies can, on the lowest computation, have been little less than three millions, and that we must add more than a quarter of a million, who perished on the voyage and whose bodies were thrown into the Atlantic."—W. E. H. Lecky, *Hist. of Eng. in the 18th Century, ch.* 5 (*v.* 2).

Also in: G. Bancroft, *Hist. of the U. S.* (*Author's last rev.*), *pt.* 3, *ch.* 16 (*v.* 2).—D. Macpherson, *Annals of Commerce, v.* 4, *pp.* 141–157.—See, also, Utrecht: A. D. 1712–1714; Aix la Chapelle: The Congress; England: A. D. 1739, 1741; Georgia: A. D. 1738–1743; Argentine Republic: A. D. 1580–1777.

A. D. 1713-1776.—Maintained in the American colonies by the English Crown and Parliament.—"The success of the American Revolution made it possible for the different states to take measures for the gradual abolition of slavery and the immediate abolition of the foreign slave-trade. On this great question the state of public opinion in America was more advanced than in England. . . . George III. . . . resisted the movement for abolition with all the obstinacy of which his hard and narrow nature was capable. In 1769 the Virginia legislature had enacted that the further importation of negroes, to be sold into slavery, should be prohibited. But George III. commanded the governor to veto this act, and it was vetoed. In Jefferson's first draft of the Declaration of Independence, this action of the king was made the occasion of a fierce denunciation of slavery, but in deference to the prejudices of South Carolina and Georgia the clause was struck out by Congress. When George III. and his vetoes had been eliminated from the case, it became possible for the States to legislate freely on the subject."—J. Fiske, *The Critical Period of Am. Hist., p.* 71.—"During the regal government, we had at one time obtained a law which imposed such a duty on the importation of slaves as amounted nearly to a prohibition, when one inconsiderate assembly, placed under a peculiarity of circumstance, repealed the law. This repeal met a joyful sanction from the then sovereign, and no devices, no expedients, which could ever after be attempted by subsequent assemblies, and they seldom met without attempting them, could succeed in getting the royal assent to a renewal of the duty. In the very first session held under the republican government, the assembly passed a law for the perpetual prohibition of the importation of slaves. This will in some measure stop the increase of this great political and moral evil, while the minds of our citizens may be ripening for a complete emancipation of human nature."—T. Jefferson, *Notes on the State of Virginia, query* 8.—"It has been frequently stated that England is responsible for the introduction of negro slavery into British America; but this assertion will not stand the test of examination. . . . It is, however, true that from a very early period a certain movement against it may be detected in some American States, that there was, especially in the Northern Provinces, a great and general dislike to the excessive importation of negroes, and that every attempt to prohibit or restrict that importation was rebuked and defeated by England. . . . The State Governors were forbidden to give the necessary assent to any measures restricting it, and the English pursued this policy steadily to the very eve of the Revolution."—W. E. H. Lecky, *Hist. of Eng. in the 18th Century, ch.* 5 (*v.* 2).

A. D. 1717.—Introduction into Louisiana. See Louisiana: A. D. 1717–1718.

A. D. 1735-1749.—Questioned early in Georgia.—Slavery prohibited at the beginning, and finally introduced. See Georgia: A. D. 1735–1749.

A. D. 1741.—The pretended Negro Plot in New York. See New York: A. D. 1741.

A. D. 1756.—Extent and distribution in the English American colonies.—"The number of African slaves in North America in 1756, the generation preceding the Revolution, was about 292,000. Of these Virginia had 120,000, her white population amounting at the same time to 173,000. The African increase in Virginia had been steady. In 1619 came the first 20, and in 1649 there were 300. In 1670, there were 2,000. In 1714, there were 23,000. In 1756, there were 120,000. The 172,000 who, in addition to these, made up the African population of America, were scattered through the provinces from New England to Georgia."—J. E. Cooke, *Virginia, p.* 367.

A. D. 1769-1785.—The ending of slavery in Connecticut and New Hampshire.—"For the New England States the Revolution was the death knell of slavery and of the slave-trade protected by the law [see action in Massachusetts and Rhode Island detailed above and below]. . . . In New Hampshire the institution died a natural death. As Belknap said in 1792, 'Slavery is not prohibited by any express law. . . . Those born since the constitution was made [1776] are free.' Although the legal status of the negro was somewhat different, he was practically treated in the same manner in New Hampshire that he was treated in Rhode Island. Connecticut did not change her royal charter into a state constitution until 1818, and her slaves were freed in 1784. The slave-trade in New England vessels did not cease when the state forbade it within New England territory. It was

conducted stealthily, but steadily, even into the lifetime of Judge Story. Felt gives instances in 1785, and the inference is that the business was prosecuted from Salem."—W. B. Weeden, *Economic and Social Hist. of New Eng., v.* 2, *pp.* 834–835.—"Connecticut was one of the first colonies to pass a law against the slave-trade. This was done in 1769. The main cause of the final abolition of slavery in the State was the fact that it became unprofitable. In 1784 the Legislature passed an Act declaring that all persons born of slaves, after the 1st of March in that year, should be free at the age of 25. Most of those born before this time were gradually emancipated by their masters, and the institution of slavery had almost died out before 1806."—E. B. Sanford, *Hist. of Conn., p.* 252.

A. D. 1774.—The bringing of slaves into Rhode Island prohibited.—"Africans had been brought to the shores of this colony in the earliest of the vessels in which the commerce of Newport had reached across the Atlantic. Becoming domesticated within the colony, the black population had in 1730 reached the number of 1,648, and in 1774 had become 3,761. How early the philanthropic movement in their behalf, and the measures looking towards their emancipation, had gained headway, cannot be determined with accuracy. It is probable that the movement originated with the Society of Friends within the colony. But little progress had been made towards any embodiment of this sentiment in legislative enactment, however, until the very year of the First Continental Congress, when at the direct instance of Stephen Hopkins (himself for many years an owner of slaves, though a most humane master), the General Assembly ordained [June, 1774] 'that for the future no negro or mulatto slave shall be brought into the colony,' and that all previously enslaved persons on becoming residents of Rhode Island should obtain their freedom. 'In this decided action,' once more, as has been so often seen to be the case with movements led by Stephen Hopkins, 'Rhode Island,' says Arnold, 'took the lead of all her sister colonies.'"—W. E. Foster, *Stephen Hopkins, pt.* 2, *pp.* 98–100.

Also in: W. D. Johnston, *Slavery in Rhode Island, pt.* 2.

A. D. 1776-1808.—Antislavery sentiment in the Southern (American) States.—The causes of its disappearance.—Jefferson's "'Notes on Virginia' were written in 1781–2. His condemnation of slavery in that work is most emphatic. 'The whole commerce between master and slave,' he says, 'is a perpetual exercise of the most boisterous passions; the most unremitting despotism on the one part, and degrading submission on the other. Our children see this and learn to imitate it. . . . The man must be a prodigy who can retain his manners and morals undepraved by such circumstances. With what execration should the statesman be loaded, who, permitting one-half the citizens thus to trample on the rights of the other, transforms those into despots and these into enemies—destroys the morals of the one part and the amor patriæ of the other? . . . Can the liberties of a nation be thought secure when we have removed their only firm basis—a conviction in the minds of men that these liberties are the gift of God; that they are not to be violated but with His wrath? Indeed, I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just—that His justice cannot sleep forever.' . . . On the practical question, 'What shall be done about it?' Mr. Jefferson's mind wavered; he was in doubt. How can slavery be abolished? He proposed, in Virginia, a law, which was rejected, making all free who were born after the passage of the act. And here again he hesitated. What will become of these people after they are free? . . . He thought they had better be emancipated and sent out of the country. He therefore took up with the colonization scheme long before the Colonization Society was founded. He did not feel sure on this point. With his practical mind he could not see how a half million of slaves could be sent out of the country, even if they were voluntarily liberated; where they should be sent to, or how unwilling masters could be compelled to liberate their slaves. While, therefore, he did not favor immediate emancipation, he was zealous for no other scheme. . . . Mr. Jefferson, in August, 1785, wrote a letter to Dr. Richard Price, of London, author of a treatise on Liberty, in which very advanced opinions were taken on the slavery question. Concerning the prevalence of anti-slavery opinions at that period, he says: 'Southward of the Chesapeake your book will find but few readers concurring with it in sentiment on the subject of slavery. From the mouth to the head of the Chesapeake, the bulk of the people will approve its theory, and it will find a respectable minority, a minority ready to adopt it in practice; which, for weight and worth of character, preponderates against the greater number who have not the courage to divest their families of a property which, however, keeps their consciences unquiet. Northward of the Chesapeake you may find, here and there, an opponent to your doctrine, as you find, here and there, a robber and murderer, but in no greater number. In that part of America there are but few slaves, and they can easily disincumber themselves of them; and emancipation is put in such train that in a few years there will be no slaves northward of Maryland. In Maryland I do not find such a disposition to begin the redress of this enormity as in Virginia. These [the inhabitants of Virginia] have sucked in the principles of liberty, as it were, with their mothers' milk, and it is to these I look with anxiety to turn the fate of this question. Be not, therefore, discouraged.'" M. Brissot de Warville visited Washington, at Mount Vernon, in 1788, and conversed with him freely on the subject of slavery. "This great man declared to me," he wrote in his narrative, afterwards published, "that he rejoiced at what was doing in other States on the subject [of emancipation—alluding to the recent formation of several state societies]; that he sincerely desired the extension of it in his own State; but he did not dissemble that there were still many obstacles to be overcome; that it was dangerous to strike too vigorously at a prejudice which had begun to diminish; that time, patience, and information would not fail to vanquish it."—W. F. Poole, *Anti-Slavery Opinions before the year* 1800, *pp.* 25–35, *and foot-note.*—"In Virginia all the foremost statesmen—Washington, Jefferson, Lee, Randolph, Henry, and Madison, and Mason—were opposed to the continuance of slavery; and their opinions were shared by many of the largest planters. For tobacco-culture slavery did not seem so indispensable as for the raising of rice and indigo;

and in Virginia the negroes, half-civilized by kindly treatment, were not regarded with horror by their masters, like the ill-treated and ferocious blacks of South Carolina and Georgia. After 1808 the policy and the sentiments of Virginia underwent a marked change. The invention of the cotton-gin, taken in connection with the sudden prodigious development of manufactures in England, greatly stimulated the growth of cotton in the ever-enlarging area of the Gulf states, and created an immense demand for slave-labour, just at the time when the importation of negroes from Africa came to an end. The breeding of slaves, to be sold to the planters of the Gulf states, then became such a profitable occupation in Virginia as entirely to change the popular feeling about slavery. But until 1808 Virginia sympathized with the anti-slavery sentiment which was growing up in the northern states; and the same was true of Maryland. . . . In the work of gradual emancipation the little state of Delaware led the way. In its new constitution of 1776 the further introduction of slaves was prohibited, all restraints upon emancipation having already been removed. In the assembly of Virginia in 1778 a bill prohibiting the further introduction of slaves was moved and carried by Thomas Jefferson, and the same measure was passed in Maryland in 1783, while both these states removed all restraints upon emancipation. North Carolina was not ready to go quite so far, but in 1786 she sought to discourage the slave-trade by putting a duty of £5 per head on all negroes thereafter imported."—J. Fiske, *The Critical Period of Am. Hist., p.* 73.

Also in: T. Jefferson, *Notes on the State of Virginia, query* 18.—J. W. Draper, *Hist. of the Am. Civil War, ch.*, 16–17 (*v.* 1).—J. R. Brackett, *The Status of the Slave*, 1775–1789 (*Essays in Const. Hist.*).

A. D. 1777.—Prohibited by the organic law of Vermont. See Vermont: A. D. 1777–1778.

A. D. 1781.—Emancipation in Massachusetts. See, above: A. D. 1638–1781.

A. D. 1787.—The compromises in the Constitution of the United States. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1787.

A. D. 1787.—Exclusion forever from the Northwest Territory of the United States. See Northwest Territory: A. D. 1787.

A. D. 1790.—Guaranteed to Tennessee. See Tennessee: A. D. 1785–1796.

A. D. 1791-1802.—The Revolt of the Haytian blacks, under Toussaint L' Ouverture, and the ending of slavery on the island. See Hayti: A. D. 1632–1803.

A. D. 1792.—The institution entrenched in the Constitution of the new state of Kentucky. See Kentucky: A. D. 1789–1792.

A. D. 1792-1807.—Earliest measures for the suppression of the slave-trade.—"In 1776 the first motion against the trade was made in the English parliament; and soon leading statesmen of all parties, including Fox, Burke, and Pitt, declared themselves in favour of its abolition. In 1792 the Danish King took the lead in the cause of humanity by absolutely prohibiting his subjects from buying, selling, and transporting slaves; and at last, in 1807, the moral sense of the British public overrode the vested interests of merchants and planters; parliament, at Lord Grenville's instance, passed the famous act for the Abolition of the Slave trade; and thenceforward successive British governments set themselves steadily by treaty and convention to bring other nations to follow their example. . . . In 1794 the United States prohibited their subjects from slave-trading to foreign countries, and in 1807 they prohibited the importation of slaves into their own."—C. P. Lucas, *Hist. Geog. of the British Colonies, v.* 2, *pp.* 67–68.

A. D. 1797. Slavocracy in Congress. See United States: A. D. 1797–1800.

A. D. 1799.—Gradual emancipation enacted in New York. See New York: A. D. 1799.

A. D. 1806-1807. Abolition of Slave Trade. See England: A. D. 1806–1812; and United States: A. D. 1807.

A. D. 1815.—Declaration of the Powers against the slave-trade.—The following are passages from the Declaration against the Slave Trade, which was signed by the representatives of the Powers at the Congress of Vienna, February 8, 1815: "Having taken into consideration that the commerce known by the name of 'the Slave Trade' has been considered by just and enlightened men of all ages as repugnant to the principles of humanity and universal morality; . . . that at length the public voice, in all civilized countries, calls aloud for its prompt suppression; that since the character and the details of this traffic have been better known, and the evils of every kind which attend it, completely developed, several European Governments have, virtually, come to the resolution of putting a stop to it, and that, successively, all the Powers possessing Colonies in different parts of the world have acknowledged, either by Legislative Acts, or by Treaties, or other formal engagements, the duty and necessity of abolishing it: That by a separate Article of the late Treaty of Paris, Great Britain and France engaged to unite their efforts at the Congress of Vienna, to induce all the Powers of Christendom to proclaim the universal and definitive Abolition of the Slave Trade: That the Plenipotentiaries assembled at this Congress . . . declare, in the face of Europe, that, considering the universal abolition of the Slave Trade as a measure particularly worthy of their attention, conformable to the spirit of the times, and to the generous principles of their august Sovereigns, they are animated with the sincere desire of concurring in the most prompt and effectual execution of this measure, by all the means at their disposal. . . . The said Plenipotentiaries at the same time acknowledge that this general Declaration cannot prejudge the period that each particular Power may consider as most desirable for the definitive abolition of the Slave Trade. Consequently, the determining the period when this trade is to cease universally must be a subject of negociation between the Powers; it being understood, however, that no proper means of securing its attainment, and of accelerating its progress, are to be neglected."—L. Hertslet, *Collection of Treaties and Conventions, v.* 1, *p.* 11.

A. D. 1816-1849.—The organization of the American Colonization Society.—The founding of Liberia.—"Samuel J. Mills organized at Williams College, in 1808, for missionary work, an undergraduate society, which was soon transferred to Andover, and resulted in the establishment of the American Bible Society and Board of Foreign Missions. But the topic which engrossed Mills' most enthusiastic attention was

the Negro. The desire was to better his condition by founding a colony between the Ohio and the Lakes; or later, when this was seen to be unwise, in Africa. On going to New Jersey to continue his theological studies, Mills succeeded in interesting the Presbyterian clergy of that State in his project. Of this body one of the most prominent members was Dr. Robert Finley. Dr. Finley succeeded in assembling at Princeton the first meeting ever called to consider the project of sending Negro colonists to Africa. Although supported by few save members of the seminary, Dr. Finley felt encouraged to set out for Washington in December 1816, to attempt the formation of a colonization society. Earlier in this same year there had been a sudden awakening of Southern interest in colonization. . . . The interest already awakened and the indefatigable efforts of Finley and his friend Col. Charles Marsh, at length succeeded in convening the assembly to which the Colonization Society owes its existence. It was a notable gathering. Henry Clay, in the absence of Bushrod Washington, presided, setting forth in glowing terms the object and aspirations of the meeting. . . . John Randolph of Roanoke, and Robert Wright of Maryland, dwelt upon the desirability of removing the turbulent free-negro element and enhancing the value of property in slaves. Resolutions organizing the Society passed, and committees appointed to draft a Constitution and present a memorial to Congress. . . . With commendable energy the newly organized Society set about the accomplishment of the task before it. Plans were discussed during the summer, and in November two agents, Samuel J. Mills and Ebenezer Burgess, sailed for Africa to explore the western coast and select a suitable spot. . . . Their inspection was carried as far south [from Sierra Leone] as Sherbro Island, where they obtained promises from the natives to sell land to the colonists on their arrival with goods to pay for it. In May they embarked on the return voyage. Mills died before reaching home. His colleague made a most favorable report of the locality selected, though, as the event proved, it was a most unfortunate one. After defraying the expenses of this exploration the Society's treasury was practically empty. It would have been most difficult to raise the large sum necessary to equip and send out a body of emigrants; and the whole enterprise would have languished and perhaps died but for a new impelling force. . . . Though the importation of slaves had been strictly prohibited by the Act of Congress of March 2, 1807, no provision had been made for the care of the unfortunates smuggled in in defiance of the Statute. They became subject to the laws of the State in which they were landed; and these laws were in some cases so devised that it was profitable for the dealer to land his cargo and incur the penalty. The advertisements of the sale of such a cargo of 'recaptured Africans' by the State of Georgia drew the attention of the Society and of Gen. Mercer in particular to this inconsistent and abnormal state of affairs. His profound indignation shows forth in the Second Annual Report of the Society, in which the attention of the public is earnestly drawn to the question; nor did he rest until a bill was introduced into the House of Representatives designed to do away with the evil. This bill became a law on March 3, 1819. . . . The clause which proved so important to the embryo colony was that dealing with the captured cargoes: 'The President of the United States is hereby authorized to make such regulations and arrangements as he may deem expedient for the safe-keeping, support, and removal beyond the limits of the United States, of all such negroes, mulattoes, or persons of color as may be so delivered and brought within their jurisdiction; and to appoint a proper person or persons residing upon the coast of Africa as agent or agents for receiving the negroes, mulattoes, or persons of color, delivered from on board vessels seized in the prosecution of the slave trade by commanders of the United States armed vessels.' The sum of $100,000 was appropriated for carrying out the provisions of the Act. President Monroe determined to construe it as broadly as possible in aid of the project of colonization. After giving Congress, in his message, December 20, 1818, fair notice of his intention, no objection being made, he proceeded to appoint two agents, the Rev. Samuel Bacon, already in the service of the Colonization Society, and John P. Bankson as assistant, and to charter the ship Elizabeth. The agents were instructed to settle on the coast of Africa, with a tacit understanding that the place should be that selected by the Colonization Society. . . . For the expenses of the expedition $33,000 was placed in the hands of Mr. Bacon. Dr. Samuel A. Crozier was appointed by the Society as its agent and representative; and 86 negroes from various states — 33 men, 18 women, and the rest children, were embarked. On the 6th of February, 1820, the Mayflower of Liberia weighed anchor in New York harbor, and, convoyed by the U. S. sloop-of-war Cyane, steered her course toward the shores of Africa. The pilgrims were kindly treated by the authorities at Sierra Leone, where they arrived on the 9th of March; but on proceeding to Sherbro Island they found the natives had reconsidered their promise, and refused to sell them land. While delayed by negotiations the injudicious nature of the site selected was disastrously shown. The low marshy ground and the bad water quickly bred the African fever, which soon carried off all the agents and nearly a fourth of the emigrants. The rest, weakened and disheartened, were soon obliged to seek refuge at Sierra Leone. In March, 1821, a body of 28 new emigrants under charge of J. B. Winn and Ephraim Bacon, reached Freetown in the brig Nautilus. Winn collected as many as he could of the first company, also the stores sent out with them, and settled the people in temporary quarters at Fourah Bay, while Bacon set out to explore the coast anew and secure suitable territory. An elevated fertile and desirable tract was at length discovered between 250 and 300 miles S. E. of Sierra Leone. This was the region of Cape Montserado. It seemed exactly suited to the purposes of the colonists, but the natives refused to sell their land for fear of breaking up the traffic in slaves; and the agent returned discouraged. Winn soon died, and Bacon returned to the United States. In November, Dr. Eli Ayres was sent over as agent, and the U. S. schooner Alligator, commanded by Lieutenant Stockton, was ordered to the coast to assist in obtaining a foothold for the colony. Cape Montserado was again visited; and the address and firmness of Lieutenant Stockton accom-

plished the purchase of a valuable tract of land. The cape upon which the settlers proposed to build their first habitations consists of a narrow peninsula or tongue of land formed by the Montserado River, which separates it from the mainland. Just within the mouth of the river lie two small islands, containing together less than three acres. To these, the Plymouth of Liberia, the colonists and their goods were soon transported. But again the fickle natives repented the bargain, and the settlers were long confined to 'Perseverance Island,' as the spot was aptly named. . . . After a number of thrilling experiences the emigrants, on April 25, 1822, formally took possession of the cape, where they had erected rude houses for themselves; and from this moment we may date the existence of the colony. Their supplies were by this time sadly reduced; the natives were hostile and treacherous; fever had played havoc with the colonists in acclimating; and the incessant downpour of the rainy season had set in. Dr. Ayres became thoroughly discouraged, and proposed to lead them back to Sierra Leone. Then it was that Elijah Johnson, an emigrant from New York, made himself forever famous in Liberian history by declaring that he would never desert the home he had found after two years' weary quest! His firmness decided the wavering colonists; the agents with a few faint-hearted ones sailed off to America; but the majority remained with their heroic Negro leader. The little band, deserted by their appointed protectors, were soon reduced to the most dire distress, and must have perished miserably but for the arrival of unexpected relief. The United States Government had at last gotten hold of some ten liberated Africans, and had a chance to make use of the agency established for them at so great an expense. They were accordingly sent out in the brig Strong under the care of the Rev. Jehudi Ashmun. A quantity of stores and some 37 emigrants sent by the Colonization Society completed the cargo. Ashmun had received no commission as agent for the colony, and expected to return on the Strong; under this impression his wife had accompanied him. But when he found the colonists in so desperate a situation he nobly determined to remain with them at any sacrifice. . . . On the 24th of May, 1823, the brig Oswego arrived with 61 new emigrants and a liberal supply of stores and tools, in charge of Dr. Ayres, who, already the representative of the Society, had now been appointed Government Agent and Surgeon. One of the first measures of the new agent was to have the town surveyed and lots distributed among the whole body of colonists. Many of the older settlers found themselves dispossessed of the holdings improved by their labor, and the colony was soon in a ferment of excitement and insurrection. Dr. Ayres, finding his health failing, judiciously betook himself to the United States. The arrival of the agent had placed Mr. Ashmun in a false position of the most mortifying character. . . . Seeing the colony again deserted by the agent and in a state of discontent and confusion, he forgot his wrongs and remained at the helm. Order was soon restored but the seeds of insubordination remained. The arrival of 103 emigrants from Virginia on the Cyrus, in February 1824, added to the difficulty, as the stock of food was so low that the whole colony had to be put on half rations. This necessary measure was regarded by the disaffected as an act of tyranny on Ashmun's part; and when shortly after the complete prostration of his health compelled him to withdraw to the Cape De Verde Islands, the malcontents sent home letters charging him with all sorts of abuse of power, and finally with desertion of his post! The Society in consternation applied to Government for an expedition of investigation, and the Rev. R. R. Gurley, Secretary of the Society, and an enthusiastic advocate of colonization, was despatched in June on the U. S. schooner Porpoise. The result of course revealed the probity, integrity and good judgment of Mr. Ashmun; and Gurley became thenceforth his warmest admirer. As a preventive of future discontent a Constitution was adopted at Mr. Gurley's suggestion, giving for the first time a definite share in the control of affairs to the colonists themselves. Gurley brought with him the name of the colony — Liberia, and of its settlement on the Cape — Monrovia, which had been adopted by the Society on the suggestion of Mr. Robert Goodloe Harper of Maryland. He returned from his successful mission in August leaving the most cordial relations established throughout the colony. Gurley's visit seemed to mark the turning of the tide, and a period of great prosperity now began." The national independence of the commonwealth of Liberia was not assumed until 1847, when the first President of the Republic, Joseph J. Roberts, was elected.—J. H. T. McPherson, *Hist. of Liberia* (*Johns Hopkins Univ. Studies, series* 9, *no.* 10), *ch.* 2–3 *and* 5.

Also in: S. Wilkeson, *Hist. of the Am. Colonies in Liberia.*— A. H. Foote, *Africa and the Am. Flag, ch.* 10–18.

A. D. 1818-1821.—The opening struggle of the American conflict.—The Missouri Compromise. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1818–1821.

A. D. 1821-1854.— Emancipation in New Granada, Venezuela aud Ecuador. See Colombian States: A. D. 1821–1854.

A. D. 1823.—Abolition in Central America. See Central America: A. D. 1821–1871.

A. D. 1825.—Bolivar's Emancipation in Bolivia. See Peru: A. D. 1825–1826.

A. D. 1827.— Final Emancipation in New York. See New York: A. D. 1827.

A. D. 1828-1832.—The rise of the Abolitionists in the United States.—Nat. Turner's Insurrection.—"While the reign of Andrew Jackson [1828–1836] paved the way on which the slave-holding interest ascended to the zenith of its supremacy over the Union, there arose, at the same time, in the body of the abolitionists, the enemy which undermined the firm ground under the feet of that same slave-holding interest. The expression, 'abolition of slavery,' is to be met with even before the adoption of the constitution. But the word 'abolitionism,' as descriptive of a definite political programme, occurs for the first time in this period. . . . The immediate precursor, and, in a certain sense, the father of the abolitionists, was Benjamin Lundy, a Quaker, born in New Jersey. In Wheeling, West Virginia, where he learned the saddler's trade, he had ample opportunity to become acquainted with the horrors of slavery, as great cargoes of slaves, on their way to the southern states, frequently passed the place. Lundy had

been endeavoring for some years to awaken an active interest among his neighbors in the hard lot of the slaves, when the Missouri question brought him to the resolve to consecrate his whole life to their cause. In 1821, he began to publish the 'Genius of Universal Emancipation,' which is to be considered the first abolition organ. The 19th century can scarcely point to another instance in which the command of Christ, to leave all things and follow him, was so literally construed and followed. Lundy gave up his flourishing business, took leave of his wife and of his two dearly beloved children, and began a restless, wandering life, to arouse consciences everywhere to a deeper understanding of the sin and curse of slavery. In the autumn of 1829 he obtained, as associate publisher of his sheet, William Lloyd Garrison, a young litterateur, born in Newburyport, Massachusetts, who, from the position of a poor apprentice to a tradesman, rose to be a type-setter, and from being a type-setter to be a journalist. The removal of Garrison from New England to Baltimore, where Lundy was then publishing the 'Genius,' was an event pregnant with consequences. Garrison had long been a zealous enemy of slavery, but had hitherto seen the right way of doing away with the evil in the efforts of the colonization society. What he now saw of slavery and its effects with his own eyes produced a complete revolution in his views in a few months. He not only recognized the impossibility of preventing the extension of slavery by colonizing the free negroes in Africa, to say nothing of gradually doing away with it altogether, but he became convinced also that the leading spirits of the colonization society purposely sought to induce the philanthropists of the north to enter on a wrong course, in the interests of slavery. Hence his own profession of faith was, henceforth, 'immediate and unconditional emancipation.' His separation from the more moderate Lundy, which was rendered unavoidable by this course, was hastened by an outside occurrence. The captain of a ship from New England took on board at Baltimore a cargo of slaves destined for New Orleans. Garrison denounced him on that account with passionate violence. The matter was carried before the court, and he was sentenced to prison and to pay a money fine for publishing a libelous article and for criminally inciting slaves to insurrection. After an imprisonment of seven weeks, his fine was paid by a New York philanthropist, Arthur Tappan, and Garrison left the city to spread his convictions by means of public lectures through New England. Although his success was not very encouraging, he, in January, 1831, established a paper of his own in Boston, known as 'The Liberator.' He was not only its publisher, and sole writer for it, but he had to be his own printer and carrier. His only assistant was a negro. . . . In one year, Garrison had found so many who shared his views, that it was possible to found the 'New England Anti-Slavery Society' in Boston [January, 1832]. The example was imitated in other states. The movement spread so rapidly that as early as December, 1833, a 'national' anti-slavery convention could be held in Philadelphia. The immediate practical result of this was the foundation of the 'American Anti-Slavery Society.' . . . In the same year that Garrison raised the standard of unconditional abolitionism in Boston, an event happened in Virginia, which, from the opposite side, contributed powerfully to lead the slavery question over into its new stage of development. In August, 1831, an uprising of slaves, under the leadership of Nat. Turner, occurred in Southampton county. It was, however, quickly subdued, but cost the life of 61 white persons, mostly women and children. The excitement throughout the entire south, and especially in Virginia and the states contiguous to it, was out of all proportion with the number of the victims and the extent of the conspiracy."—H. von Holst, *Const. and Pol. Hist. of the U. S., v. 2, ch. 2.*

Also in: W. P. and F. J. Garrison, *William Lloyd Garrison: The Story of his Life, v. 1, ch. 6–9.*—S. J. May, *Recollections of the Anti-Slavery Conflict, pp. 1–90.*—G. L. Austin, *Life and Times of Wendell Phillips, ch. 3.*—O. Johnson, *William Lloyd Garrison and his Times, ch. 1–5.*—J. F. Rhodes, *Hist. of the U. S. from 1850, ch. 1.*—B. Tuckerman, *William Jay and the Constitutional Movement for the Abolition of Slavery.*

A. D. 1829-1837.—Emancipation in Mexico, resisted in Texas.—Schemes of the American slave power for acquiring that state. See Texas: A. D. 1824–1836; and Mexico: A. D. 1829–1837.

A. D. 1834-1838.—Emancipation in the British colonies.—"The abolition of slavery, as Fox had said, was the natural consequence of the extinction of the slave trade; and in 1833 the act for the Abolition of Slavery throughout the British colonies was passed. The law was to take effect from the first of August 1834, but the slaves were to be apprenticed to their former owners till 1838 and in the case of agricultural slaves till 1840, and £20,000,000 sterling were voted as compensation to the slave-holders at the Cape, in Mauritius, and in the West Indies. As a matter of fact, however, two colonies, Antigua and the Bermudas, had the good sense to dispense with the apprenticeship system altogether, and in no case was it prolonged beyond 1838. . . . When Burke wrote, there were, according to his account, in the British West Indies at least 230,000 slaves against at the most 90,000 whites. In 1788 it is stated that there were 450,000 negroes in the British sugar colonies. At the last registration prior to emancipation, after British Guiana and Trinidad had become British possessions, the number of slaves was given at some 674,000."—C. P. Lucas, *Hist. Geog. of the British Colonies, v. 2, pp. 68–69.*—See, also, England: A. D. 1832–1833.

A. D. 1836.—The Atherton Gag. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1836.

A. D. 1837.—The murder of Lovejoy.—Rev. Elijah P. Lovejoy, publishing a religious paper that dealt freely with slavery, had been driven from St. Louis to Alton, Ill. There he was thrice attacked by a mob and his press and printing materials were destroyed. On the third attack, which he and his friends resolutely resisted, he was killed.—J. C. and O. Lovejoy, *Memoir of Rev. Elijah P. Lovejoy.*

A. D. 1840-1847.—The Liberty Party and League.—The Liberty Party was formed by anti-slavery men who favored political action against slavery, but not through the old Whig and Democratic parties. In 1847 it became divided, and a separate body was formed which took the name of the Liberty League, and which

nominated Gerrit Smith for President, with Elihu Burritt for Vice-President. "As distinguished from the other wing, it may be said that the members of the Liberty League were less practical, more disposed to adhere to theories, and more fearful of sacrificing principle to policy."—H. Wilson, *Hist. of the Rise and Fall of the Slave Power in Am., v. 2, ch. 9.*

Also in: W. Birney, *James G. Birney and his Times, ch. 29.*—See, also, United States of Am.: A. D. 1840, and 1844.

A. D. 1840-1860.—The Underground Railroad.—"The Underground Railroad was the popular designation given [in the United States] to those systematic and co-operative efforts which were made by the friends of the fleeing slave to aid him in eluding the pursuit of the slave-hunters, who were generally on his track. This 'institution,' as it was familiarly called, played an important part in the great drama of slavery and anti-slavery. By its timely and effective aid thousands were enabled to escape from the prison-house of bondage. . . . The practical working of the system required 'stations' at convenient distances, or rather the houses of persons who held themselves in readiness to receive fugitives, singly or in numbers, at any hour of day or night, to feed and shelter, to clothe if necessary, and to conceal until they could be despatched with safety to some other point along the route. There were others who held themselves in like readiness to take them by private or public conveyance. . . . When the wide extent of territory embraced by the Middle States and all the Western States east of the Mississippi is borne in mind, and it is remembered that the whole was dotted with these 'stations,' and covered with a network of imaginary routes, not found, indeed, in the railway guides or on the railway maps; that each station had its brave and faithful men and women, ever on the alert to seek out and succor the coming fugitive, and equally intent on deceiving and thwarting his pursuers; that there were always trusty and courageous conductors waiting, like the 'minute-men' of the Revolution, to take their living and precious freights, often by unfrequented roads, on dark and stormy nights, safely on their way; and that the numbers actually rescued were very great, many counting their trophies by hundreds, some by thousands, two men being credited with the incredible estimate of over 2,500 each,—there are materials from which to estimate, approximately at least, the amount of labor performed, of cost and risk incurred on the despised and deprecated Underground Railroad, and something of the magnitude of the results secured."—H. Wilson, *Hist. of the Rise and Fall of the Slave Power in Am., v. 2, ch. 6.*

Also in: J. F. Clarke, *Anti-Slavery Days, ch. 3.*—W. Still, *The Underground Railroad.*—M. G. McDougal, *Fugitive Slaves (Fay House Monographs, 3).*

A. D. 1844.—Attempted insurrection in Cuba. See Cuba: A. D. 1514–1851.

A. D. 1844-1845.—The contest over the annexation of Texas. See Texas: A. D. 1836–1845.

A. D. 1845-1846.—Revolt in the Democratic Party against slavery extension.—The Wilmot Proviso. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1845–1846.

A. D. 1854.—The Kansas-Nebraska Bill.—Repeal of the Missouri Compromise. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1854.

A. D. 1854.—Abolition in Venezuela. See Venezuela: A. D. 1829–1886.

A. D. 1854-1855.—Solidification of antislavery sentiment in the North.—Birth of the Republican Party of the United States. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1854–1855.

A. D. 1854-1859.—The struggle for Kansas. See Kansas: A. D. 1854–1859.

A. D. 1856.—Abolition in Peru. See Peru: A. D. 1826–1876.

A. D. 1857.—The Dred Scott case. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1857.

A. D. 1859.—John Brown at Harper's Ferry. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1859.

A. D. 1860-1865.—The slaveholders' Rebellion in the United States. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1860 (November—December), and after.

A. D. 1861 (May).—The first war-thrust.—General Butler declares the slaves to be Contraband of War. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1861 (May).

A. D. 1861 (August).—Act of Congress freeing slaves employed in the service of the Rebellion. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1861 (August).

A. D. 1861 (August — September). — Fremont's premature Proclamation of Emancipation in Missouri, and Lincoln's modification of it. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1861 (August—October: Missouri).

A. D. 1862. — Compensated Emancipation proposed by President Lincoln. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1862 (March) President Lincoln's proposal of compensated emancipation.

A. D. 1862.—Federal officers forbidden, by the amended Military Code, to surrender fugitive slaves. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1862 (March) Amendment of the military code.

A. D. 1862. — Abolition in the District of Columbia and the Territories of the United States. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1862 (April—June).

A. D. 1862.—General Hunter's Emancipation Order, rescinded by President Lincoln. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1862 (May) General Hunter's emancipation order.

A. D. 1862.—First arming of the Freedmen in the War for the Union. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1862 (May: South Carolina).

A. D. 1862.—Gradual Emancipation in West Virginia provided for. See West Virginia: A. D. 1862 (April—December).

A. D. 1862.—Act confiscating the property and freeing the slaves of Rebels. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1862 (July).

A. D. 1862.— President Lincoln's preliminary or monitory Proclamation of Emancipation. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1862 (September).

A. D. 1862.—Abolition in the Dutch West Indies. See Netherlands: A. D. 1830–1884.

A. D. 1863.—President Lincoln's final Proclamation of Emancipation. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1863 (January).

A. D. 1864.—Repeal of the Fugitive Slave Laws. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1864 (June).

A. D. 1864.—Constitutional abolition of slavery in Louisiana. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1863–1864 (DECEMBER—JULY).

A. D. 1865.—Adoption of the Thirteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, forever prohibiting slavery. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1865 (JANUARY).

A. D. 1865.—Abolition in Tennessee by Constitutional Amendment. See TENNESSEE: A. D. 1865–1866.

A. D. 1865.—Emancipation of the families of colored soldiers. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1865 (MARCH).

A. D. 1869-1893.—The slave-trade in Africa and the European measures for its suppression.—"While Livingstone was making his terrible disclosures respecting the havoc wrought by the slave-trader in east central Africa, Sir Samuel Baker was striving to effect in north central Africa what has been so successfully accomplished in the Congo State. During his expedition for the discovery of the Albert Nyanza, his explorations led him through one of the principal man-hunting regions, wherein murder and spoliation were the constant occupations of powerful bands from Egypt and Nubia. These revelations were followed by diplomatic pressure upon the Khedive Ismail, and through the personal influence of an august personage he was finally induced to delegate to Sir Samuel the task of arresting the destructive careers of the slavers in the region of the upper Nile. In his book Ismailïa we have the record of his operations by himself. The firman issued to him was to the effect that he 'was to subdue to the Khedive's authority the countries to the south of Gondokoro, to suppress the slave trade, to introduce a system of regular commerce, to open to navigation the great lakes of the equator, and to establish a chain of military stations and commercial depots throughout central Africa.' This mission began in 1869, and continued until 1874. On Baker's retirement from the command of the equatorial Soudan the work was intrusted to Colonel C. G. Gordon—commonly known as Chinese Gordon. Where Baker had broken ground, Gordon was to build; what his predecessor had commenced, Gordon was to perfect and to complete. If energy, determination and self-sacrifice received their due, then had Gordon surely won for the Soudan that peace and security which it was his dear object to obtain for it. But slaving was an old institution in this part of the world. Every habit and custom of the people had some connection with it. They had always been divided from prehistoric time into enslavers and enslaved. How could two Englishmen, accompanied by only a handful of officers, removed 2,000 miles from their base of supplies, change the nature of a race within a few years? Though much wrong had been avenged, many thousands of slaves released, many a slaver's camp scattered, and many striking examples made to terrify the evil-doers, the region was wide and long; and though within reach of the Nile waters there was a faint promise of improvement, elsewhere, at Kordofan, Darfoor, and Sennaar, the trade flourished. After three years of wonderful work, Gordon resigned. A short time afterwards, however, he resumed his task, with the powers of a dictator, over a region covering 1,100,000 square miles. But the personal courage, energy, and devotion of one man opposed to a race can effect but little. . . . After another period of three years he again resigned. Then followed a revulsion. The Khedivial government reverted to the old order of things. . . . All traces of the work of Baker and Gordon have long ago been completely obliterated. Attention has been given of late to Morocco. This near neighbor of England is just twenty years behind Zanzibar. . . . While the heart of Africa responds to the civilizing influences moving from the east and the west and the south, Morocco remains stupidly indifferent and inert, a pitiful example of senility and decay. The remaining portion of North Africa which still fosters slavery is Tripoli. The occupation of Tunis by France has diverted such traffic in slaves as it maintained to its neighbor. Though the watchfulness of the Mediterranean cruisers renders the trade a precarious one, the small lateen boats are frequently able to sail from such ports as Benghazi, Derna, Solum, etc., with living freight, along the coast to Asia Minor. In the interior, which is inaccessible to travellers, owing to the fanaticism of the Senoussi sect, caravans from Darfoor and Wadai bring large numbers of slaves for the supply of Tripolitan families and Senouissian sanctuaries. . . . The partition of Africa among the European powers [by the Berlin Conference of 1885 and the Anglo-German Convention of 1890—see AFRICA: A. D. 1884–1891] . . . was the first effective blow dealt to the slave trade in inner Africa. The east coast, whence a few years ago the slaves marched in battalions to scatter over the wide interior of the continent for pillage and devastation, is to-day guarded by German and British troops. The island of Zanzibar, where they were equipped for their murderous enterprises, is under the British flag. . . . The final blow has been given by the act of the Brussels Antislavery Conference, lately [1893] ratified by the powers, wherein modern civilization has fully declared its opinions upon the question of slavery, and no single power will dare remain indifferent to them, under penalty of obloquy and shame. . . . The Congo State devotes her annual subsidies of £120,000 and the export tax of £30,000 wholly to the task of securing her territory against the malign influences of the slave trade, and elevating it to the rank of self-protecting states. The German government undertakes the sure guardianship of its vast African territory as an imperial possession, so as to render it inaccessible to the slave-hunter. . . . The coast towns are fortified and garrisoned; they [the Germans] are making their advance towards Lake Tanganika by the erection of military stations; severe regulations have been issued against the importation of arms and gunpowder; the Reichstag has been unstinted in its supplies of money; an experienced administrator, Baron von Soden, has been appointed an imperial commissioner, and scores of qualified subordinates assist him. . . . So far the expenses, I think, have averaged over £100,000 annually."—H. M. Stanley, *Slavery and the Slave Trade in Africa* (1893).

ALSO IN: R. F. Clarke, *Cardinal Lavigerie and the African Slave Trade, pt.* 2.

A. D. 1871-1888.—Emancipation in Brazil. See BRAZIL: A. D. 1871–1888.

A. D. 1880-1886. Abolition in Cuba. See CUBA: A. D. 1865–1895.

SLAVES AND GLADIATORS, Rising of the. See SPARTACUS, RISING OF.

SLAVONIC PEOPLES AND LANGUAGE.—"The name under which the Slavonians appear in ancient literature is generally Venedi or Veneti. . . . This name, unknown to the Slavonians themselves, is that by which the Teutonic tribes have from the first designated these their eastern neighbours, viz. Wends, and the use of this appellation by the Roman authors plainly shows that their knowledge of the Slavonians was derived only from the Germans. The Old German form of this name was Wineda, and Wenden is the name which the Germans of the present day give to the remnants of a Slavonic population, formerly large, who now inhabit Lusatia, while they give the name of Winden to the Slovens in Carinthia, Carniola and Styria. . . . If the Slavonians themselves ever applied any common name to the whole of their family, it must most probably have been that by which we now are accustomed to call them, Slavs, or Slavonians; its original native form was Slovene. . . . The most ancient sources from which we derive a knowledge of the Wends or Slavonians, unanimously place them by the Vistula. From that river, which must have formed their western frontier, they extended eastward to the Dnieper, and even beyond. To the south the Carpathians formed their boundary. To the north they perhaps crossed the Dwina into the territory afterwards known as Novgorod. In the extensive woods and marshes which cover these remote tracts the Slavonians seem to have dwelt in peace and quiet during the first centuries after Christ, divided into a number of small tribes or clans. . . . It was not long, however, before their primitive home became too narrow for the Slavs, and as their numbers could no longer be contained within their ancient boundaries—and, perhaps, compelled to it by pressure from without—they began to spread themselves to the west, in which direction the great migrations of the fourth and fifth centuries had made abundant room for the new immigrants. By two different roads the Slavs now begin to advance in great masses. On the one side, they cross the Vistula and extend over the tracts between the Carpathian mountains and the Baltic, right down to the Elbe, the former Germanic population of this region having either emigrated or been exhausted by their intestine contests and their deadly struggle with the Roman empire. By this same road the Poles, and probably also the Chekhs of Bohemia and Moravia, reached the districts they have inhabited since that period. In the rest of this western territory the Slavonians were afterwards almost exterminated during their bloody wars with the Germans, so that but few of their descendants exist. The other road by which the Slavonians advanced lay to the south-west, along the course of the Danube. These are the so-called South-Slavonians: the Bulgarians, the Servians, the Croatians, and farthest westward, the Slovens."—V. Thomsen, *Relations between Ancient Russia and Scandinavia, lect.* 1.—"A controversy has been maintained respecting the origin of the name [Slave]. The fact that . . . it has become among ourselves a synonyme of servitude, does not of course determine its real meaning. Those who bear it, naturally dignify its import and themselves by assigning to it the signification of 'glory';—the Slavonians to themselves are, therefore, 'the glorious race.' But the truth seems to be, that 'Slava' in its primitive meaning, was nothing but 'speech,' and that the secondary notions of 'fama,' 'gloria,' followed from this, as it does in other tongues. ['If I know not the meaning of the voice, I shall be unto him that speaketh a barbarian, and he that speaketh shall be a barbarian unto me.' I. Corinthians, xiv. 11.]. . . . Slave or Slavonian was, therefore, nothing more than the gentile appellative, derived from the use of the national tongue, and intended as antithetical to 'foreigner.' In the ancient historic world, the Slaves played an insignificant part. Some have identified them with the Scythians of Herodotus. . . . Like the Celts, they seemed destined to be driven into corners in the old world."—J. G. Sheppard, *The Fall of Rome, lect.* 3.—See SLAVE: ORIGIN, &c.

—"The Wendic or Slav group [lingual] . . . came into Europe during the first five centuries of our era; it is divided into two great branches, Eastern and Western. The first includes Russian, Great Russian in West Central Russia; Little Russian, Rusniac, or Ruthene in the south of Russia and even into Austria, . . . Servian, Croatian, Slovenic, and Bulgarian, of which the most ancient form is to the whole group what Gothic is to the German dialects; modern Bulgarian is, on the contrary, very much altered. . . . The western branch covered from the 7th to the 9th century vast districts of Germany in which only German is now known: Pomerania, Mecklenburg, Brandenburg, Saxony, Western Bohemia, Austria, Styria, and Northern Carinthia. Though now much restricted, it can still boast numerous dialects; among others the Wendic of Lusatia, which is dying out, Tzech or Bohemian, which is very vigorous (ten millions), of which a variety, Slovac, is found in Hungary; lastly, Polish (ten millions)."—A. Lefèvre, *Race and Language, pp.* 239–240.—See, also: ARYANS; SARMATIA; and SCYTHIANS.

6-7th Centuries.—Migrations and settlements.—"The movements of the Avars in the sixth century [see AVARS] seem to have had much the same effect upon the Slaves which the movements of the Huns in the fourth century had upon the Teutons. . . . The Slaves seem to have been driven by the Turanian incursions in two directions; to the North-west and to the South-west. The North-western division gave rise to more than one European state, and their relations with Germany form an important part of the history of the Western Empire. These North-western Slaves do not become of importance till a little later. But the South-western division plays a great part in the history of the sixth and seventh centuries. . . . The Slaves play in the East, though less thoroughly and less brilliantly, the same part, half conquerors, half disciples, which the Teutons played in the West. During the sixth century they appear only as ravagers; in the seventh they appear as settlers. There seems no doubt that Heraclius encouraged Slavonic settlements south of the Danube, doubtless with a view to defence against the more dangerous Avars. . . . A number of Slavonic states thus arose in the lands north and east of the Hadriatic, as Servia, Chrobatia or Croatia, Carinthia. . . . Istria and

Dalmatia now became Slavonic, with the exception of the maritime cities, which, among many vicissitudes, clave to the Empire. . . . The Slaves pressed on into a large part of Macedonia and Greece, and, during the seventh and eighth centuries, the whole of those countries, except the fortified cities and a fringe along the coast, were practically cut off from the Empire. The name of Slavinia reached from the Danube to Peloponnêsos, leaving to the Empire only islands and detached points of coast from Venice round to Thessalonica. . . . The Slavonic occupation of Greece is a fact which must neither be forgotten nor exaggerated. It certainly did not amount to an extirpation of the Greek nation; but it certainly did amount to an occupation of a large part of the country, which was Hellenized afresh from those cities and districts which remained Greek or Roman."—E. A. Freeman, *Historical Geog. of Europe, ch.* 5, *sect.* 4.—See, also, BALKAN AND DANUBIAN STATES: 7TH CENTURY.

SLESWIG. See SCHLESWIG.

SLIDING SCALE OF CORN DUTIES. See TARIFF LEGISLATION (ENGLAND): A. D. 1815–1828; and 1842.

SLIVNITZA, Battle of (1885). See BALKAN AND DANUBIAN STATES: A. D. 1878–1886 (BULGARIA).

SLOBADYSSA, Battle of (1660). See POLAND: A. D. 1668–1696.

SLOVENES, The. See SLAVONIC PEOPLES.

SLUYS: A. D. 1587.—Siege and capture by the Spaniards. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1587–1588.

A. D. 1604.—Taken by Prince Maurice of Nassau. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1594–1609.

SLUYS, Battle of (1340).—Edward III. of England, sailing with 200 ships on his second expedition to France (see FRANCE: A. D. 1337–1360), found a French fleet of about equal numbers lying in wait for him in the harbor of Sluys. The English attacked, June 24, 1340, and with such success that almost the entire French fleet was taken or destroyed, and 25,000 to 30,000 men slain.—W. Warburton, *Edward III., pp.* 77–79.

ALSO IN: Sir J. Froissart, *Chronicles, (tr. by Johnes), v.* 1, *bk.* 1, *ch.* 50.

SMALKALDE, League of. See GERMANY: A. D. 1530–1532.

SMALL-POX, AND VACCINATION. See PLAGUE, ETC.: 6–13TH CENTURIES, and MEDICAL SCIENCE: 18TH CENTURY.

SMERWICK, Massacre of (1580). See IRELAND: A. D. 1559–1603.

SMITH, Captain John: American voyages and adventures. See VIRGINIA: A. D. 1607–1610, and 1609–1616; also, AMERICA: A. D. 1614–1615.

SMITH, Joseph, and the founding of Mormonism. See MORMONISM.

SMITH, Sir Sidney, and the siege of Acre. See FRANCE: A. D. 1798–1799 (AUGUST—AUGUST).

SMITH COLLEGE. See EDUCATION, MODERN: REFORMS, &C.: A. D. 1804–1891.

SMOLENSK, Battle of. See RUSSIA: A. D. 1812 (JUNE—SEPTEMBER).

SMYRNA: Turkish massacre of Christians (1821). See GREECE: A. D. 1821–1829.

SNAKE INDIANS, OR SHOSHONES, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: SHOSHONEAN FAMILY.

SNUFF-TAKERS, The. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1850.

SOBIESKI, John, King of Poland, A. D. 1674–1697, and his deliverance of Vienna. See POLAND: A. D. 1668–1696; and HUNGARY: A. D. 1668–1683.

SOBRAON, Battle of (1846). See INDIA: A. D. 1845–1849.

SOBRARBE, Kingdom of. See SPAIN: A. D. 1035–1258.

SOCAGE TENURE.—FREESOCAGE. See FEUDAL TENURES.

SOCIAL MOVEMENTS.

Communism.—Socialism.—Labor-organization.

Utopias, Ancient and Modern.—"Speculative Communism has a brilliant history. It begins about six hundred years before Christ with Phaleas of Chalcedon, whom Milton speaks of as the first to recommend the equalization of property in land. Plato favors Communism. In the fifth book of the 'Republic,' Socrates is made to advocate, not merely community of goods, but also community of wives and children. This was no after-dinner debauch in the groves of the Academy, as Milton too severely suggests. It was a logical conclusion from a mistaken premise. . . . The ideal aimed at was the unity of the State, whose pattern appears to have been partly Pythagorean, and partly Spartan. In regard to property, the formulated purpose was, not to abolish wealth, but to abolish poverty. In the 'Laws' (v. 13), Plato would allow to the richest citizen four times as much income as to the poorest. In regard to women, the aim was not sensual indulgence, but the propagation and rearing of the fittest offspring. This community of wives and children was for the ruling class only; not for the husbandmen, nor for the artificers. So also, probably, the community of goods. We say probably, for the scheme is not wrought out in all its details, and Plato himself had no hope of seeing his dream realized till kings are philosophers, or philosophers are kings. The echoes of this Platonic speculation have been loud and long. About the year 316 B. C., Evemerus, sent eastward by Cassander, King of Macedon, on a voyage of scientific discovery, reports in his 'Sacred History' the finding of an island which he calls Panchaia, the seat of a Republic, whose citizens were divided into the three classes of Priests, Husbandmen, and Soldiers; where all property was common; and all were happy. In 1516 Sir Thomas More published his 'Utopia;' evidently of Platonic inspiration. More also chose an island for his political and social Paradise. He had Crete in mind. His island, crescent-shaped, and 200 miles wide at the widest point, contained 54 cities. It

had community of goods, but not of women. The 'Civitas Solis' of Campanella, published in 1623, was in imitation perhaps of More's 'Utopia.' This City of the Sun stood on a mountain in Ceylon, under the equator, and had a community both of goods and of women. About the same time Lord Bacon amused himself by writing the 'New Atlantis,' a mere fragment, the porch of a building that was never finished. In the great ferment of Cromwell's time the 'Oceana' of Harrington appeared (1656); a book famous in its day, with high traditional repute ever since, but now seldom read except by the very few who feel themselves called upon to master the literature of the subject. Hallam pronounces it a dull, pedantic book; and nobody disputes the verdict. Harrington advocates a division of land, no one to have more than two thousand pounds' (ten thousand dollars') worth. The upshot of it all would be, a moderate aristocracy of the middle classes. Such books belong to a class by themselves, which may be called Poetico-Political; æsthetic, scholarly, humane, and hopeful. They are not addressed to the masses. If they make revolutions, it is only in the long run. They are not battles, nor half battles, but only the bright wild dreams of tired soldiers in the pauses of battles. Communistic books with iron in them . . . are not modern only, but recent. Modern Communism, now grown so surly and savage everywhere, began mildly enough. As a system, it is mostly French, name and all. The famous writers are Saint-Simon, Fourier, Considérant, Proudhon, Cabet, and Louis Blanc."—R. D. Hitchcock, *Socialism, pp.* 33–36.

Also in: M. Kaufmann, *Utopias.*

Definition of Terms: Socialism.—Communism.—Collectivism.—"As socialism has been most powerful and most studied on the Continent, it may be interesting to compare the definitions given by some leading French and German economists. The great German economist Roscher defines it as including 'those tendencies which demand a greater regard for the common weal than consists with human nature.' Adolf Held says that 'we may define as socialistic every tendency which demands the subordination of the individual will to the community.' Janet more precisely defines it as follows:—'We call socialism every doctrine which teaches that the State has a right to correct the inequality of wealth which exists among men, and to legally establish the balance by taking from those who have too much in order to give to those who have not enough, and that in a permanent manner, and not in such and such a particular case—a famine, for instance, a public calamity, etc.' Laveleye explains it thus: 'In the first place, every socialistic doctrine aims at introducing greater equality in social conditions; and in the second place at realising those reforms by the law or the State.' Von Scheel simply defines it as the 'economic philosophy of the suffering classes.'"—T. Kirkup, *A History of Socialism, introd.*—"The economic quintessence of the socialistic programme, the real aim of the international movement, is as follows. To replace the system of private capital (i. e. the speculative method of production, regulated on behalf of society only by the free competition of private enterprises) by a system of collective capital, that is, by a method of production which would introduce a unified (social or 'collective') organization of national labour, on the basis of collective or common ownership of the means of production by all the members of the society. This collective method of production would remove the present competitive system, by placing under official administration such departments of production as can be managed collectively (socially or co-operatively), as well as the distribution among all of the common produce of all, according to the amount and social utility of the productive labour of each. This represents in the shortest possible formula the aim of the socialism of to-day."—A. Schäffle, *The Quintessence of Socialism, pp.* 3–4.—"Socialism, . . . while it may admit the state's right of property over against another state, does away with all ownership, on the part of members of the state, of things that do not perish in the using, or of their own labor in creating material products. Its first and last policy is to prevent the acquisition or exclusive use of capital, by any person or association under the control of the state, with the exception, perhaps, of articles of luxury or enjoyment procured by the savings of wages. No savings can give rise to what is properly called capital, or means of production in private hands. . . . Communism, in its ordinary signification, is a system or form of common life, in which the right of private or family property is abolished by law, mutual consent, or vow. . . . Collectivism, which is now used by German as well as by French writers, denotes the condition of a community when its affairs, especially its industry, is managed in the collective way, instead of the method of separate, individual effort. It has, from its derivation, some advantages over the vague word socialism, which may include many varieties of associated or united life."—T. D. Woolsey, *Communism and Socialism, pp.* 1–8.

A. D. 1720-1800.—Origin of Trades Unions in England.—"A Trade Union, as we understand the term, is a continuous association of wage-earners for the purpose of maintaining or improving the conditions of their employment. . . . We have, by our definition, expressly excluded from our history any account of the innumerable instances in which the manual workers have formed ephemeral combinations against their social superiors. Strikes are as old as history itself. The ingenious seeker of historical parallels might, for instance, find in the revolt, B. C. 1490, of the Hebrew brickmakers in Egypt against being required to make bricks without straw, a curious precedent for the strike of the Stalybridge cotton-spinners, A. D. 1892, against the supply of bad material for their work. But we cannot seriously regard, as in any way analogous to the Trade Union Movement of to-day, the innumerable rebellions of subject races, the slave insurrections, and the semi-servile peasant revolts of which the annals of history are full. . . . When, however, we pass from the annals of slavery or serfdom to those of the nominally free citizenship of the mediæval town, we are on more debatable ground. We make no pretence to a thorough knowledge of English town-life in the Middle Ages. But it is clear that there were at all times, alongside of the independent master craftsmen, a number of hired journeymen, who are known to have occasionally combined against their rulers and governors. . . . After detailed consideration of every published instance of a journeyman's fraternity in England, we are fully

convinced that there is as yet no evidence of the existence of any such durable and independent combination of wage-earners against their employers during the Middle Ages. There are certain other cases in which associations, which are sometimes assumed to have been composed of journeymen maintained a continuous existence. But in all these cases the 'Bachelors' Company,' presumed to be a journeymen's fraternity, formed a subordinate department of the masters' gild, by the rulers of which it was governed. It will be obvious that associations in which the employers dispensed the funds and appointed the officers can bear no analogy to modern Trade Unions. The explanation of the tardy growth of stable combination among hired journeymen is, we believe, to be found in the prospects of economic advancement which the skilled handicraftsman still possessed. . . . The apprenticed journeyman in the skilled handicrafts belonged, until comparatively modern times, to the same social grade as his employer, and was, indeed, usually the son of a master in the same or an analogous trade. So long as industry was carried on mainly by small masters, each employing but one or two journeymen, the period of any energetic man's service as a hired wage-earner cannot normally have exceeded a few years. . . . Under such a system of industry the journeymen would possess the same prospects of economic advancement that hindered the growth of stable combinations in the ordinary handicrafts, and in this fact may lie the explanation of the striking absence of evidence of any Trade Unionism in the building trades right down to the end of the eighteenth century. When, however, the capitalist builder or contractor began to supersede the master mason, master plasterer, &c., and this class of small entrepreneurs had again to give place to a hierarchy of hired workers, Trade Unions, in the modern sense, began, as we shall see, to arise. We have dwelt at some length upon these ephemeral associations of wage-earners and on the journeymen fraternities of the Middle Ages, because it might plausibly be argued that they were in some sense the predecessors of the Trade Union. But strangely enough it is not in these institutions that the origin of Trade Unionism has usually been sought. For the predecessor of the modern Trade Union, men have turned, not to the mediæval associations of the wage-earners, but to those of their employers — that is to say, the Craft Gilds. . . . The supposed descent of the Trade Unions from the mediæval Craft Gild rests, as far as we have been able to discover, upon no evidence whatsoever. The historical proof is all the other way. In London, for instance, more than one Trade Union has preserved an unbroken existence from the eighteenth century. The Craft Gilds still exist in the City Companies, and at no point in their history do we find the slightest evidence of the branching off from them of independent journeymen's societies. . . . We have failed to discover, either in the innumerable trade pamphlets and broad-sheets of the time, or in the Journals of the House of Commons, any evidence of the existence, prior to 1700, of continuous associations of wage-earners for maintaining or improving the conditions of their employment. And when we remember that during the latter decades of the seventeenth century the employers of labour, and especially the industrial 'companies' or corporations, memorialised the House of Commons on every conceivable grievance which affected their particular trade, the absence of all complaints of workmen's combinations suggests to us that no such combinations existed. In the early years of the eighteenth century we find isolated complaints of combinations 'lately entered into' by the skilled workers in certain trades. As the century progresses we watch the gradual multiplication of these complaints, met by counter-accusations presented by organised bodies of workmen. . . . If we examine the evidence of the rise of combinations in particular trades, we see the Trade Union springing, not from any particular institution, but from every opportunity for the meeting together of wage-earners of the same trade. Adam Smith remarked that 'people of the same trade seldom meet together, even for merriment and diversion, but the conversation ends in a conspiracy against the public, or in some contrivance to raise prices.' And there is actual evidence of the rise of one of the oldest of the existing Trade Unions out of a gathering of the journeymen 'to take a social pint of porter together.' More often it is a tumultuous strike, out of which grows a permanent organisation. . . . If the trade is one in which the journeymen frequently travel in search of work, we note the slow elaboration of systematic arrangements for the relief of these 'tramps' by their fellow-workers in each town through which they pass, and the inevitable passage of this far-extending tramping society into a national Trade Union. . . . We find that at the beginning of the eighteenth century the typical journeyman tailor in London and Westminster had become a lifelong wage-earner. It is not surprising, therefore, that one of the earliest instances of permanent Trade Unionism that we have been able to discover occurs in this trade. The master tailors in 1720 complain to Parliament that 'the Journeymen Taylors in and about the Cities of London and Westminster, to the number of seven thousand and upwards, have lately entered into a combination to raise their wages and leave off working an hour sooner than they used to do; and for the better carrying on their design have subscribed their respective names in books prepared for that purpose, at the several houses of call or resort (being publick-houses in and about London and Westminster) where they use; and collect several considerable sums of money to defend any prosecutions against them.' Parliament listened to the masters' complaint, and passed the Act 7, Geo. I. st. 1, c. 13, restraining both the giving and the taking of wages in excess of a stated maximum, all combinations being prohibited. From that time forth the journeymen tailors of London and Westminster have remained in effective though sometimes informal combination, the organisation centring round the fifteen or twenty 'houses of call.'"—S. and B. Webb, *The History of Trade-Unionism, ch.* 1.

A. D. 1753-1797.—Mably, Morelly, and the conspiracy of Babœuf, in France.—"If Rousseau cannot be numbered among the communistic writers, strictly so called, two of his contemporaries, Mably and Morelly— the first more a dreamer, the second of a more practical spirit —deserve that title. . . . In the social theory of Mably, inequality of condition is the great evil in the world . . . Mably was a theorist who shrunk

back from the practical application of his own theories. The establishment of community of goods, and even of equality of fortunes, he dared not advocate. 'The evil,' he says, 'is too inveterate for the hope of a cure.' And so he advised half measures — agrarian laws fixing the maximum of landed estates, and sumptuary laws regulating expenses. . . . Morelly, whose principal works are a communistic poem, called 'The Basiliade' (1753) and 'The Code of Nature' (1755), is called by a French writer one of the most obscure authors of the last century. But he knew what he wanted, and had courage to tell it to others. . . . Morelly's power on subsequent opinion consists in his being the first to put dreams or theories into a code; from which shape it seemed easy to fanatical minds to carry it out into action. His starting-point is that men can be made good or evil by institutions. Private property, or avarice called out by it, is the source of all vice. 'Hence, where no property existed there would appear none of its pernicious consequences.'. . . In 1782, Brissot de Warville invented the phrase, used afterward by Proudhon, Propriété c'est le vol. . . . Twelve years afterward a war against the rich began, and such measures as a maximum of property and the abolition of the right to make a will were agitated. But the right of property prevailed, and grew stronger after each new revolution. In 1796 the conspiracy of the Equals, or, as it is generally called, of Babœuf, was the final and desperate measure of a portion of those Jacobins who had been stripped by the fall of Robespierre (in 1794) of political power. It was the last hope of the extreme revolutionists, for men were getting tired of agitations and wanted rest. This conspiracy seems to have been fomented by Jacobins in prison; and it is said that one of them, who was a believer in Morelly and had his work in his hands, expounded its doctrines to his fellow-prisoner Babœuf. When they were set at liberty by an amnesty law, there was a successful effort made to bring together the society or sect of the Equals; but it was found that they were not all of one mind. Babœuf was for thorough measures — for a community of goods and of labor, an equality of conditions and of comforts. . . . There was a secret committee of the society of the Equals, as well as an open society. The latter excited the suspicion of the Directory, and an order was given to suspend its sessions in the Pantheon (or Church of St. Geneviève). The order was executed by Bonaparte, then general of the army of the interior, who dispersed the members and put a seal on the doors of the place of meeting. Next the Equals won over a body of the police into their measures; and, when this force was disbanded by the Directory, the Equals established a committee of public safety. The committee was successful in bringing as many as sixty of the party of the mountain into their ranks, and an insurrection was projected. Seventeen thousand fighting men were calculated upon by the conspirators as at their disposal. But an officer of the army whom they had tried to bring into their plots denounced them to the Directory. The leading conspirators were arrested [1797]. Babœuf and Darthé suffered death, and five others were banished."— T. D. Woolsey, *Communism and Socialism, pp.* 97–104.

A. D. 1774-1875.— The Communities of the Shakers. See SHAKERS.

A. D. 1800-1824.— Robert Owen.— His experiments at New Lanark and his New Harmony Society.— "Whilst in France the hurricane of the Revolution swept over the land, in England a quieter, but not on that account less tremendous, revolution was going on. Steam and the new tool-making machinery were transforming manufacture into modern industry, and thus revolutionising the whole foundation of bourgeois society. . . . With constantly increasing swiftness the splitting-up of society into large capitalists and non-possessing proletarians went on. Between these, instead of the former stable middle-class, an unstable mass of artisans and small shopkeepers, the most fluctuating portion of the population, now led a precarious existence. The new mode of production was, as yet, only at the beginning of its period of ascent; as yet it was the normal, regular method of production — the only one possible under existing conditions. Nevertheless, even then it was producing crying social abuses. . . . At this juncture there came forward as a reformer a manufacturer 29 years old — a man of almost sublime, childlike simplicity of character, and at the same time one of the few born leaders of men. Robert Owen had adopted the teaching of the materialistic philosophers: that man's character is the product, on the one hand, of heredity, on the other, of the environment of the individual during his lifetime, and especially during his period of development. In the industrial revolution most of his class saw only chaos and confusion, and the opportunity of fishing in these troubled waters and making large fortunes quickly. He saw in it the opportunity of putting into practice his favourite theory, and so of bringing order out of chaos. He had already tried it with success, as superintendent of more than 500 men in a Manchester factory. From 1800 to 1829, he directed the great cotton mill at New Lanark, in Scotland, as managing partner, along the same lines, but with greater freedom of action and with a success that made him a European reputation. A population, originally consisting of the most diverse and, for the most part, very demoralised elements, a population that gradually grew to 2,500, he turned into a model colony, in which drunkenness, police, magistrates, lawsuits, poor laws, charity, were unknown. And all this simply by placing the people in conditions worthy of human beings, and especially by carefully bringing up the rising generation. He was the founder of infant schools, and introduced them first at New Lanark. . . . Whilst his competitors worked their people 13 or 14 hours a day, in New Lanark the working-day was only 10½ hours. When a crisis in cotton stopped work for four months, his workers received their full wages all the time. And with all this the business more than doubled in value, and to the last yielded large profits to its proprietors. In spite of all this, Owen was not content. The existence which he secured for his workers was, in his eyes, still far from being worthy of human beings. 'The people were slaves at my mercy.'. . . 'The working part of this population of 2,500 persons was daily producing as much real wealth for society as, less than half a century before, it would have required the working part of a population of 600,000 to create. I asked myself, what became of the difference between the wealth consumed

by 2,500 persons and that which would have been consumed by 600,000?' The answer was clear. It had been used to pay the proprietors of the establishment 5 per cent. on the capital they had laid out, in addition to over £300,000 clear profit. And that which held for New Lanark held to a still greater extent for all the factories in England. . . . The newly-created gigantic productive forces, hitherto used only to enrich individuals and to enslave the masses, offered to Owen the foundations for a reconstruction of society; they were destined, as the common property of all, to be worked for the common good of all. Owen's Communism was based upon this purely business foundation, the outcome, so to say, of commercial calculation. Throughout, it maintained this practical character."—F. Engels, *Socialism, Utopian and Scientific, pp.* 19–24. — Owen's projects "were received with applause at first. 'The Times' spoke of 'his enlightened zeal in the cause of humanity;' the Duke of Kent writes to Owen: 'I have a most sincere wish that a fair trial should be given to your system, of which I have never hesitated to acknowledge myself an admirer;' Lord Brougham sympathised with the propounder of this social scheme; the judicial philosopher Bentham became actually a temporary ally of the 'wilful Welshman;' a committee was appointed, including Ricardo and Sir R. Peel, who recommended Owen's scheme to be tried; it was taken up by the British and Foreign Philanthropic Society for the permanent relief of the working-classes; it was actually presented to Parliament with petitions humbly praying that a Committee of the House might be appointed to visit and report on New Lanark. But the motion was lost. The temporary enthusiasm cooled down. . . . Contemporaneously with royal speeches alluding to the prosperity of trade, and congratulations as to the flourishing appearance of town and country, the voice of Owen is silenced with his declining popularity. It must be remembered also that he had by this time justly incurred the displeasure of the religious public, by the bold and unnecessarily harsh expressions of his ethical and religious convictions. Those who could distinguish the man from his method, who were fully aware of his generous philanthropy, purity of private life, and contempt of personal advancement, could make allowance for his rash assertions. The rest, however, turned away with pious horror or silent contempt from one who so fiercely attacked positive creeds, and appeared unnecessarily vehement in his denial of moral responsibility. Owen set his face to the West, and sought new adherents in America, where he founded [1824] a 'Preliminary Society' in 'New Harmony' [see below: A. D. 1805–1824], which was to be the nucleus of his future society. . . . In the following year Owen agreed to a change in the constitution, in favour of communism, under the title of the 'New Harmony Community of Equality.' The settlement enjoyed a temporary prosperity, but soon showed signs of decay, and Owen was destined to meet with as many trials in the new as he had encountered discouragements in the old world." — M. Kaufmann, *Utopias, ch.* 6.

Also in: W. L. Sargant, *Robert Owen and his Social Philosophy.— Life of Robert Owen (anon.).*

A. D. 1800-1875.—Struggle of the Trades Unions in England for a legal existence.— During the 18th century, "the employers succeeded in passing a whole series of laws, some of them of Draconian severity, designed to suppress combinations of working men. In England they are called the Combination Laws, and culminated in the Act of 40 George III., c. 106, which was passed in 1800 in response to a petition from the employers. It made all trade combinations illegal. . . . The result of this law, which was expressly designed to put an end to strikes altogether, is an instructive example of the usual effect of such measures. The workmen's associations, which had frequently hitherto been formed quite openly, became secret, while they spread through the length and breadth of England. The time when the books of the Union were concealed on the moors, and an oath of secrecy was exacted from its members, is still a living tradition in labour circles. It was a time when the hatred of the workers towards the upper classes and the legislature flourished luxuriantly, while the younger generation of working men who had grown up under the shadow of repressive legislation, became the pillars of the revolutionary Chartist movement. The old struggle against capital assumed a more violent character. . . . It was the patent failure of the Combination Laws which gave the stimulus to the suggestion of repeal soon after 1820," and the repeal was accomplished by the Act of 1824. "The immediate consequence of this Act was the outbreak of a number of somewhat serious strikes. The general public then took fright, and thus the real struggle for the right of combination began after it had received legal recognition. In 1825, the employers rallied and demanded the re-enactment of the earlier laws on the ground that Parliament had carried their repeal with undue precipitation. . . . The Act of 1825 which repealed that of the previous year, was a compromise in which the opponents of free combination had gained the upper hand. But they had been frustrated in their attempt to stamp out the Unions with all the rigour of the law, for the champions of the Act of 1824 were in a position to demonstrate that the recognition of combination had already done something to improve the relations between capital and labour. It had at least done away with that secrecy which in itself constituted a danger to the State; and now that the Unions were openly avowed, their methods had become less violent. Nevertheless, the influence of the manufacturers strongly predominated in framing the Bill. . . . The only advance on the state of things previous to 1824 which had been secured was the fundamental point that a combination of working men was not in itself illegal — though almost any action which could rise out of such a combination was prohibited. Yet it was under the Act of 1825 that the Trade Unions grew and attained to that important position in which we find them at the beginning of the seventies. Here was emphatically a movement which the law might force into illegal channels, but could not suppress. . . . The most serious danger that the Trade Unions encountered was in the course of the sixties. Under the leadership of one Broadhead, certain Sheffield Unions had entered on a course of criminal intimidation of non-members. The general public took their action as indicating the spirit of Trade Unions generally. In point of fact, the workmen employed in the

Sheffield trade were in a wholly exceptional position. . . . But both in Parliament and the Press it was declared that the occurrences at Sheffield called for more stringent legislation and the suppression of combinations of working men. . . . But times had changed since 1825. The Unions themselves called for the most searching inquiry into their circumstances and methods, which would, they declared, prove that they were in no way implicated in such crimes as had been committed in Sheffield. The impulse given by Thomas Carlyle had raised powerful defenders for the workmen, first among whom we may mention the positivist Frederic Harrison, and Thomas Hughes, the co-operator. . . . The preliminaries to the appointment of the Commission of 1867 revealed a change in the attitude of the employers, especially the more influential of them, which marked an enormous advance on the debates of 1824 and 1825. . . . The investigation of the Commission of 1867–1869 were of a most searching character, and their results are contained in eleven reports. The Unions came well through the ordeal, and it was shown that the outrages had been confined to a few Unions, for the most part of minor importance. It further appeared that where no combination existed the relations between employers and hands were not more friendly, while the position of the workers was worse and in some cases quite desperate. The report led up to proposals for the legislation of Trade Unions, and to the legislation of 1871–1876, which was supported by many influential employers. The attitude of Parliament had changed with amazing rapidity. . . . The Trade Union Acts of 1871 and 1876 give all Unions, on condition that they register their rules, the same rights as were already enjoyed by the Friendly Societies in virtue of earlier legislation, i. e. the rights of legal personality. They can sue and be sued, possess real and personal estate, and can proceed summarily against their officers for fraudulent conduct. They also possess facilities for the transfer of investments to new trustees. The Act of 1871 was extended by that of 1876, framed expressly with the concurrence of the Trade Union leaders. . . . The working men, now that they are left to conduct their meetings in any way they choose, have gradually developed that sober and methodical procedure which amazes the Continental observer. . . . At Common Law, any action of Trade Unionists to raise wages seemed liable to punishment as conspiracy, on the ground that it was directed against the common weal. The course run by the actual prosecutions did, indeed, prevent this doctrine from ever receiving the sanction of a sentence expressly founded on it; but it gathered in ever heavier thunders over the heads of the Unions, and its very vagueness gave it the appearance of a deliberate persecution of one class of society in the interests of another. The Act of 1871 first brought within definite limits the extreme penalties that could be enforced against Trade Unionists either at Statute or Common Law. . . . By the Conspiracy and Protection of Property Act of 1875 the workmen's economic aims were at last recognised on precisely the same footing as those of other citizens."—G. von Schulze-Gaevernitz, *Social Peace, pp.* 86–102.

Also in: Le Comte de Paris, *The Trades' Unions of England.*—W. Trant, *Trade Unions.*—*National Association for the Promotion of Social Science, Rep't of Committee on Societies and Strikes,* 1860.

A. D. 1805-1827.—George Rapp and the Harmony Society.—Robert Owen and the Community at New Harmony.—The "Harmony Society" was first settled in Pennsylvania, on a tract of land about twenty five miles north of Pittsburgh, in 1805, by George Rapp, the leader of a religious congregation in Germany which suffered persecution there and sought greater freedom in America. From the beginning, they agreed "to throw all their possessions into a common fund, to adopt a uniform and simple dress and style of house; to keep thenceforth all things in common; and to labor for the common good of the whole body. . . . At this time they still lived in families, and encouraged, or at any rate did not discourage, marriage." But in 1807 they became persuaded that "it was best to cease to live in the married state. . . . Thenceforth no more marriages were contracted . . . , and no more children were born. A certain number of the younger people, feeling no vocation for a celibate life, at this time withdrew from the society." In 1814 and 1815 the society sold its property in Pennsylvania and removed to a new home in Posey County, Indiana, on the Wabash, where 30,000 acres of land were bought for it. The new settlement received the name of "Harmony." But this in its turn was sold, in 1824, to Robert Owen, for his New Lanark colony, which he planted there, under the name of the "New Harmony Community," and the Rappists returned eastward, to establish themselves at a lovely spot on the Ohio, where their well-known village called "Economy" was built. "Once it was a busy place, for it had cotton, silk, and woolen factories, a brewery, and other industries; but the most important of these have now [1874] ceased. . . . Its large factories are closed, for its people are too few to man them; and the members [numbering 110 in 1874, mostly aged] think it wiser and more comfortable for themselves to employ labor at a distance from their own town. They are pecuniarily interested in coal-mines, in saw-mills, and oil-wells; and they control manufactories at Beaver Falls—notably a cutlery shop. . . . The society is reported to be worth from two to three millions of dollars."—C. Nordhoff, *The Communistic Societies of the U. S., pp.* 63–91.—At the settlement in Indiana, "on the departure of the Rappites, persons favorable to Mr. Owen's views came flocking to New Harmony (as it was thenceforth called) from all parts of the country. Tidings of the new social experiment spread far and wide. . . . In the short space of six weeks from the commencement of the experiment, a population of 800 persons was drawn together, and in October 1825, the number had increased to 900." At the end of two years, in June, 1827, Mr. Owen seems to have given up the experiment and departed from New Harmony. "After his departure the majority of the population also removed and scattered about the country. Those who remained returned to individualism, and settled as farmers and mechanics in the ordinary way. One portion of the estate was owned by Mr. Owen, and the other by Mr. Maclure. They sold, rented, or gave away the houses and lands, and their heirs and assigns have continued to do so."—J. H. Noyes, *Hist. of American Socialisms, ch.* 4.

A. D. 1816-1886.—The modern Co-operative movement in England.—"The co-operative idea as applied to industry existed in the latter part of the last century. Ambelakia was almost a co-operative town, as may be read in David Urquhart's 'Turkey and its Resources.' So vast a municipal partnership of industry has never existed since. The fishers on the Cornish coast carried out co-operation on the sea, and the miners of Cumberland dug ore on the principle of sharing the profits. The plan has been productive of contentment and advantage. Gruyère is a co-operative cheese, being formerly made in the Jura mountains, where the profits were equitably divided among the makers. In 1777, as Dr. Langford relates in his 'Century of Birmingham Life,' the tailors of that enterprising town set up a co-operative workshop, which is the earliest in English record. In France an attempt was made by Babœuf in 1796, to establish a despotism of justice and equality by violence, after the manner of Richelieu, whose policy taught the French revolutionists that force might be a remedy. . . . Contemporaneous with the French revolutionists we had Shute Barrington, Bishop of Durham, who surpassed all other bishops in human sympathy and social sagacity. He established at Mongewell, in Oxfordshire, the first known co-operative store; and he, Count Rumford, and Sir Thomas Bernard published in 1795, and for many years after, plans of co-operative and social life, far exceeding in variety and thoroughness any in the minds of persons now living. 'The only apostle of the social state in England at the beginning of this century,' Harriet Martineau testifies, 'was Robert Owen,' and to him we owe the co-operation of to-day. With him it took the shape of a despotism of philanthropy. . . . The amazing arrangements Mr. Owen made at his New Lanark Mills for educating his workpeople, and the large amount of profit which he expended upon their personal comforts, have had no imitators except Godin of Guise, whose palaces of industry are to-day the wonder of all visitors. Owen, like Godin, knew how to make manufacturing generosity pay. . . . It was here that Mr. Owen set up a co-operative store on the primitive plan of buying goods and provisions wholesale and selling them to the workmen's families at cost price, he giving storerooms and paying for the management, to the greater advantage of the industrial purchasers. The benefit which the Lanark weavers enjoyed in being able to buy retail at wholesale prices was soon noised abroad, and clever workmen elsewhere began to form stores to supply their families in the same way. The earliest instance of this is the Economical Society of Sheerness, commenced in 1816, and which is still doing business in the same premises and also in adjacent ones lately erected. . . . These practical co-operative societies with economical objects gradually extended themselves over the land, Mr. Owen with splendid generosity, giving costly publicity to his successes, that others might profit likewise according to their means. His remarkable manufacturing gains set workmen thinking that they might do something in the same way. . . . The co-operative stores now changed their plan. They sold retail at shop charges, and saved the difference between retail and cost price as a fund with which to commence co-operative workshops. In 1830 from 300 to 400 co-operative stores had been set up in England. There are records of 250 existing, cited in the 'History of Co-operation in England.'. . . The Rochdale Society of 1844 was the first which adopted the principle of giving the shareholders 5 per cent. only, and dividing the remaining profit among the customers. There is a recorded instance of this being done in Huddersfield in 1827, but no practical effect arose, and no propagandism of the plan was attempted until the Rochdale co-operators devised the scheme of their own accord, and applied it. They began under the idea of saving money for community purposes and establishing co-operative workshops. For this purpose they advised their members to leave their savings in the store at 5 per cent. interest; and with a view to get secular education, of which there was little to be had in those days, and under the impression that stupidity was against them, they set apart 2½ per cent. of their profits for the purpose of instruction, education, and propagandism. By selling at retail prices they not only acquired funds, but they avoided the imputation of underselling their neighbours, which they had the good sense and good feeling to dislike. They intended to live, but their principle was 'to let live.' By encouraging members to save their dividends in order to accumulate capital, they taught them habits of thrift. By refusing to sell on credit they made no losses; they incurred no expenses in keeping books, and they taught the working classes around them, for the first time, to live without falling into debt. This scheme of equity, thrift, and education constitutes what is called the 'Rochdale plan.' . . . The subsequent development of co-operation has been greatly due to the interest which Professor Maurice, Canon Kingsley, Mr. Vansittart Neale, Mr. Thomas Hughes, and Mr. J. M. Ludlow took in it. They promoted successive improvements in the law which gave the stores legal protection, and enabled them to become bankers, to hold land, and allow their members to increase their savings to £200. . . . The members of co-operative societies of the Rochdale type now exceed 900,000, and receive more than 2½ millions of profit annually. There are 1,200 stores in operation, which do a business of nearly 30 millions a year, and own share capital of 8 millions. The transactions of their Co-operative Bank at Manchester amount to 16 millions annually. The societies devote to education £22,000 a year out of their profits, and many societies expend important sums for the same purpose, which is not formally recorded in their returns. In the twenty-five years from 1861 to 1886 the co-operators have done business of upwards of 361 millions, and have made for working people a profit of 30 millions. . . . Co-operation in other countries bears no comparison with its rise and progress in England. The French excel in co-operative workshops, the Germans in co-operative banks, England in the organisation of stores. No country has succeeded yet with all three. Italy excels even Germany in co-operative banks. It has, too, some remarkable distributive societies, selling commodities at cost prices, and is now beginning stores on the Rochdale plan. France has many distributive stores, and is likely to introduce the Rochdale type. . . . America . . . is likely to excel in industrial partnerships, and is introducing the English system of co-operation."—G. J.

Holyoake, *The Growth of Co-operation in England* (*Fortnightly Rev., August* 1, 1887).—The "Christian Socialism" which arose in England about 1850, under the influence of Frederick D. Maurice, Charles Kingsley, Thomas Hughes, identified itself practically with the co-operative movement. — R. T. Ely, *French and German Socialism, pp.* 249–251.

ALSO IN: G. J. Holyoake, *Hist. of Co-operation in England.*—The same, *Hist. of the Rochdale Pioneers.*—B. Jones, *Co-operative Production.*

A. D. 1817-1825.—Saint Simon and Saint Simonism.—"Comte Henri de Saint-Simon, the founder of French socialism, was born at Paris in 1760. He belonged to a younger branch of the family of the celebrated duke of that name. His education, he tells us, was directed by D'Alembert. At the age of nineteen he went as volunteer to assist the American colonies in their revolt against Britain. . . . It was not till 1817 that he began, in a treatise entitled 'L'Industrie,' to propound his socialistic views, which he further developed in 'L'Organisateur' (1819), 'Du Système industriel' (1821), 'Catechisme des Industriels' (1823). The last and most important expression of his views is the 'Nouveau Christianisme' (1825). For many years before his death in 1825 Saint-Simon had been reduced to the greatest straits. He was obliged to accept a laborious post for a salary of £40 a year, to live on the generosity of a former valet, and finally to solicit a small pension from his family. In 1823 he attempted suicide in despair. It was not till very late in his career that he attached to himself a few ardent disciples. As a thinker Saint-Simon was entirely deficient in system, clearness, and consecutive strength. His writings are largely made up of a few ideas continually repeated. But his speculations are always ingenious and original; and he has unquestionably exercised great influence on modern thought, both as the historic founder of French socialism and as suggesting much of what was afterwards elaborated into Comtism. . . . His opinions were conditioned by the French Revolution and by the feudal and military system still prevalent in France. In opposition to the destructive liberalism of the Revolution he insisted on the necessity of a new and positive re-organisation of society. So far was he from advocating social revolt that he appealed to Louis XVIII. to inaugurate the new order of things. In opposition, however, to the feudal and military system, the former aspect of which had been strengthened by the Restoration, he advocated an arrangement by which the industrial chiefs should control society. In place of the Mediæval Church, the spiritual direction of society should fall to the men of science. What Saint-Simon desired, therefore, was an industrialist State directed by modern science. The men who are best fitted to organise society for productive labour are entitled to bear rule in it. The social aim is to produce things useful to life; the final end of social activity is 'the exploitation of the globe by association.' The contrast between labour and capital, so much emphasised by later socialism, is not present to Saint-Simon, but it is assumed that the industrial chiefs, to whom the control of production is to be committed, shall rule in the interest of society. Later on, the cause of the poor receives greater attention, till in his greatest work, 'The New Christianity,' it becomes the central point of his teaching, and takes the form of a religion. It was this religious development of his teaching that occasioned his final quarrel with Comte. Previous to the publication of the 'Nouveau Christianisme' Saint-Simon had not concerned himself with theology. Here he starts from a belief in God, and his object in the treatise is to reduce Christianity to its simple and essential elements. . . . During his lifetime the views of Saint-Simon had little influence, and he left only a very few devoted disciples, who continued to advocate the doctrines of their master, whom they revered as a prophet. . . . The school of Saint-Simon insists strongly on the claims of merit; they advocate a social hierarchy in which each man shall be placed according to his capacity and rewarded according to his works. This is, indeed, a most special and pronounced feature of the Saint-Simon Socialism, whose theory of government is a kind of spiritual or scientific autocracy. . . . With regard to the family and the relation of the sexes the school of Saint-Simon advocated the complete emancipation of woman and her entire equality with man."—T. Kirkup, *A History of Socialism, ch.* 2.

A. D. 1832-1847.—Fourier and Fourierism.—"Almost contemporaneously with St. Simon [see above: A. D. 1817–1825] another Frenchman, Charles Fourier, was elaborating a different and, in the opinion of Mill, a more workable scheme of social renovation on Socialistic lines. The work, indeed, in which Fourier's main ideas are embodied, called the 'Théorie des quatre Mouvements,' was published in 1808, long before St. Simon had given his views to the world, but it received no attention until after the discredit of the St. Simonian scheme, beginning in 1832. Association is the central word of Fourier's as of St. Simon's industrial system. Associated groups of from 1,600 to 2,000 persons are to cultivate a square league of ground called the Phalange, or phalanx; and are likewise to carry on all other kinds of industry which may be necessary. The individuals are to live together in one pile of buildings, called the Phalanstery, in order to economize in buildings, in domestic arrangements, cooking, etc., and to reduce distributors' profits; they may eat at a common table or not, as seems good to them: that is, they have life in common, and a good deal in each other's sight; they do not work in common more than is necessary under the existing system; and there is not a community of property. Neither private property, nor inheritance, is abolished. In the division of the produce of industry, after a minimum sufficient for bare subsistence has been assigned to each one, the surplus, deducting the capital necessary for future operations, is to be divided amongst the three great interests of Labour, Capital, and Talent, in the respective proportions of five-twelfths, four-twelfths, and three-twelfths. Individuals, according to their several tastes or aptitudes, may attach themselves to more than one of the numerous groups of labourers within each association. Every one must work; useless things will not be produced; parasitic or unnecessary work, such as the work of agents, distributors, middlemen generally, will not exist in the phalanstery; from all which the Fourierist argues that no one need work excessively. Nor need the work be disagreeable. On the contrary, Fourier has discovered the secret of

making labour attractive. Few kinds of labour are intrinsically disagreeable; and if any is unpleasant, it is mostly because it is monotonous or too long continued. On Fourier's plan the monotony will vanish, and none need work to excess. Even work regarded as intrinsically repugnant ceases to be so when it is not regarded as dishonourable, or when it absolutely must be done. But should it be thought otherwise, there is one way of compensating such work in the phalanstery — let those who perform it be paid higher than other workers, and let them vary it with work more agreeable, as they will have opportunity of doing in the new community."—W. Graham, *Socialism, New and Old, pp.* 98–100.— Fourier died in 1837. After his death the leadership of his disciples, who were still few in number, devolved upon M. Considérant, the editor of 'La Phalange,' a journal which had been started during the previous year for the advocacy of the doctrines of the school. "The activity of the disciples continued unabated. Every anniversary of the birthday of the founder they celebrated by a public dinner. In 1838 the number of guests was only 90; in the following year they had increased to 200; and they afterwards rose to more than 1,000. Every anniversary of his death they visited his grave at the cemetery of Montmartre, and decorated it with wreaths of immortelles. Upon these solemn occasions representatives assembled from all parts of the world, and testified by their presence to the faith they had embraced. In January, 1839, the Librairie Sociale, in the Rue de l' Ecole de Medicine, was established, and the works of Fourier and his disciples, with those of other socialist writers, obtained a large circulation. . . . In 1840 'La Phalange,' began to appear, as a regular newspaper, three times a week. . . . Some of its principles began to exercise a powerful influence. Several newspapers in Paris, and throughout the country, demanded social revolution rather than political agitation. The cries of 'Organisation du Travail,' 'Droit au Travail,' that were now beginning to be heard so frequently in after-dinner toasts, and in the mouths of the populace, were traced back to Fourier. Cabet had already published his 'Voyage en Icarie'; Louis Blanc was writing in 'La Revue du Progrès,' and many other shades of socialism and communism were springing into existence, and eagerly competing for public favour. . . . M. Schneider communicated the theory to his countrymen in Germany, in 1837. The knowledge was farther extended in a series of newspaper articles by M. Gatzkow, in 1842; and separate works treating of the subject were subsequently published by M. Stein and M. Loose. In Spain, it found an active disciple in Don Joachin Abreu; and a plan for realisation was laid before the Regent by Don Manuel de Beloy. In England, Mr. Hugh Doherty was already advocating it in the 'Morning Star.' In 1841, his paper appeared with the new name of 'London Phalanx'; and it was announced that thousands of pounds, and thousands of acres, were at the disposal of the disciples. The Communists of the school of Owen received the new opinions favourably, and wished them every success in their undertaking. In America, Fourier soon obtained followers; the doctrine seems to have been introduced by M. Jean Manesca, who was the secretary of a phalansterian society, established in New York so early as 1838. In 1840, no less than 50 German families started from New York, under the leadership of MM. Gaertner and Hempel, both Fourierists, to establish a colony in Texas. They seem to have prospered for a time at least, for their numbers subsequently rose to 200,000. In October of the same year, the first number of the 'Phalanx' appeared at Buffalo, in New York State. Mr. Albert Brisbane, who had recently returned from Paris, had just published a work on the 'Social Destiny of Man,' which is, to a great extent, an abridgment of M. Considérant's 'Destinée Sociale.' He became the editor of the 'Future,' which replaced the 'Phalanx,' and was published at New York. This paper obtained but a small circulation, and Mr. Brisbane thought it advisable to discontinue it, and, in its stead, to purchase a column in the 'New York Tribune.' . . . When Mr. Brisbane began his propaganda, there was a 'Society of Friends of Progress' in existence in Boston. It included among its members some of the most eminent men in the intellectual capital of the New World. . . . A paper called the 'Dial' was started, to which Emerson, Parker, and Margaret Fuller contributed. Their object was to advocate a community upon the principles of Fourier, but so modified as to suit their own peculiar views. The result was the acquisition of Brook Farm. . . . But the influence of Mr. Brisbane was not limited to indirectly inspiring these eccentric experiments. It was said that in New York alone, in 1843, there were three newspapers reflecting the opinions of Fourier, and no less than forty throughout the rest of the States. Besides this, many reviews were occupied in discussing them. The first association in America to call itself a phalanx was Sylvania. It was begun in October, 1843, and lasted for about a year and a half. There were 150 members, and Mr. Horace Greeley's name appears among the list of its officers; it consisted of 2,300 acres in Pennsylvania. . . . There were thirty-four undertaken during the Fourier excitement, but of these we have complete statistics of only fourteen. . . . The years 1846–7 proved fatal to most of them. Indeed, Mr. Brisbane acknowledged in July, 1847, that only three then survived."— A. J. Booth, *Fourier* (*Fortnightly Rev., Dec.,* 1872). — "Horace Greeley, under date of July 1847, wrote to the 'People's Journal' the following. 'As to the Associationists (by their adversaries termed "Fourierites"), with whom I am proud to be numbered, their beginnings are yet too recent to justify me in asking for their history any considerable space in your columns. Briefly, however, the first that was heard in this country of Fourier and his views (beyond a little circle of perhaps a hundred persons in two or three of our large cities, who had picked up some notion of them in France or from French writings), was in 1840, when Albert Brisbane published his first synopsis of Fourier's theory of industrial and household Association. Since then the subject has been considerably discussed, and several attempts of some sort have been made to actualize Fourier's ideas, generally by men destitute alike of capacity, public confidence, energy and means. In only one instance that I have heard of was the land paid for on which the enterprise commenced; not one of these vaunted "Fourier Associations" ever had the means of erecting a proper dwelling for so

many as three hundred people, even if the land had been given them. Of course the time for paying the first installment on the mortgage covering their land has generally witnessed the dissipation of their sanguine dreams. Yet there are at least three of these embryo Associations still in existence; and, as each of these is in its third or fourth year, they may be supposed to give some promise of vitality. They are the North American Phalanx, near Leedsville, New Jersey; the Trumbull Phalanx, near Braceville, Ohio; and the Wisconsin Phalanx, Ceresco, Wisconsin. Each of these has a considerable domain nearly or wholly paid for, is improving the soil, increasing its annual products, and establishing some branches of manufactures. Each, though far enough from being a perfect Association, is animated with the hope of becoming one, as rapidly as experience, time and means will allow.' Of the three Phalanxes thus mentioned as the rear-guard of Fourierism, one — the Trumbull—disappeared about four months afterward (very nearly at the time of the dispersion of Brook Farm), and another — the Wisconsin — lasted only a year longer, leaving the North American alone for the last four years of its existence."—J. H. Noyes, *History of American Socialisms, ch.* 40.

Also in: R. Brisbane: *Albert Brisbane; a Mental Biography.*

A. D. 1839-1894.—Proudhon and his doctrines of Anarchism.—The Individualistic and Communistic Anarchists of the present generation.—"Of the Socialistic thinkers who serve as a kind of link between the Utopists and the school of the Socialism of historical evolution, or scientific Socialists, by far the most noteworthy figure is Proudhon, who was born at Besançon in 1809. By birth he belonged to the working class, his father being a brewer's cooper, and he himself as a youth followed the occupation of cowherding. In 1838, however, he published an essay on general grammar, and in 1839 he gained a scholarship to be held for three years, a gift of one Madame Suard to his native town. The result of this advantage was his most important though far from his most voluminous work, published the same year as the essay which Madame Suard's scholars were bound to write: it bore the title of 'What is Property?' (Qu' est-ce que la propriété?) his answer being Property is Robbery (La propriété est le vol). As may be imagined, this remarkable essay caused much stir and indignation, and Proudhon was censured by the Besançon Academy for its production, narrowly escaping a prosecution. In 1841 he was tried at Besançon for a letter he wrote to Victor Considérant, the Fourierist, but was acquitted. In 1846 he wrote his 'Philosophie de la Misère' (Philosophy of Poverty), which received an elaborate reply and refutation from Karl Marx. In 1847 he went to Paris. In the Revolution of 1848 he showed himself a vigorous controversialist, and was elected Deputy for the Seine. . . . After the failure of the revolution of '48, Proudhon was imprisoned for three years, during which time he married a young woman of the working class. In 1858 he fully developed his system of 'Mutualism' in his last work, entitled 'Justice in the Revolution and the Church.' In consequence of the publication of this book he had to retire to Brussels, but was amnestied in 1860, came back to France and died at Passy in 1865."—W. Morris and E. B. Bax, *Socialism, its Growth and Outcome, ch.* 18.—"In anarchism we have the extreme antithesis of socialism and communism. The socialist desires so to extend the sphere of the state that it shall embrace all the more important concerns of life. The communist, at least of the older school, would make the sway of authority and the routine which follows therefrom universal. The anarchist, on the other hand, would banish all forms of authority and have only a system of the most perfect liberty. The anarchist is an extreme individualist. . . . Anarchism, as a social theory, was first elaborately formulated by Proudhon. In the first part of his work, 'What is Property?' he briefly stated the doctrine and gave it the name 'anarchy,' absence of a master or sovereign. In that connection he said: 'In a given society the authority of man over man is inversely proportional to the stage of intellectual development which that society has reached. . . . Property and royalty have been crumbling to pieces ever since the world began. As man seeks justice in equality, so society seeks order in anarchy.' About twelve years before Proudhon published his views Josiah Warren reached similar conclusions in America. But as the Frenchman possessed the originality necessary to the construction of a social philosophy, we must regard him as altogether the chief authority upon scientific anarchism. . . . Proudhon's social ideal was that of perfect individual liberty. Those who have thought him a communist or socialist have wholly mistaken his meaning. . . . Proudhon believed that if the state in all its departments were abolished, if authority were eradicated from society, and if the principle of laissez faire were made universal in its operation, every form of social ill would disappear. According to his views men are wicked and ignorant because, either directly or indirectly, they have been forced to be so: it is because they have been subjected to the will of another, or are able to transfer the evil results of their acts to another. If the individual, after reaching the age of discretion, could be freed from repression and compulsion in every form and know that he alone is responsible for his acts and must bear their consequences, he would become thrifty, prudent, energetic; in short he would always see and follow his highest interests. He would always respect the rights of others; that is, act justly. Such individuals could carry on all the great industrial enterprises of to-day either separately or by voluntary association. No compulsion, however, could be used to force one to fulfil a contract or remain in an association longer than his interest dictated. Thus we should have a perfectly free play of enlightened self-interests: equitable competition, the only natural form of social organization. . . . Proudhon's theory is the sum and substance of scientific anarchism. How closely have the American anarchists adhered to the teachings of their master? One group, with its centre at Boston and with branch associations in a few other cities, is composed of faithful disciples of Proudhon. They believe that he is the leading thinker among those who have found the source of evil in society and the remedy therefor. They accept his analysis of social phenomena and follow his lead generally, though not implicitly. They call themselves Individualistic Anarchists, and claim to

be the only class who are entitled to that name. They do not attempt to organize very much, but rely upon 'active individuals, working here and there all over the country.' It is supposed that they may number in all some five thousand adherents in the United States. . . . They, like Proudhon, consider the government of the United States to be as oppressive and worthless as any of the European monarchies. Liberty prevails here no more than there. In some respects the system of majority rule is more obnoxious than that of monarchy. It is quite as tyrannical, and in a republic it is more difficult to reach the source of the despotism and remove it. They regard the entire machinery of elections as worthless and a hindrance to prosperity. They are opposed to political machines of all kinds. They never vote or perform the duties of citizens in any way, if it can be avoided. . . . Concerning the family relation, the anarchists believe that civil marriage should be abolished and 'autonomistic' marriage substituted. This means that the contracting parties should agree to live together as long as it seems best to do so, and that the partnership should be dissolved whenever either one desires it. Still, they would give the freest possible play to love and honor as restraining motives. . . . The Individualistic Anarchists . . . profess to have very little in common with the Internationalists. The latter are Communistic Anarchists. They borrow their analysis of existing social conditions from Marx, or more accurately from the 'communistic manifesto' issued by Marx and Engels in 1847. In the old International Workingman's association they constituted the left wing, which, with its leader, Bakunine, was expelled in 1872. Later the followers of Marx, the socialists proper, disbanded, and since 1883 the International in this country has been controlled wholly by the anarchists. Their views and methods are similar to those which Bakunine wished to carry out by means of his Universal Alliance, and which exist more or less definitely in the minds of Russian Nihilists. Like Bakunine, they desire to organize an international revolutionary movement of the laboring classes, to maintain it by means of conspiracy and, as soon as possible, to bring about a general insurrection. In this way, with the help of explosives, poisons and murderous weapons of all kinds, they hope to destroy all existing institutions, ecclesiastical, civil and economic. Upon the smoking ruins they will erect the new and perfect society. Only a few weeks or months will be necessary to make the transition. During that time the laborers will take possession of all lands, buildings, instruments of production and distribution. With these in their possession, and without the interposition of government, they will organize into associations or groups for the purpose of carrying on the work of society."—H. L. Osgood, *Scientific Anarchism* (*Political Science Quarterly, March*, 1889).

ALSO IN: F. Dubois, *The Anarchist Peril.*

A. D. 1840-1848.—Louis Blanc and his scheme of State-aided Co-operation.—"St. Simonism would destroy individual liberty, would weight the State with endless responsibilities, and the whole details of production, distribution, and transportation. It would besides be a despotism if it could be carried out, and not a beneficent despotism, considering the weakness and imperfection of men. So objected Louis Blanc to St. Simonism, in his 'Organisation du Travail' (1840), whilst bringing forward a scheme of his own, which, he contends, would be at once simple, immediately applicable, and of indefinite extensibility; in fact a full and final solution of the Social Problem. The large system of production, the large factory and workshop, he saw was necessary. Large capital, too, was necessary, but the large capitalist was not. On the contrary, capitalism — capital in the hands of private individuals, with, as a necessary consequence, unbounded competition, was ruinous for the working classes, and not good for the middle classes, including the capitalists themselves, because the larger capitalists, if sufficiently astute or unscrupulous, can destroy the smaller ones by under-selling, as in fact they constantly did. His own scheme was what is now called co-operative production, with the difference that instead of voluntary effort, he looked to the State to give it its first motion, by advancing the capital without interest, by drawing up the necessary regulations, and by naming the hierarchy of workers for one year, after which the co-operative groups were to elect their own officers. He thought that if a number of these co-operative associations were thus launched State-aided in each of the greater provinces of industry, they could compete successfully with the private capitalist, and would beat him within no very long time. By competition he trusted to drive him out in a moderate time, and without shock to industry in general. But having conquered the capitalist by competition, he wished competition to cease between the different associations in any given industry; as he expressed it, he would 'avail himself of the arm of competition to destroy competition.' . . . The net proceeds each year would be divided into three parts: the first to be divided equally amongst the members of the association; the second to be devoted partly to the support of the old, the sick, the infirm, partly to the alleviation of crises which would weigh on other industries; the third to furnish 'instruments of labour' to those who might wish to join the association. . . . Capitalists would be invited into the associations, and would receive the current rate of interest at least, which interest would be guaranteed to them out of the national budget; but they would only participate in the net surplus in the character of workers. . . . Such was the scheme of Louis Blanc, which, in 1848, when member of the Provisional Government in France, he had the opportunity, rarely granted to the social system-maker, of partially trying in practice. He was allowed to establish a number of associations of working men by the aid of Government subsidies. The result did not realize expectations. After a longer or shorter period of struggling, every one of the associations failed; while, on the other hand, a number of co-operative associations founded by the workmen's own capital, as also some industrial partnerships founded by capitalists, on Louis Blanc's principle of distribution of the net proceeds, were successful. . . . I do not refer to the 'ateliers nationaux,' [see FRANCE: A. D. 1848] which were not countenanced by Louis Blanc; but to certain associations of working men who received advances from the Government on the principle advocated in his book. There were not many of these at first. L. Blanc congratulated himself on being able

to start a few: after the second rising the Government subsidized fifty-six associations, all but one of which had failed by 1875."—W. Graham, *Socialism, New and Old, ch.* 3, *sect.* 5, *with foot-note.*—"In 1848 the Constituent Assembly voted, in July, that is, after the revolution of June, a subsidy of three millions of francs in order to encourage the formation of working men's associations. Six hundred applications, half coming from Paris alone, were made to the commission entrusted with the distribution of the funds, of which only fifty-six were accepted. In Paris, thirty associations, twenty-seven of which were composed of working men, comprising in all 434 associates, received 890,500 francs. Within six months, three of the Parisian associations failed; and of the 434 associates, seventy-four resigned, fifteen were excluded, and there were eleven changes of managers. In July, 1851, eighteen associations had ceased to exist. One year later, twelve others had vanished. In 1865 four were still extant, and had been more or less successful. In 1875 there was but a single one left, that of the file-cutters, which, as Citizen Finance remarked, was unrepresented at the Congress."—E. de Laveleye, *The Socialism of To-day, ch.* 5, *foot-note.*

Also in: L. Blanc, 1848: *Historical Revelations, ch.* 5–9, *and* 19.

A. D. 1840-1883.—Icaria.—In 1840, Étienne Cabet published in France an Utopian romance, the "Voyage en Icarie," which awakened remarkable interest, very quickly. He described in this romance an ideal community, and eight years later, having continued the propagation of his social theories in the meantime, he undertook to carry them into practice. A tract of land was secured in Texas, and in February, 1848, sixty-nine emigrants—the advance guard of what promised to be a great army of Icarians—set sail from Havre for New Orleans. They were followed during the year by others—a few hundreds in all; but even before the later comers reached New Orleans the pioneers of the movement had abandoned their Texas lands, disappointed in all their expectations and finding themselves utterly unprepared for the work they had to do, the expenditures they had to make, and the hardships they had to endure. They retreated to New Orleans and were joined there by Cabet. It happened that the Mormons, at this time, were deserting their town of Nauvoo, in Illinois, and were making their hejira to Salt Lake City. Cabet struck a bargain with the retreating disciples of Joseph Smith, which gave his community a home ready-made. The followers who adhered to him were conveyed to Nauvoo in the spring; but two hundred more gave up the socialistic experiment, and either remained at New Orleans or returned to France. For a few years the colony was fairly prosperous at Nauvoo. Good schools were maintained. "Careful training in manners and morals, and in Icarian principles and precepts, is work with which the schools are especially charged. The printing office is a place of great activity. Newspapers are printed in English, French and German. Icarian school-books are published. . . . A library of 5,000 or 6,000 volumes, chiefly standard French works, seems to be much patronized. . . . Frequent theatrical entertainments, social dances, and lectures are common means of diversion. . . . These families . . . are far from the condition of the happy Icarians of the 'Voyage,' but considering the difficulties they have encountered they must be accredited with having done remarkably well." Dissensions arose however. In 1856 Cabet found himself opposed by a majority of the community. In November of that year he withdrew, with about 180 adherents, and went to St. Louis, where he died suddenly, a few days after his arrival. Those who had accompanied him settled themselves upon an estate called Cheltenham, six miles west of St. Louis; but they did not prosper, and were dispossessed, by the foreclosure of a mortgage, in 1864, and the last of the community was dispersed. The section left at Nauvoo held no title to lands there, after Cabet separated from them, and were forced to remove in 1860. They established themselves on a tract of land in Adams county, southwestern Iowa, and there Icaria, in a slender and modest form, has been maintained, through many vicissitudes, to the present day. A new secession, occurring 1879–83, sent forth a young colony which settled at Cloverdale, California, and took the name of the Icaria-Speranza Community, borrowing the name "Speranza" from another Utopian romance by Pierre Leroux.—A. Shaw, *Icaria.*

A. D. 1841-1847.—Brook Farm.—On the 29th day of September, 1841, articles of association were made and executed which gave existence to an Association bearing the name and style of "The Subscribers to the Brook Farm Institute of Agriculture and Education." By the second of these articles, it was declared to be the object of the Association "to purchase such estates as may be required for the establishment and continuance of an agricultural, literary, and scientific school or college, to provide such lands and houses, animals, libraries and apparatus, as may be found expedient or advantageous to the main purpose of the Association." By article six, "the Association guarantees to each shareholder the interest of five per cent. annually on the amount of stock held by him in the Association." By article seven, "the shareholders on their part, for themselves, their heirs and assigns, do renounce all claim on any profits accruing to the Association for the use of their capital invested in the stock of the Association, except five per cent. interest on the amount of stock held by them." By article eight it was provided that "every subscriber may receive the tuition of one pupil for every share held by him, instead of five per cent. interest." The subscribers to these Articles, for shares ranging in amount from $500 to $1,500, were George Ripley, Nathaniel Hawthorne, Minot Pratt, Charles A. Dana, William B. Allen, Sophia W. Ripley, Maria T. Pratt, Sarah F. Stearns, Marianne Ripley, and Charles O. Whitmore. "The 'Brook Farm Association for Education and Agriculture' was put in motion in the spring of 1841. There was no difficulty in collecting a company of men and women large enough to make a beginning. One third of the subscriptions was actually paid in, Mr. Ripley pledging his library for four hundred dollars of his amount. With the sum subscribed a farm of a little less than two hundred acres was bought for ten thousand five hundred dollars, in West Roxbury, about nine miles from Boston. The site was a pleasant one, not far from Theodore Parker's meeting-house in Spring Street, and in close vicinity to some of the most

wealthy, capable, and zealous friends of the enterprise. It was charmingly diversified with hill and hollow, meadow and upland. . . . Later experience showed its unfitness for lucrative tillage, but for an institute of education, a semi-æsthetic, humane undertaking, nothing could be better. This is the place to say, once for all, with the utmost possible emphasis, that Brook Farm was not a 'community' in the usual sense of the term. There was no element of 'socialism' in it. There was about it no savor of antinomianism, no taint of pessimism, no aroma, however faint, of nihilism. It was wholly unlike any of the 'religious' associations which had been established in generations before, or any of the atheistic or mechanical arrangements which were attempted simultaneously or afterwards. . . . The institution of Brook Farm, though far from being 'religious' in the usual sense of the word, was enthusiastically religious in spirit and purpose. . . . There was no theological creed, no ecclesiastical form, no inquisition into opinions, no avowed reliance on superhuman aid. The thoughts of all were heartily respected; and while some listened with sympathy to Theodore Parker, others went to church nowhere, or sought the privileges of their own communion. . . . A sympathizing critic published in the 'Dial' (January, 1842) an account of the enterprise as it then appeared: . . . 'They have bought a farm in order to make agriculture the basis of their life, it being the most direct and simple in relation to nature. . . . The plan of the Community, as an economy, is, in brief, this: for all who have property to take stock, and receive a fixed interest thereon; then to keep house or board in common, as they shall severally desire, at the cost of provisions purchased at wholesale, or raised on the farm; and for all to labor in community and be paid at a certain rate an hour, choosing their own number of hours and their own kind of work. With the results of this labor and their interest they are to pay their board, and also purchase whatever else they require, at cost, at the warehouses of the community, which are to be filled by the community as such. To perfect this economy, in the course of time they must have all trades and all modes of business carried on among themselves, from the lowest mechanical trade which contributes to the health and comfort of life, to the finest art which adorns it with food or drapery for the mind. All labor, whether bodily or intellectual, is to be paid at the same rate of wages, on the principle that, as the labor becomes merely bodily, it is a greater sacrifice to the individual laborer to give his time to it.' . . . The daily life at Brook Farm was, of course, extremely simple, even homely. . . . There was at no time too much room for the one hundred and fifty inmates. . . . The highest moral refinement prevailed in all departments. In the morning, every species of industrial activity went on. In the afternoon, the laborers changed their garments and became teachers, often of abstruse branches of knowledge. The evenings were devoted to such recreations as suited the taste of the individual. The farm was never thoroughly tilled, from the want of sufficient hands. A good deal of hay was raised, and milk was produced from a dozen cows. . . . Some worked all day in the field, some only a few hours, some none at all, being otherwise employed, or by some reason disqualified. The most cultivated worked the hardest. . . . The serious difficulties were financial. . . . As early as 1843 the wisdom of making changes in the direction of scientific arrangement was agitated; in the first months of 1844 the reformation was seriously begun," and the model of the new organization was Fourier's "Phalanx." "The most powerful instrument in the conversion of Brook Farm was Mr. Albert Brisbane. He had studied the system [of Fourier] in France, and made it his business to introduce it here. . . . In March, 1845, the Brook Farm Phalanx was incorporated by the Legislature of Massachusetts. The Constitution breathes a spirit of hope which is pathetic at this distance of time. . . . The publication of the Constitution was followed in the summer by 'The Harbinger,' which became the leading journal of Fourierism in the country. The first number appeared on June 14th. . . . Its list of contributors was about the most remarkable ever presented. Besides Ripley, Dwight, Dana, and Rykman, of Brook Farm, there were Brisbane, Channing, Curtis [George W., who had lived at Brook Farm for two years], Cranch, Godwin, Greeley, Lowell, Whittier, Story, Higginson, to say nothing of gentlemen less known. . . . 'The Harbinger' lived nearly four years, a little more than two at Brook Farm, less than two in New York. The last number was issued on the 10th of February, 1849. . . . It is unnecessary to speculate on the causes of the failure at Brook Farm. There was every reason why it should fail; there was no earthly, however much heavenly reason there may have been, why it should succeed." In August, 1847, a meeting of stockholders and creditors authorized the transfer of the property of the Brook Farm Phalanx to a board of three trustees, "for the purpose and with the power of disposing of it to the best advantage of all concerned." And so the most attractive of all social experiments came to an end.—O. B. Frothingham, *George Ripley, ch.* 3–4.

A. D. 1842-1889.—Profit-sharing experiments.—"Profit sharing was first practised systematically by M. Leclaire, a Parisian house-painter and decorator. Beginning to admit his workmen to participation in the profits of his business in 1842, he continued the system, with modifications and developments, until his death in 1872. His financial success was signal. It was not due to mere good fortune. Leclaire was a man of high business capacity. . . . In France, the increase in the number of participating firms, from 1855 onwards, has been comparatively steady, the number now [1889] standing between 55 and 60. In Switzerland, the 10 instances, dating ten years back or more, have no followers recorded in the sources of information open to me. This fact may be explained in some degree by the circumstances that Dr. Böhmert's work, the chief authority thus far on this subject, was published in 1878, and that the principal investigations since that time have been concerned mainly with France, England, and the United States. This remark will apply to Germany also; but the prevalence there of socialism has probably been an important reason for the small and slow increase in the number of firms making a trial of the system of participation. . . . In England, the abandonment of their noted trials of industrial partnership by the

Messrs. Briggs and by Fox, Head and Co. in 1874 checked the advance of the scheme to a more general trial; but in the last five years, 7 houses have entered upon the plan. In the United States, the experience of the Messrs. Brewster and Co. exerted a similar influence, but by 1882 6 concerns had introduced profit sharing; these were followed by 11 in 1886, and in 1887 by 12 others. There are, then, at least 29 cases of profit sharing in actual operation at this time [1889] in this country, which began in 1887, 1886, or 1882. As compared with France, Germany, and Switzerland, the United States show a smaller number of cases of long standing, and a considerably larger number of instances of adoption of the system in the last three years [1887–1889]. . . . Not by mere chance, apparently, the two republics of France and the United States show the longest lists of profit sharing firms."—N. P. Gilman, *Profit Sharing, ch.* 9.—See, also, below: 1859–1887—the profit-sharing experiment of M. Godin, at Guise, in France.

A. D. 1843-1874.—Ebenezer and Amana, the communities of the "True Inspiration Congregations."—In 1843 the first detachment of a company of immigrants, belonging to a sect called the "True Inspiration Congregations" which had existed in Germany for more than a century, was brought to America and settled on a tract of land in Western New York, near the city of Buffalo. Others followed, until more than a thousand persons were gathered in the community which they called "Ebenezer." They were a thrifty, industrious, pious people, who believed that their leader, Christian Metz, and some others, were "inspired instruments," through whom Divine messages came to them. These messages have all been carefully preserved and printed. Communism appears to have been no part of their religious doctrine, but practically forced upon them, as affording the only condition under which they could dwell simply and piously together. In 1854 they were "commanded by inspiration" to remove to the West. Their land at Ebenezer was advantageously sold, having been reached by the widening boundaries of Buffalo, and they purchased a large tract in Iowa. The removal was accomplished gradually during the next ten years, and in their new settlement, comprising seven villages, with the common name, Amana, the community is said to be remarkably thriving. In 1874 Amana contained a population of 1,485 men, women and children.—C. Nordhoff, *The Communistic Societies of the United States, pp.* 25–43.

A. D. 1843-1883.—Karl Marx.—His theory of Capital.—His socialistic influence.—"The greatest and most influential name in the history of socialism is unquestionably Karl Marx. . . . Like Ferdinand Lassalle, he was of Jewish extraction. He was born at Treves in 1818, his father being a lawyer in that town; and he studied at Berlin and Bonn, but neglected the specialty of law, which he nominally adopted, for the more congenial subjects of philosophy and history. Marx was a zealous student, and apparently an adherent of Hegelianism, but soon gave up his intention of following an academic career as a teacher of philosophy, and joined the staff of the Rhenish Gazette, published at Cologne as an organ of the extreme democracy. While thus engaged, however, he found that his knowledge of economics required to be enlarged and corrected, and accordingly in 1843, after marrying the sister of the Prussian Minister, Von Westfalen, he removed to Paris, where he applied himself to the study of the questions to which his life and activity were henceforward to be devoted so entirely. Here also he began to publish those youthful writings which must be reckoned among the most powerful expositions of the early form of German socialism. With Arnold Ruge he edited the 'Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher.' In 1845 he was expelled from Paris and settled in Brussels, where he published his 'Discours sur le Libre Échange,' and his criticism of Proudhon's 'Philosophie de la Misère,' entitled, 'Misère de la Philosophie.' In Paris he had already met Friedrich Engels, who was destined to be his lifelong and loyal friend and companion-in-arms, and who in 1845 published his important work, 'The Condition of the Working Class in England.' The two friends found that they had arrived at a complete identity of opinion; and an opportunity soon occurred for an emphatic expression of their common views. A society of socialists, a kind of forerunner of the International, had established itself in London, and had been attracted by the new theories of Marx and the spirit of strong and uncompromising conviction with which he advocated them. They entered into relation with Marx and Engels; the society was re-organised under the name of the Communist League; and a congress was held, which resulted (1847) in the framing of the 'Manifesto of the Communist Party,' which was published in most of the languages of Western Europe, and is the first proclamation of that revolutionary socialism armed with all the learning of the nineteenth century, but expressed with the fire and energy of the agitator, which in the International and other movements has so startled the world. During the revolutionary troubles in 1848 Marx returned to Germany, and along with his comrades, Engels, Wolff, &c., he supported the most advanced democracy in the 'New Rhenish Gazette.' In 1849 he settled in London, where he spent his after-life in the elaboration of his economic views and in the realisation of his revolutionary programme. During this period he published 'Zur Kritik der politischen Oekonomie' (1859), and the first volume of his great work on capital, 'Das Kapital' (1867). He died in London, March 14, 1883."—T. Kirkup, *A History of Socialism, ch.* 7.—"As to the collectivist creed, Marx looks upon history as ruled by material interests. He borrows from Hegel the idea of development in history, and sees in the progress of civilization merely the development of economic production, which involves a conflict of classes. The older socialists were idealists, and constructed a perfect social system. Marx simply studies economic changes, and their effects on the conflict of classes, as a basis for predicting the future. Starting from the principle that there are no permanent economic laws, but merely transitory phases, a principle denied by the modern French economists, he does not criticise but explains our modern capitalistic industrial system, and its effects on society. Formerly, says Engels, an artisan owned his tools and also the product of his labor. If he chose to employ wage earners, these were merely apprentices, and worked not so much for wages, but in order to learn the trade. All this is changed by

the introduction of capital and the modern industrial system. Marx explains the origin of capital by saying that it was formerly the result of conquest, the pillage of peasants, and of colonies, and the secularization of church property. However, he does not hold the present capitalists to be robbers. He does not deal with the capitalist but with capital. His primary theory then is that profit on capital, on which the possibility of accumulating wealth depends, is due to the fact that the laborer does not receive the entire product of his labor as his reward, but that the capitalist takes the lion's share. Under the old industrial system, the laborer's tools, his means of production, belonged to him. Now they are owned by the capitalist. Owing to the improvement of machinery, and the invention of steam-power, the laborer can no longer apply his energy in such a way as to be fully remunerated. He now must sell his muscular energy in the market. The capitalist who buys it offers him no just reward. He gives the laborers only a part of the product of his labors, pocketing the remainder as interest on capital, and returns for risks incurred. The laborer is cheated out of the difference between his wages and the full product of his labor, while the capitalist's share is increased, day by day, by this stolen amount. 'Production by all, distribution among a few.' This is the gist of Marx's theories. Capital is not the result of intelligent savings. It is simply an amount of wealth appropriated by the capitalist from the laborer's share in his product."—J. Bourdeau, *German Socialism* (*N. Englander and Yale Rev., Sept.*, 1891, *tr. from Revue des Deux Mondes*).—"The principal lever of Marx against the present form of industry, and of the distribution of its results, is the doctrine that value — that is, value in exchange — is created by labor alone. Now this value, as ascertained by exchanges in the market or measured by some standard, does not actually all go to the laborer, in the shape of wages. Perhaps a certain number of yards of cotton cloth, for instance, when sold, actually pay for the wages of laborers and leave a surplus, which the employer appropriates. Perhaps six hours of labor per diem might enable the laborer to create products enough to support himself and to rear up an average family; but at present he has to work ten hours for his subsistence. Where do the results of the four additional hours go? To the employer, and the capitalist from whom the employer borrows money; or to the employer who also is a capitalist and invests his capital in his works, with a view to a future return. The laborer works, and brings new workmen into the world, who in turn do the same. The tendency of wages being toward an amount just sufficient for the maintenance of the labor, there is no hope for the future class of laborers. Nor can competition or concurrence help the matter. A concurrence of capitalists will tend to reduce wages to the minimum, if other conditions remain as they were before. A concurrence of laborers may raise wages above the living point for a while; but these fall again, through the stimulus which high wages give to the increase of population. A general fall of profits may lower the price of articles used by laborers; but the effect of this is not to add in the end to the laborer's share. He can live at less expense, it is true, but he will need and will get lower wages. Thus the system of labor and capital is a system of robbery. The capitalist is an 'expropriator' who must be expropriated, as Marx expresses it. A just system can never exist as long as wages are determined by free contract between laborers and employers; that is, as long as the means of carrying on production are in private hands. The only cure for the evils of the present industrial system is the destruction of private property — so far, at least, as it is used in production; and the substitution of the state, or of bodies or districts controlled by the state, for the private owner of the means of production. Instead of a number of classes in society, especially instead of a bourgeoisie and a proletariat, there must be but one class, which works directly or indirectly for the state, and receives as wages what the state decides to give to them. The state, it is taken for granted, will give in return for hours of labor as much as can be afforded, consistently with the interests of future labor and with the expenses necessary for carrying on the state system itself."—T. D. Woolsey, *Communism and Socialism, pp.* 162–163.

Also in: K. Marx, *Capital.*

A. D. 1848.—The founding of the Oneida Community. — The Oneida and Wallingford communities of Perfectionists are followers of doctrines taught by one John Humphrey Noyes, a native of Vermont, who began his preaching at Putney, in that state, about 1834. The community at Oneida, in Madison county, New York, was formed in 1848, and had a struggling existence for many years; but gradually several branches of industry, such as the making of traps, travelling bags, and the like, were successfully established, and the community became prosperous. Everything is owned in common, and they extend the community system "beyond property to persons." That is to say, there is no marriage among them, and "exclusiveness in regard to women and children" is displaced by what they claim to be a scientific regulation of the intercourse of the sexes. In the early years of the Oneida Community several other settlements of the followers of Noyes were attempted; but one at Wallingford, Connecticut, is the only survivor. — C. Nordhoff, *The Communistic Societies of the U. S., pp.* 259–293.

Also in: J. H. Noyes, *Hist. of American Socialisms, ch.* 46.

A. D. 1848-1883. — Schulze-Delitzsch and the Co-operative movement in Germany.— "Hermann Schulze was born at Delitzsch, in Prussian Saxony, August 29th, 1808. He studied jurisprudence at Leipzig and Halle, and afterwards occupied judicial posts under the Government, becoming District Judge at Delitzsch in 1841, a position which he held until 1850. In 1848, he was elected to the Prussian National Assembly, and the following year he became a member of the Second Chamber, in which he sat as Schulze-Delitzsch, a name which has since adhered to him. Being a member of the Progressist party, he proved a thorn in the Government's flesh, and he was made District Judge at Wreschen, but he returned later to the Prussian Diet, and became also a member of the North German and German Reichstags. For more than thirty years Schulze headed the co-operative movement in Germany, but his self-sacrifice impoverished him, and although his motto as a

social reformer had always been 'Self-help,' as opposed to Lassalle's 'State-help,' he was compelled in his declining years to accept a gift of £7,000 from his friends. Schulze died honoured if not famous on April 29th, 1883. Schulze-Delitzsch is the father of the co-operative movement in Germany. He had watched the development of this movement in England, and as early as 1848 he had lifted up his voice in espousal of co-operative principles in his own country. Though a Radical, Schulze was no Socialist, and he believed co-operation to be a powerful weapon wherewith to withstand the steady advance of Socialistic doctrines in Germany. Besides carrying on agitation by means of platform-speaking, he published various works on the subject, the chief of which are: 'Die arbeitenden Klassen und das Associationswesen in Deutschland, als Programm zu einem deutschen Congress,' (Leipzig, 1858); 'Kapitel zu einem deutschen Arbeitercatechismus,' (Leipzig, 1863); 'Die Abschaffung des geschäftlichen Risico durch Herrn Lassalle,' (Berlin, 1865); 'Die Entwickelung des Genossenschaften in einzelnen Gewerbszweigen,' (Leipzig, 1873). Schulze advocated the application of the co-operative principle to other organisations than the English stores, and especially to loan, raw material, and industrial associations. He made a practical beginning at his own home and the adjacent town of Eilenburg, where in 1849 he established two co-operative associations of shoemakers and joiners, the object of which was the purchase and supply to members of raw material at cost price. In 1850 he formed a Loan Association (Vorschussverein) at Delitzsch on the principle of monthly payments, and in the following year a similar association on a larger scale at Eilenburg. For a long time Schulze had the field of agitation to himself, and the consequence was that the more intelligent sections of the working classes took to his proposals readily. Another reason for his success, however, was the fact that the movement was practical and entirely unpolitical. It was a movement from which the Socialistic element was absent, and one in which, therefore, the moneyed classes could safely co-operate. Schulze, in fact, sought to introduce reforms social rather than Socialistic. The fault of his scheme as a regenerative agency was that it did not affect the masses of the people, and thus the roots of the social question were not touched. Schulze could only look for any considerable support to small tradesmen and artisans, to those who were really able to help themselves if shown the way. But his motto of 'Self-help' was an unmeaning gospel to the vast class of people who were not in this happy position. . . . The movement neared a turning point in 1858. In that year Schulze identified himself with the capitalist party at a Congress of German economists, held at Gotha, and he soon began to lose favour with the popular classes. The high-water mark was reached in 1860, at which time the co-operative associations had a membership of 200,000, and the business done amounted to 40,000,000 thalers or about £6,000,000; the capital raised by contribution or loan approaching a third of this sum. In the year 1864 no fewer than 800 Loan and Credit Associations had been established, while in 1861 the number of Raw Material and Productive Associations was 172, and that of Co-operative Stores 66. Possibly the movement might have continued to prosper, even though Schulze was suspected of sympathy with the capitalists, had no rival appeared on the scene. But a rival did appear, and he was none other than Lassalle."—W. H. Dawson, *German Socialism and Ferdinand Lassalle, ch.* 7.—The co-operative societies in Germany on the Schulze-Delitzsch plan have been regularly organized into an association. "The number of societies in this association increased from 171 in 1859, to 771 in 1864, and was 3,822 in 1885. At the last named date they were distributed thus: loan and credit societies, 1,965; co-operative societies in various branches of trade, 1,146; co-operative store societies, 678; building societies, 33. At the end of 1884 the membership was 1,500,000. Of their own capital, in shares and reserve funds, they possessed 300,000,000 marks; and of borrowed capital 500,000,000 marks."—*Science, Sept.* 9, 1887.

A. D. 1859-1887.—The "Social Palace" of M. Godin at Guise.—"The Familistère founded at Guise (Aisne), France, by the late M. Jean Baptiste André Godin, has a world-wide reputation. The Social Palace itself, a marvel of ingenious philanthropy, which realizes successfully some of the characteristic ideas of Fourier, . . . entitles M. Godin to a high place among the social reformers of the 19th century. He was the son of a worker in iron, and even before his apprenticeship had conceived the idea that he was destined to set a great example to the industrial world. . . . The business carried on in the great foundries at Guise is the manufacture of cast-iron wares for the kitchen and general house use, and of heating apparatus of various kinds. M. Godin was the first man in France to use cast iron in making stoves, in place of sheet iron; this was but one example of his inventive powers. He began in 1840, with 20 workmen, the manufacture which employed in 1883 over 1,400 at Guise and 300 in the branch establishment at Laeken, in Belgium. From the beginning there was an organization for mutual aid among the workmen, assisted by the proprietor. The Familistère was opened in 1860; but it was not until 1877, owing to the obstacles presented by the French law to the plan which he had in mind, that M. Godin introduced participation by the workmen in the profits of his gigantic establishment. . . . In 1880 the establishment became a joint-stock company with limited liability, and the system of profit sharing was begun which still [1889] obtains there. M. Godin's main idea was gradually to transfer the ownership of the business and of the associated Familistère into the hands of his workmen. . . . No workman is admitted to participation [in the profit-sharing] who is not the owner already of a share. But the facility of purchase is great, and the interest on his stock adds materially to the income of the average workman. M. Godin was gradually disposing of his capital to the workmen up to his death [in 1888], and this process will go on until Madame Godin simply retains the direction of the business. But when this shall have happened, the oldest workmen shall, in like manner, release their shares to the younger, in order to keep the ownership of the establishment in the hands of the actual workers from generation to generation. In this way a true coöperative productive house will be formed within ten or a dozen years. M. Godin's capital in 1880 was 4,600,000 francs; the whole capital of the house

in 1883 had risen to 6,000,000 francs, and of this sum 2,753,500 francs were held by various employees in October, 1887. The organization of the workmen as participators forms quite a hierarchy," at the head of which stand the "associates." "The 'associates' must own at least 500 francs' worth of stock; they must be engaged in work, and have their home in the Familistère: they elect new members themselves. . . . They will furnish Madame Godin's successor from their ranks."—N. P. Gilman, *Profit Sharing, pp.* 173–177.—In April, 1859, M. Godin began to realize the most important of his ideas of social reform, namely, "the substitution for our present isolated dwellings of homes and dwellings combined into Social Palaces, where, to use M. Godin's expressive words, 'the equivalents of riches,' that is the most essential advantages which wealth bestows on our common life, may be brought within reach of the mass of the population. In April, 1859, he laid the foundation of the east wing of such a palace, the Familistère of Guise. It was covered in in September of the same year, completed in 1860, and fully occupied in the year following. In 1862 the central building was commenced. It was completed in 1864 and occupied in 1865. The offices in front of the east wing were built at the same time as that wing—in 1860. The other appendages of the palace were added in the following order—the nursery and babies' school in 1866; the schools and theatre in 1869; and the baths and washhouses in 1870. The west wing was begun in 1877, finished in 1879, and fully occupied in 1880. Till its completion the inhabitants of the Familistère numbered about 900 persons; at present [1880] it accommodates 1,200. Its population therefore already assumes the proportion of a considerable village; while its style of construction would easily allow of the addition of quadrangles, communicating with the north-eastern and north-western angles of the central building, by which the number of occupants might be raised to 1,800 or 2,000, without in any way interfering with the enjoyments of the present inmates, supposing circumstances made it desirable to increase their numbers to this extent. . . . Of the moral effect upon the population of the free and yet social life which a unitary dwelling makes possible, M. Godin wrote in 1874:—'For the edification of those who believe that the working classes are undisciplined or undisciplinable, I must say that there has not been in the Familistère since its foundation a single police case, and yet the palace contains 900 persons; meetings in it are frequent and numerous; and the most active intercourse and relations exist among all the inhabitants.' And this is not the consequence of any strict control exercised over the inmates. On the contrary, the whole life of the Familistère is one of carefully-guarded individual liberty, which is prevented from degenerating into license simply by the influence of public opinion among its inhabitants, who, administering their own internal affairs as a united body, exercise a disciplinary action upon each other. There are no gates, beyond doors turning on a central pivot and never fastened, introduced in winter for the sake of warmth; no porter to mark the time of entrance or egress of anyone. Every set of apartments is accessible to its occupants at any hour of the day or night, with the same facility as if it opened out of a well-lighted street, since all the halls of the Familistère are lighted during the whole night. And as there are ten different entrances, each freely communicating with the whole building, it would be less easy for one inmate to spy the movements of another than it is for the neighbours in an ordinary street to keep an outlook on each other's actions. . . . But one factor, and I conceive a very important factor, in this effort, must not be lost sight of, namely that the Social Palace at Guise is not a home provided for the poor, by a benevolence which houses its own fine clay in its isolated dwelling over against the abodes where those of coarser clay are clustered together. It is a home for M. Godin and members of his family, the heads of departments and other persons connected with him, whose means rise considerably above those of the workers, no less than for the workers in the foundry—a mansion of which it is the glory that all the rooms on every floor originally differ only by a few inches of height, and such slight differences in the height and width of doors and windows as require careful observation to detect, and that all participate alike, according to the quarter of the sky to which they look, in air and light. So that the difference of accommodation is practically reduced to the number of square feet which the means of the inmate enables him to occupy, and the internal arrangement of the space at his disposal."—E. V. Neale, *Associated Homes.*

Also in: E. Howland, *The Social Palace at Guise, and The Familistère at Guise* (*Harper's Monthly Mag., April*, 1872, *and Nov.*, 1885).—M. Godin, *Social Solutions.*

A. D. 1860-1870.—Nihilism in Russia.—"For the origin of nihilism [which had its period of activity between 1860 and 1870] we must go back half a century to a little company of gifted young men, most of whom rose to great distinction, who used at that time to meet together at the house of a rich merchant in Moscow, for the discussion of philosophy, politics and religion. They were of the most various views. Some of them became Liberal leaders, and wanted Russia to follow the constitutional development of the Western nations; others became founders of the new Slavophil party, contending that Russia should be no imitator, but develop her own native institutions in her own way; and there were at least two among them—Alexander Herzen and Michael Bakunin—who were to be prominent exponents of revolutionary socialism. But they all owned at this period one common master—Hegel. Their host was an ardent Hegelian, and his young friends threw themselves into the study of Hegel with the greatest zeal. Herzen himself tells us in his autobiography how assiduously they read everything that came from his pen, how they devoted nights and weeks to clearing up the meaning of single passages in his writings, and how greedily they devoured every new pamphlet that issued from the German press on any part of his system. From Hegel, Herzen and Bakunin were led, exactly like Marx and the German Young Hegelians, to Feuerbach, and from Feuerbach to socialism. Bakunin, when he retired from the army, rather than be the instrument of oppressing the Poles among whom he was stationed, went for some years to Germany, where he lived among the Young Hegelians and wrote for their organ, the 'Hallische Jahrbücher';

but before either he or Herzen ever had any personal intercommunication with the members of that school of thought, they had passed through precisely the same development. Herzen speaks of socialism almost in the very phrases of the Young Hegelians, as being the new 'terrestrial religion,' in which there was to be neither God nor heaven; as a new system of society which would dispense with an authoritative government, human or Divine, and which should be at once the completion of Christianity and the realization of the Revolution. 'Christianity,' he said, 'made the slave a son of man; the Revolution has emancipated him into a citizen. Socialism would make him a man.' This tendency of thought was strongly supported in the Russian mind by Haxthausen's discovery and laudation of the rural commune of Russia. The Russian State was the most arbitrary, oppressive, and corrupt in Europe, and the Russian Church was the most ignorant and superstitious; but here at last was a Russian institution which was regarded with envy even by wise men of the west, and was really a practical anticipation of that very social system which was the last work of European philosophy. It was with no small pride, therefore, that Alexander Herzen declared that the Muscovite peasant in his dirty sheepskin had solved the social problem of the nineteenth century, and that for Russia, with this great problem already solved, the Revolution was obviously a comparatively simple operation. You had but to remove the Czardom, the services, and the priesthood, and the great mass of the people would still remain organized in fifty thousand complete little self-governing communities living on their common land and ruling their common affairs as they had been doing long before the Czardom came into being. . . . All the wildest phases of nihilist opinion in the sixties were already raging in Russia in the forties. . . . Although the only political outbreak of Nicholas's reign, the Petracheffsky conspiracy of 1849, was little more than a petty street riot, a storm of serious revolt against the tyranny of the Czar was long gathering, which would have burst upon his head after the disasters to his army in the Crimea, had he survived them. He saw it thickening, however, and on his death-bed said to his son, the noble and unfortunate Alexander II., 'I fear you will find the burden too heavy.' The son found it eventually heavy enough, but in the meantime he wisely bent before the storm, relaxed the restraints the father had imposed, and gave pledges of the most liberal reforms in every department of State — judicial administration, local government, popular education, serf emancipation. . . . An independent press was not among the liberties conceded, but Russian opinion at this period found a most effective voice in a newspaper started in London by Alexander Herzen, called the 'Kolokol' (Bell), which for a number of years made a great impression in Russia. . . . Herzen was the hero of the young. Herzenism, we are told, became the rage, and Herzenism appears to have meant, before all, a free handling of everything in Church or State which was previously thought too sacred to be touched. This iconoclastic spirit grew more and more characteristic of Russian society at this period, and presently, under its influence, Herzenism fell into the shade, and nihilism occupied the scene. We possess various accounts of the meaning and nature of nihilism, and they all agree substantially in their description of it. The word was first employed by Turgenieff in his novel 'Fathers and Sons,' where Arcadi Petrovitch surprises his father and uncle by describing his friend Bazaroff as a nihilist. 'A nihilist,' said Nicholas Petrovitch. 'This word must come from the Latin nihil, nothing, as far as I can judge, and consequently it signifies a man who recognises nothing.' 'Or rather who respects nothing,' said Paul Petrovitch. 'A man who looks at everything from a critical point of view,' said Arcadi. 'Does not that come to the same thing?' asked his uncle. 'No, not at all. A nihilist is a man who bows before no authority, who accepts no principle without examination, no matter what credit the principle has.' . . . 'Yes, before we had Hegelians; now we have nihilists. We shall see what you will do to exist in nothingness, in a vacuum, as if under an air pump.' Koscheleff, writing in 1874, gives a similar explanation of nihilism. 'Our disease is a disease of character, and the most dangerous possible. We suffer from a fatal unbelief in everything. We have ceased to believe in this or in that, not because we have studied the subject thoroughly and become convinced of the untenability of our views, but only because some author or another in Germany or England holds this or that doctrine to be unfounded. . . . Our nihilists are simply Radicals. Their loud speeches, their fault-finding, their strong assertions, are grounded on nothing.'"— J. Rae, *Contemporary Socialism, ch.* 9. — See, also, NIHILISM.

A. D. 1862-1864.—Ferdinand Lassalle and the formation of the Social Democratic Party in Germany.—"There has probably been no more interesting appearance in the later political history of Germany than Lassalle's — no character that has secured more completely the attention of its world. There may be and there are many difficulties in the way of accepting Lassalle's political creed, but he had sufficient breadth and strength to win a secure place in the two widely separated domains of German science and politics and to profoundly influence the leading spirits of his time. . . . In addition to his worth in the department of science Lassalle was also a man of affairs, a practical politician, and — however large an element of the actor and sophist there may have been in him — the greatest German orator since Luther and John Tauler. Besides this, he was naturally heroic, as beautiful in person as Goethe; and when we remember that he was crossed in love and met in consequence with a romantic death at the age of thirty-nine, we see at once, as the publicist de Laveleye has suggested, the making of a story like that of Abelard. Lassalle has been the poetry of the various accounts of contemporary socialism, and has already created a literature which is still growing almost with the rapidity of the Goethe literature. The estimate of Lassalle's worth has been in each account naturally influenced by the economical or sentimental standpoint of the writer. To de Laveleye, who takes so much interest in socialism, Lassalle was a handsome agitator, whose merit lies chiefly in his work as interpreter of Karl Marx. To Montefiore he was a man of science who was led by accident into politics; and Franz Mehring, who was once the follower of Lassalle, in his

'Geschichte der deutschen Social-Demokratie,' discusses his career in the intolerant mood in which one generally approaches a forsaken worship. The Englishman John Rae, on the contrary, in his account of socialism, makes Lassalle a hero; and in the narrative of the talented Dane, Georg Brandes, Lassalle is already on the broad road to his place as a god. In the same spirit Rudolf Meyer in his work 'The Fourth Estate's Struggle for Emancipation' does not hesitate to use the chief hyperbole of our modern writers, and compares Lassalle with Jesus of Nazareth. Heine also, who saw in his fellow Israelite that perfect Hegelian 'freedom from God' which he himself had attempted in vain, hails Lassalle as the 'Messiah of the age.' Among Lassalle's more immediate disciples this deification seems to have become a formal cultus, and it is affirmed, hard as one finds it to believe the story, that after Lassalle's death he became an object of worship with the German laborers. . . . The father of Lassalle was a Jewish merchant in Breslau, where the future 'fighter and thinker' as Boeckh wrote mournfully over his tomb, was born on the 11th of April, 1825. The Israelite Lassal, for so the family name is still written, was a wealthy wholesale dealer in cloth, and with a consciousness of the good in such an avocation had from the first intended that Ferdinand should be a merchant. . . . But this was not his destiny. . . . The first feature in Lassalle was his will, the source of his strength and his ruin, and one can find no period in his life when this will seemed in the least capable of compromise or submission. . . . When he decided to become a Christian and a philosopher instead of a merchant, the family had nothing to do but to accommodate themselves as best they could to this arrangement."—L. J. Huff, *Ferdinand Lassalle* (*Pol. Science Quarterly, Sept.*, 1887).—"It was in 1862 that Lassalle began his agitation in behalf of the laboring classes, an agitation which resulted in the formation of the German Social Democratic Party. Previous to his time, German laborers had been considered contented and peaceable. It had been thought that a working-men's party might be established in France or England, but that it was hopeless to attempt to move the phlegmatic German laborers. Lassalle's historical importance lies in the fact that he was able to work upon the laborers so powerfully as to arouse them to action. It is due to Lassalle above all others that German workingmen's battalions, to use the social democratic expression, now form the vanguard in the struggle for the emancipation of labor. Lassalle's writings did not advance materially the theory of social democracy. He drew from Rodbertus and Marx in his economic writings, but he clothed their thoughts in such manner as to enable ordinary laborers to understand them, and this they never could have done without such help. . . . Lassalle gave to Ricardo's law of wages the designation, the iron law of wages, and expounded to the laborers its full significance, showing them how it inevitably forced wages down to a level just sufficient to enable them to live. He acknowledged that it was the key-stone of his system and that his doctrines stood or fell with it. Laborers were told that this law could be overthrown only by the abolition of the wages system. How Lassalle really thought this was to be accomplished is not so evident. He proposed to the laborers that government should aid them by the use of its credit to the extent of 100,000,000 of thalers, to establish co-operative associations for production; and a great deal of breath has been wasted to show the inadequacy of his proposed measures. Lassalle could not himself have supposed that so insignificant a matter as the granting of a small loan would solve the labor question. He recognized, however, that it was necessary to have some definite party programme to insure success in agitation. . . . On the 23d of May, 1863, German social democracy was born. Little importance was attached to the event at the time. A few men met at Leipsic, and, under the leadership of Ferdinand Lassalle, formed a new political party called the 'Universal German Laborers' Union' ('Der Allgemeine Deutsche Arbeiterverein'). . . . Lassalle did not live to see the fruits of his labors. He met with some success and celebrated a few triumphs, but the Union did not flourish as he hoped. At the time of his death he did not appear to have a firm, lasting hold on the laboring population. There then existed no social-democratic party with political power. Although Lassalle lost his life in a duel [1864], which had its origin in a love affair, and not in any struggle for the rights of labor, he was canonized at once by the workingmen. . . . His influence increased more than tenfold as soon as he ceased to live."—R. T. Ely, *French and German Socialism in Modern Times*, *ch.* 12.

A. D. 1862-1872.—The International in Europe.—"The International came into being immediately after the holding of the International Exhibition at London, in 1862. At least it was then that it took bodily shape, for the idea, in its theoretical form, dates from much earlier. . . . In 1862 certain manufacturers, such as M. Arlès-Dufour, and certain newspapers, such as 'Le Temps' and 'L'Opinion Nationale,' started the idea that it would be a good thing to send delegates from the French working men to the London Exhibition. 'The visit to their comrades in England,' said 'L'Opinion Nationale,' 'would establish mutual relations in every way advantageous. While they would be able to get an idea of the great artistic and industrial works at the Exhibition, they would at the same time feel more strongly the mutual interests which bind the working men of both countries together; the old leaven of international discord would settle down, and national jealousy would give place to a healthy fraternal emulation.' The whole programme of the International is summed up in these lines; but the manufacturers little foresaw the manner in which it was going to be carried out. Napoleon III. appeared to be very favourable to the sending of the delegates to London. He allowed them to be chosen by universal suffrage among the members of the several trades, and, naturally, those who spoke the strongest on the rights of labour were chosen. By the Emperor's orders, their journey was facilitated in every way. At that time Napoleon still dreamed of relying, for the maintenance of his Empire, on the working men and peasants, and of thus coping with the liberal middle classes. At London the English working men gave the most cordial welcome to 'their brothers of France.' On the 5th of August they organized a fête of 'international fraternization' at the Freemasons'

Tavern. . . . They proposed to create committees of working men 'as a medium for the interchange of ideas on questions of international trade.' The conception of a universal association appears here in embryo. Two years afterwards it saw the light. On the 28th of September, 1864, a great meeting of working men of all nations was held at St. Martin's Hall, London, under the presidency of Professor Beesly. M. Tolain spoke in the name of France. Karl Marx was the real inspirer of the movement, though Mazzini's secretary, Major Wolff, assisted him — a fact which has given rise to the statement that Mazzini was the founder of the International. So far was this from being the case that he only joined it with distrust, and soon left it. The meeting appointed a provisional committee to draw up the statutes of the association, to be submitted to the Universal Congress, which was expected to meet at Brussels in the following year. In this committee England, France, Italy, Poland, Switzerland, and Germany were represented; and afterwards delegates from other countries were admitted. They were fifty in all. They adopted none of the ways of a secret society. On the contrary, it was by publicity that they hoped to carry on their propaganda. Their office was in London. . . . Mazzini, by his secretary, Wolff, proposed a highly centralized organization, which would entrust the entire management to the leaders. Marx took the other side. . . . Marx carried the day. Soon, in his turn, he too was to be opposed and turned off as too dictatorial. Mazzini and his followers seceded. . . . The progress of the new association was at first very slow." After its second congress, held at Lausanne, in 1867, it spread rapidly and acquired an influence which was especially alarming to the French government. In 1870 the International was at the summit of its power. In 1872 its congress, at the Hague, was a battlefield of struggling factions and clashing ideas, and practically it perished in the conflict. "The causes of the rapid decline of the famous Association are easy to discover, and they are instructive. First of all, as the organizer of strikes, its principal and most practical end, it proved itself timid and impotent. The various bodies of working men were not slow to perceive this, and gave it up. Next, it had taken for motto, 'Emancipation of the workers by the workers themselves.' It was intended, then, to do without the bourgeois-radicals, 'the palaverers,' 'the adventurers,' who when the revolution was made, would step into power and leave the working men as they were before. The majority of the delegates were nevertheless bourgeois; but, in reality, the sentiment of revolt against the aristocratic direction of the more intelligent members always persisted, and it fastened principally on Karl Marx, the true founder of the International, and the only political brain that it contained. But to keep in existence a vast association embracing very numerous groups of different nationalities, and influenced sometimes by divergent currents of ideas, to make use of publicity as the sole means of propaganda, and yet to escape the repressive laws of different States, was evidently no easy task. How could it possibly have lasted after the only man capable of directing it had been ostracized? The cause of the failure was not accidental; it was part of the very essence of the attempt. The proletariat will not follow the middle-class radicals, because political liberties, republican institutions, and even universal suffrage, which the latter claim or are ready to decree, do not change the relations of capital and labour. On the other hand, the working man is evidently incapable of directing a revolutionary movement which is to solve the thousand difficulties created by any complete change in the economic order. Revolutionary Socialism thus leads to an insoluble dilemma and to practical impotence. A further cause contributed to the rapid fall of the International, namely, personal jealousies."—É. de Laveleye, *The Socialism of To-day, ch.* 9.

A. D. 1866-1875.—Rise and growth of the Patrons of Husbandry, or Grangers, in the United States.—The order, composed of farmers, known as Patrons of Husbandry, or Grangers, was founded in 1866. It grew rapidly during the first decade of its existence, and reported a membership, in November, 1875, of 763,263. After that period the numbers declined. The general aims of the order were set forth in a "Declaration of Purposes," as follows: "We shall endeavor to advance our cause by laboring to accomplishing the following objects: To develop a better and higher manhood and womanhood among ourselves. To enhance the comforts and attractions of our homes, and strengthen our attachments to our pursuits. To foster mutual understanding and co-operation. . . . To discountenance the credit system, the mortgage system, the fashion system, and every other system tending to prodigality and bankruptcy. We propose meeting together, talking together, working together, buying together, selling together, and in general acting together for our mutual protection and advancement, as occasion may require. We shall avoid litigation as much as possible by arbitration in the Grange. . . . We are not enemies to capital, but we oppose the tyranny of monopolies. We long to see the antagonism between labor and capital removed by common consent and by an enlightened statesmanship worthy of the nineteenth century. . . . Last, but not least, we proclaim it among our purposes to inculcate a proper appreciation of the abilities and sphere of woman, as is indicated by admitting her to membership and position in our order."—R. T. Ely, *The Labor Movement in America, ch.* 3.—See, also, United States of Am.: A. D. 1877-1891.

A. D. 1867-1875.—The Brocton Community of the Brotherhood of the New Life.—The Community of the Brotherhood of the New Life was established at Brocton, on the shore of Lake Erie, by Thomas Lake Harris, in 1867. Harris had been, partly at least, the founder of an earlier community at Mountain Cove, in North Carolina, which went to pieces after two years. For some time he travelled and lectured in America and England, and during a certain period he engaged in business as a banker, at Amenia, in Dutchess county, New York. He possessed qualities which exercised a fascinating influence upon many people of superior cultivation, and made them docile recipients of a very peculiar religious teaching. He claimed to have made a strange spiritual discovery, through which those who disciplined themselves to the acceptance of what it offered might attain to a "new life." The discipline required seems to have involved a very complete surrender to the

leader, Harris; and it was on such terms, apparently, that the Community at Brocton—or Salem-on-Erie as the Brotherhood renamed the place—was constituted. Among those who entered it was the brilliant writer, diplomatist, and man of society, Laurence Oliphant, who joined, with his wife, and with Lady Oliphant, his mother. The connection of Oliphant with the society drew to it more attention than it might otherwise have received. The Community bought and owned about 2,000 acres of land, and devoted its labors extensively and with success to the culture of grapes and the making of wine. The breaking up of the Brotherhood appears to be covered with a good deal of obscurity. Harris left Brocton in 1875 and went to California, where he is reported to be living, at Sonoma, on a great estate. Some of the Brotherhood went with him; others were scattered, and the Brocton vineyards are now cultivated by other hands.—W. E. K., *Brocton* (*Buffalo Courier, July* 19, 1891).

Also in: M. O. W. Oliphant, *Memoir of the life of Laurence Oliphant.*

A. D. 1869-1883.—The Knights of Labor.—"The second great attempt [the first having been 'the International'] to organize labor on a broad basis—as broad as society itself, in which all trades should be recognized—was the Noble Order of Knights of Labor of America. This organization was born on Thanksgiving Day, 1869, in the city of Philadelphia, and was the result of the efforts of Uriah S. Stephens, as the leader, and six associates, all garment-cutters. For several years previous to this date, the garment-cutters of Philadelphia had been organized as a trades-union, but had failed to maintain a satisfactory rate of wages in their trade. A feeling of dissatisfaction prevailed, which resulted, in the fall of 1869, in a vote to disband the union. Stephens, foreseeing this result, had quietly prepared the outlines of a plan for an organization embracing 'all branches of honorable toil,' and based upon education, which, through co-operation and an intelligent use of the ballot, should gradually abolish the present wages system. Stephens himself was a man of great force of character, a skilled mechanic, with the love of books which enabled him to pursue his studies during his apprenticeship, and feeling withal a strong affection for secret organizations, having been for many years connected with the Masonic order. . . . He believed it was necessary to bring all wage-workers together in one organization, where measures affecting the interests of all could be intelligently discussed and acted upon; and this he held could not be done in a trades-union. At the last session of the Garment-cutters' Union, and after the motion to disband had prevailed, Stephens invited the few members present to meet him, in order to discuss his new plan of organization. . . . Stephens then laid before his guests his plan of an organization, which he designated 'The Noble and Holy Order of the Knights of Labor.' It was a new departure in labor organization. The founder described what he considered a tendency toward large combinations of capital, and argued that the trades-union form of organization was like a bundle of sticks when unbound,—weak and powerless to resist combination. . . . Stephens' great controlling ideas may be formulated as follows: first that surplus labor always keeps wages down; and, second, that nothing can remedy this evil but a purely and deeply secret organization, based upon a plan that shall teach, or rather inculcate, organization, and at the same time educate its membership to one set of ideas ultimately subversive of the present wages system. . . . At a subsequent meeting, held Dec. 28, 1869, upon the report of a Committee on Ritual, involving obligations and oaths, Mr. Stephens and his six associates subscribed their names to the obligations; and, when the ritual was adopted, Mr. James L. Wright moved that the new Order be named the 'Knights of Labor.' . . . The members were sworn to the strictest secrecy. The name even of the Order was not to be divulged. . . . The rules of government . . . excluded physicians from the Order, because professional confidence might force the societies' secrets into unfriendly ears. The rule prohibiting the admission of physicians, however, was repealed at Detroit in 1881. Politicians were to be excluded, because the founders of the Order considered that their moral character was on too low a plane for the sacred work of the new Order; and, besides, it was considered that professional politicians would not keep the secrets of the Order, if such secrets could be used for their own advantage. Men engaged in political work are not now excluded for that cause alone. Lawyers were to be excluded, and still are, because the founders considered that the logical, if not the practical, career of the lawyer is to get money by his aptitudes and cunning, which, if used to the advantage of one, must be at the expense of another. . . . Rum-sellers were and are excluded, because the trade is not only useless, by being non-productive of articles of use, but results in great suffering and immorality. . . . The founders also considered that those who sell or otherwise handle liquors should be excluded, because such persons would be a defilement to the Order. In consequence of the close secrecy thrown around the new organization, it did not grow rapidly. Stephens, impressed with the Masonic ritual and that of the Odd Fellows, was unwilling to allow any change. . . . So the society struggled on, admitting now and then a member, its affairs running smoothly, as a whole, but the name of the organization never divulged. . . . In January, 1878, when the whole machinery of the organization was perfected so far as bodies were concerned, there had been no general declaration of principles. The Order had been intensely secret, as much as the society of the Masons or of the Odd Fellows. The name of the Order began to be whispered about; but beyond the name and most exaggerated accounts of the membership, nothing was known of the Knights of Labor. The membership must have been small,—indeed, not counting far into the thousands. In fact, it did not reach fifty thousand until five years later. . . . About this time [1878] the strict secrecy in the workings of the Order, and the fact that the obligations were oaths taken on the Bible, brought on a conflict with the Catholic Church, and during the years 1877–78 many Local and several District Assemblies lapsed. . . . Measures were adopted whereby a satisfactory conciliation was brought about, on the general ground that the labor movement could consistently take no interest in the advocacy of any kind of religion, nor assume any position for or against

creeds. The prejudices against the Knights of Labor on account of Catholic opposition then naturally, but gradually, disappeared; and the Order took on new strength, until there were in 1879 twenty-three District Assemblies and about thirteen hundred Local Assemblies in the United States. . . . The third annual session of the General Assembly was held at Chicago, in September, 1879, when the federal body busied itself with general legislation, and was called upon to consider the resignation of Mr. Stephens as Master Workman. This resignation, urgently pressed by Mr. Stephens, was accepted; and Hon. Terrence V. Powderly was elected Grand Master Workman in his place. . . . The membership was stated to be five thousand in good standing. . . . The next annual meeting of the General Assembly (the fourth) took place at Pittsburg, in September, 1880, and consisted of forty delegates. At this session, strikes were denounced as injurious, and as not worthy of support except in extreme cases. . . . The fifth session was held in September, 1881, at Detroit. This session had to deal with one of the most important actions in the history of the Order. The General Assembly then declared that on and after January 1, 1882, the name and objects of the Order should be made public. It also declared that women should be admitted upon an equal footing with men. . . . A benefit insurance law was also passed, and an entire change of the ritual was advised. . . . The sixth annual assembly was held in New York in September, 1882, the chief business consisting in the discussion, and finally in the adoption, of a revised constitution and ritual. At this Assembly, what is known as the 'strike' element — that is, the supporters and believers in strikes — was in the majority, and laws and regulations for supporting strikes were adopted; and the co-operation of members was suppressed by a change of the co-operative law of the Order. . . . The seventh annual session of the General Assembly was held at Cincinnati in September, 1883, and consisted of one hundred and ten representative delegates. . . . This large representation was owing to the rapid growth of the Order since the name and objects had been made public. . . . The membership of the Order was reported to this Assembly to be, in round numbers, fifty-two thousand. In September, 1884, the eighth annual Assembly convened at Philadelphia. Strikes and boycotts were denounced. . . . The ninth General Assembly convened at Hamilton, Ontario, in October, 1885, and adopted legislation looking to the prevention of strikes and boycotts. The session lasted eight days, the membership being reported at one hundred and eleven thousand. . . . The tenth annual session of the General Assembly was held at Richmond, Virginia, in October, 1886. . . . Mr. Powderly, in his testimony before the Strike Investigating Committee of Congress, April 21, 1886, made the following statement as to membership: 'Our present membership does not exceed 500,000, although we have been credited with 5,000,000.' This statement indicates a growth of nearly 400,000 in one year. The growth was so rapid that the Executive Board of the Order felt constrained to call a halt in the initiation of new members. To-day (December 10, 1886), while the membership has fallen off in some localities, from various causes, in the whole country it has increased, and is, according to the best inside estimates, not much less than one million."— Carroll D. Wright, *Historical Sketch of the Knights of Labor* (*Quarterly Journal of Economics, Jan.*, 1887).—"At the annual convention of the Knights of Labor, held at Philadelphia, November 14–28 [1893], Grand Master Workman Powderly, for fifteen years the head of the order, was succeeded by J. R. Sovereign, of Iowa. The new leader's first address to the organization, issued December 7, contained in addition to the usual denunciation of capitalists, a strong demand for the free coinage of silver and an expansion of the currency."— *Political Science Quarterly, June*, 1894; *Record of Political Events.*

A. D. 1872-1886. — The International in America.—By the order of the congress of the International held at the Hague in 1872, the General Council of the Association was transferred to New York. "Modern socialism had then undoubtedly begun to exist in America. The first proclamation of the council from their new headquarters was an appeal to workingmen 'to emancipate labor and eradicate all international and national strife.' . . . The 'Exceptional Law' passed against socialists by the German Parliament in 1878 drove many socialists from Germany to this country, and these have strengthened the cause of American socialism through membership in trades-unions and in the Socialistic Labor Party. There have been several changes among the socialists in party organization and name since 1873, and national conventions or congresses have met from time to time. . . . The name Socialistic Labor Party was adopted in 1877 at the Newark Convention. In 1883 the split between the moderates and extremists had become definite, and the latter held their congress in Pittsburg, and the former in Baltimore. . . . The terrible affair of May 4, 1886, when the Chicago Internationalists endeavored to resist the police by the use of dynamite, terminated all possibility of joint action — even if there could previously have been any remote hope of it; for that was denounced as criminal folly by the Socialistic Labor Party. . . . The Internationalists, at their congress in Pittsburg, adopted unanimously a manifesto or declaration of motives and principles, often called the Pittsburg Proclamation, in which they describe their ultimate goal in these words: —'What we would achieve is, therefore, plainly and simply,—First, Destruction of the existing class rule, by all means, i. e., by energetic, relentless, revolutionary, and international action. Second, Establishment of a free society based upon co-operative organization of production. Third, Free exchange of equivalent products by and between the productive organizations without commerce and profit-mongery. Fourth, Organization of education on a secular, scientific and equal basis for both sexes. Fifth, Equal rights for all without distinction to sex or race. Sixth, Regulation of all public affairs by free contracts between the autonomous (independent) communes and associations, resting on a federalistic basis.'"—R. T. Ely, *The Labor Movement in America, ch.* 8–9.

A. D. 1875-1893.— Socialist parties in Germany.— Their increasing strength.—Before 1875, there existed in Germany two powerful Socialist associations. The first was called the 'General Association of German Working

Men' (der allgemeine deutsche Arbeiterverein). Founded by Lassalle in 1863, it afterwards had for president the deputy Schweizer, and then the deputy Hasenclever. Its principal centre of activity was North Germany. The second was the 'Social-democratic Working Men's Party' (die Social-democratische Arbeiterpartei), led by two well-known deputies of the Reichstag, Herr Bebel and Herr Liebknecht. Its adherents were chiefly in Saxony and Southern Germany. The first took into account the ties of nationality, and claimed the intervention of the State in order to bring about a gradual transformation of society; the second, on the contrary, expected the triumph of its cause only from a revolutionary movement. These two associations existed for a long time in open hostility towards each other; less, however, from the difference of the aims they had in view than in consequence of personal rivalry. Nevertheless, in May, 1875, at the Congress of Gotha, they amalgamated under the title of the 'Socialist Working Men's Party of Germany' (Socialistische Arbeiterpartei Deutschlands). The deputy Hasenclever was nominated president; but the union did not last long, or was never complete, for as early as the month of August following a separate meeting of the 'General Association of German Working Men' was held at Hamburg. . . . The German Socialist party does not confine itself to stating general principles. Now that it has gained foothold on political soil, and sends representatives to Parliament, it endeavours to make known the means by which it hopes to realize the reforms it has in view. This is what it claims: —'The German Socialist party demands, in order to pave the way for the solution of the social question, the creation of socialistic productive associations aided by the State, under the democratic control of the working people. These productive associations for manufacture and agriculture should be created on a sufficiently large scale to enable the socialistic organization of labour to arise out of them. As basis of the State, it demands direct and universal suffrage for all citizens of twenty years of age, in all elections both of State and Commune; direct legislation, by the people, including the decision of peace or war; general liability to bear arms and a militia composed of civilians instead of a standing army; the abolition of all laws restricting the right of association, the right of assembly, the free expression of opinion, free thought, and free inquiry; gratuitous justice administered by the people; compulsory education, the same for all and given by the State; and a declaration that religion is an object of private concern.'"—É. de Laveleye, *The Socialism of To-day, introd. and ch.* 1.—"The social democratic party [in Germany] advanced in strength, as far as that is measured by votes, until 1878, when the decrease was only slight. Two attempts were made on the life of the Emperor William in that year, and the social democrats had to bear a good share of the blame. . . . In the Reichstag the celebrated socialistic law was passed, which gave government exceptional and despotic powers to proceed against social democracy. . . . Governmental persecution united the divided members and gave new energy to all. . . . They all became secret missionaries, distributing tracts and exhorting individually their fellow-laborers to join the struggle for the emancipation of labor. The German social democrats have held two congresses since the socialistic law, both, of course, on foreign soil, and both have indicated progress. The first was held at Wyden, Switzerland, August 20–23, 1880. This resulted in a complete triumph for the more moderate party. The two leading extremists, Hasselmann and Most, were both expelled from the party — the former by all save three votes, the latter by all save two. The next congress was held at Copenhagen, Denmark, from March 29 to April 2, 1883. It exhibited greater unanimity of sentiment and plan, and a more wide-spread interest in social democracy, than any previous congress."—R. T. Ely, *French and German Socialism, ch.* 14.—At the general election, February, 1890, in Germany, the Social Democratic party "polled more votes than any other single party in the Empire, and returned to the Imperial Diet a body of representatives strong enough, by skilful alliances, to exercise an effective influence on the course of affairs. The advance of the party may be seen in the increase of the socialist vote at the successive elections since the creation of the Empire: In 1871 it was 101,927; 1874, 351,670; 1877, 493,447; 1878, 437,438; 1881, 311,961; 1884, 549,000; 1887, 774,128; 1890, 1,427,000. The effect of the coercive laws of 1878, as shown by these figures, is very noteworthy. . . . The first effect . . . was, as was natural, to disorganize the socialist party for the time. Hundreds of its leaders were expelled from the country; hundreds were thrown into prison or placed under police restriction; its clubs and newspapers were suppressed; it was not allowed to hold meetings, to make speeches, or to circulate literature of any kind. In the course of the twelve years during which this exceptional legislation has subsisted, it was stated at the recent Socialist Congress at Halle [1890], that 155 socialist journals and 1,200 books or pamphlets had been prohibited; 900 members of the party had been banished without trial; 1,500 had been apprehended and 300 punished for contraventions of the Anti-Socialist Laws." But this "policy of repression has ended in tripling the strength of the party it was designed to crush, and placing it in possession of one-fifth of the whole voting power of the nation. It was high time, therefore, to abandon so ineffectual a policy, and the socialist coercive laws expired on the 30th September, 1890. . . . The strength of the party in Parliament has never corresponded with its strength at the polls. . . . In 1890, with an electoral vote which, under a system of proportional representation, would have secured for it 80 members, it has carried only 37."—J. Rae, *Contemporary Socialism, pp.* 33–34.—The Social Democrats "retained their position as the strongest party in the empire in the elections of 1893, casting nearly 1,800,000 votes, and electing 44 members of parliament. . . . Another indication of the growth of social democracy, is the fact that it has gained a foothold among the students of the universities."—R. T. Ely, *Socialism, p.* 59.—"The two principal leaders of the Social-Democratic party in Germany — in fact, the only members of the party to whom the term leader can properly be applied — are now Wilhelm Liebknecht and August Bebel. Both men have lived eventful lives and have suffered often and severely for the sake of their cause. . . . Liebknecht has done a great deal to popularise the political and social

theories of men like Marx and Lassalle. He is through and through a Communist and a Republican, and he is determined upon realising his ideals by hook or by crook. . . . He works for the subversion of the monarchical principle and for the establishment of a Free People's State. In this State all subjects will stand upon the same level: there will be no classes and no privileges. . . . Bebel once summarised his views in a sentence which, so far as he spoke for himself, is as true as it is short. 'We aim,' he said, 'in the domain of politics at Republicanism, in the domain of economics at Socialism, and in the domain of what is to-day called religion at Atheism.' Here we see Bebel as in a mirror. He is a Republican and a Socialist, and he is proud of it; he is without religion, and he is never tired of parading the fact, even having himself described in the Parliamentary Almanacs as 'religionslos.' Like his colleague Liebknecht he is a warm admirer of England."—W. H. Dawson, *German Socialism and Ferdinand Lassalle, ch.* 15.

A. D. 1880.—Mr. Henry George, and the proposed confiscation of rent.—The Single-Tax movement.—The doctrine of Mr. Henry George, set forth in his famous book, "Progress and Poverty," published in 1880, is stated in his own language as follows: "We have traced the want and suffering that everywhere prevail among the working classes, the recurring paroxysms of industrial depression, the scarcity of employment, the stagnation of capital, the tendency of wages to the starvation point, that exhibit themselves more and more strongly as material progress goes on, to the fact that the land on which and from which all must live is made the exclusive property of some. We have seen that there is no possible remedy for these evils but the abolition of their cause; we have seen that private property in land has no warrant in justice, but stands condemned as the denial of natural right—a subversion of the law of nature that as social development goes on must condemn the masses of men to a slavery the hardest and most degrading. . . . I do not propose either to purchase or to confiscate private property in land. The first would be unjust; the second, needless. Let the individuals who now hold it still retain, if they want to, possession of what they are pleased to call their land. Let them continue to call it their land. Let them buy and sell, and bequeath and devise it. We may safely leave them the shell, if we take the kernel. It is not necessary to confiscate land; it is only necessary to confiscate rent. Nor to take rent for public uses is it necessary that the State should bother with the letting of lands, and assume the chances of the favoritism, collusion, and corruption that might involve. It is not necessary that any new machinery should be created. The machinery already exists. Instead of extending it, all we have to do is to simplify and reduce it. By leaving to land owners a percentage of rent which would probably be much less than the cost and loss involved in attempting to rent lands through State agency, and by making use of this existing machinery, we may, without jar or shock, assert the common right to land by taking rent for public uses. We already take some rent in taxation. We have only to make some changes in our modes of taxation to take it all. What I, therefore, propose, as the simple yet sovereign remedy, which will raise wages, increase the earnings of capital, extirpate pauperism, abolish poverty, give remunerative employment to whoever wishes it, afford free scope to human powers, lessen crime, elevate morals, and taste, and intelligence, purify government and carry civilization to yet nobler heights, is—to appropriate rent by taxation. In this way, the State may become the universal landlord without calling herself so, and without assuming a single new function. In form, the ownership of land would remain just as now. No owner of land need be dispossessed, and no restriction need be placed upon the amount of land any one could hold. For, rent being taken by the State in taxes, land, no matter in whose name it stood, or in what parcels it was held, would be really common property, and every member of the community would participate in the advantages of its ownership. Now, insomuch as the taxation of rent, or land values, must necessarily be increased just as we abolish other taxes, we may put the proposition into practical form by proposing—To abolish all taxation save that upon land values."—H. George, *Progress and Poverty, bk.* 8, *ch.* 2.—"Mr. George sent his 'Progress and Poverty' into the world with the remarkable prediction that it would find not only readers but apostles. . . . Mr. George's prediction is not more remarkable than its fulfilment. His work has had an unusually extensive sale; a hundred editions in America, and an edition of 60,000 copies in this country [England, 1891] are sufficient evidences of that; but the most striking feature in its reception is precisely that which its author foretold; it created an army of apostles, and was enthusiastically circulated, like the testament of a new dispensation. Societies were formed, journals were devised to propagate its saving doctrines, and little companies of the faithful held stated meetings for its reading and exposition. . . . The author was hailed as a new and better Adam Smith, as at once a reformer of science and a renovator of society."—J. Rae, *Contemporary Socialism, ch.* 12.

A. D. 1883-1889.—State Socialistic measures of the German Government.—"Replying once to the accusation made by an opponent in the Reichstag that his social-political measures were tainted with Socialism, Prince Bismarck said, 'You will be compelled yet to add a few drops of social oil in the recipe you prescribe for the State; how many I cannot say.' In no measures has more of the Chancellor's 'social oil' been introduced than in the industrial insurance laws. These may be said to indicate the high-water mark of German State Socialism. . . . The Sickness Insurance Law of 1883, the Accident Insurance Laws of 1884 and 1885, and the Old Age Insurance Law of 1889 are based upon the principle of compulsion which was introduced into the sick insurance legislation of Prussia in 1854. . . . The trio of insurance laws was completed in 1889 by the passing of a measure providing for the insurance of workpeople against the time of incapacity and old age (Invalidäts und Altersversicherungsgesetz). This was no after-thought suggested by the laws which preceded. It formed from the first part of the complete plan of insurance foreshadowed by Prince Bismarck over a decade ago, and in some of the Chancellor's early speeches on the social question he regarded the pensioning of old and

incapacitated workpeople as at once desirable and inevitable. . . . The Old Age Insurance Law is expected to apply to about twelve million workpeople, including labourers, factory operatives, journeymen, domestic servants, clerks, assistants, and apprentices in handicrafts and in trade (apothecaries excluded), and smaller officials (as on railways, etc.), so long as their wages do not reach 2,000 marks (about £100) a year; also persons employed in shipping, whether maritime, river, or lake; and, if the Federal Council so determine, certain classes of small independent undertakers. The obligation to insure begins with the completion of the sixteenth year, but there are exemptions, including persons who, owing to physical or mental weakness, are unable to earn fixed minimum wages, and persons already entitled to public pensions, equal in amount to the benefits secured by the law, or who are assured accident annuities. The contributions are paid by the employers and workpeople in equal shares, but the State also guarantees a yearly subsidy of 50 marks (£2.10s.) for every annuity paid. Contributions are only to be paid when the insured is in work. The law fixes four wages classes, with proportionate contributions as follows:—

Wages.			Contributions.		
			Weekly.	Yearly (47 weeks).	
1st class	300 marks	(£15)	14 pfennig	3·29 marks	(3s. 3½d.)
2nd "	500 "	(£25)	20 "	4·70 "	(4s. 8½d.)
3rd "	720 "	(£36)	24 "	5·64 "	(5s. 7½d.)
4th "	960 "	(£78)	30 "	7·05 "	(7s.).

Of course, of these contributions the workpeople only pay half. Old age annuities are first claimable at the beginning of the seventy-first year, but annuities on account of permanent incapacity may begin at any time after the workman has been insured for five years. The minimum period of contribution in the case of old age pensioning is thirty years of forty-seven premiums each. Where a workman is prevented by illness (exceeding a week but not exceeding a year), caused by no fault of his own, or by military duties, from continuing his contributions, the period of his absence from work is reckoned part of the contributory year. . . . Contributions are made in postage stamps affixed to yearly receipt cards supplied to the insured. Annuities are to be paid through the post-office monthly in advance."—W. H. Dawson, *Bismarck and State Socialism, ch.* 9.

A. D. 1887-1888.—Development of the "New Trade Unionism."—"The elements composing what is termed the New Trade Unionism are not to be found in the constitution, organization, and rules of the Unions started within the last two or three years. In these respects they either conform to the experience of modern Unions, or they revive the practices of the older Unions. There is scarcely a feature in which any of them differ from types of Unions long in existence. In what, then, consists the 'New Trade Unionism,' of which we hear so much? Mainly in the aspirations, conduct, modes of advocacy, and methods of procedure of, and also in the expressions used, and principles inculcated by the new leaders in labour movements, in their speeches and by their acts. This New Unionism has been formulated and promulgated at Trades Union Congresses, at other Congresses and Conferences, and at the meetings held in various parts of the country; and in letters and articles which have appeared in the newspaper, press, and public journals from the pens of the new leaders. . . . The institution of Labour Bureaus, or the establishment of Labour Registries, is one of the acknowledged objects of the Dockers' Union. Singularly enough this is the first time that any such project has had the sanction of a boná-fide Trade Union. All the older Unions repudiate every such scheme. It has hitherto been regarded as opposed in principle to Trade Unionism. . . . At the recent Trades Union Congress held in Liverpool, September 1890, the following resolution was moved by one of the London delegates representing the 'South Side Labour Protection League'—'That in the opinion of this Congress, in order to carry on more effectually the organization of the large mass of unorganized labour, to bring into closer combination those sections of labour already organized, to provide means for communication and the interchange of information between all sections of industry, and the proper tabulation of statistics as to employment, &c., of advantage to the workmen, it is necessary that a labour exchange, on the model of the Paris Bourse des Travail, should be provided and maintained by public funds in every industrial centre in the kingdom.' . . . The mover said that 'not a single delegate could deny the necessity for such an institution, in every industrial centre.' The Congress evidently thought otherwise, for only 74 voted for the resolution, while 92 voted against it. . . . The proposal, however, shows to what an extent the New Trade Unionism seeks for Government aid, or municipal assistance, in labour movements. The most astonishing resolution carried by the Congress was the following—'Whereas the ever-changing methods of manufacture affect large numbers of workers adversely by throwing them out of employment, without compensation for loss of situation, and whereas those persons are in many instances driven to destitution, crime, and pauperism: Resolved, that this Congress is of opinion that power should at once be granted to each municipality or County Council to establish workshops and factories under municipal control, where such persons shall be put to useful employment, and that it be an instruction to the Parliamentary Committee to at once take the matter in hand.' . . . The proposal of all others which the new Trade Unionists sought to ingraft upon, and had determined to carry as a portion of the programme of the Trades Union Congress, was the 'legal Eight Hour day;' and they actually succeeded in their design after a stormy battle. The new leaders, with their socialist allies, had been working to that end for over two years."—G. Howell, *Trade Unionism, New and Old, ch.* 8, *pt.* 2.

A. D. 1888-1893.—Mr. Bellamy's "Looking Backward," and the Nationalist movement.—"The so-called 'Nationalist' movement, originating in an ingenious novel called 'Looking Backward' [published in 1888], is one of the most interesting phenomena of the present condition of public opinion in this country. Mr. Edward Bellamy, a novelist by profession, is the recognized father of the Nationalist Clubs which have been formed in various parts of the United States within the last twelve months. His romance of the year 2000 A. D. is the reason for their existence, and furnishes the inspiration of their declarations. . . . The new society [depicted in Mr. Bellamy's romance] is industrial,

rather than militant, in every feature. There are no wars or government war powers. But the function has been assumed by the nation of directing the industry of every citizen. Every man and woman is enrolled in the 'industrial army,' this conception being fundamental. This universal industrial service rests upon the recognized duty of every citizen 'to contribute his quota of industrial or intellectual work to the maintenance of the nation.' The period of service 'is twenty-four years, beginning at the close of the course of education at twenty-one, and terminating at forty-five. After forty-five, while discharged from labor, the citizen still remains liable to special calls, in case of emergencies.' There are, of course, no such numerous exemptions from this industrial service as qualify very greatly the rigor of the Continental military service of the present day. Every new recruit belongs for three years to the class of unskilled or common laborers. After this term, he is free to choose in what branch of the service he will engage, to work with hand or with brain: — 'It is the business of the administration to seek constantly to equalize the attractions of the trades, so far as the conditions in them are concerned, so that all trades shall be equally attractive to persons having natural tastes for them. This is done by making the hours of labor in different trades to differ according to their arduousness. The principle is that no man's work ought to be, on the whole, harder for him than any other man's for him, the workers themselves to be the judges.' The headship of the industrial army of the nation is the most important function of the President of the United States. Promotion from the ranks lies through three grades up to the officers. These officers are, in ascending order, lieutenants, captains, or foremen, colonels, or superintendents, and generals of the guilds. The various trades are grouped into ten great departments, each of which has a chief. These chiefs form the council of the general-in-chief, who is the President. He must have passed through all the grades, from the common laborers up. . . . Congress has but little to do beyond passing upon the reports of the President and the heads of departments at the end of their terms of office. Any laws which one Congress enacts must receive the assent of another, five years later, before going into effect; but, as there are no parties or politicians in the year 2000 A. D., this is a matter of little consequence. In Mr. Bellamy's Utopia, money is unknown: there is, therefore, no need of banks or bankers. Buying and selling are processes entirely antiquated. The nation is the sole producer of commodities. All persons being in the employment of the nation, there is supposed to be no need of exchanges between individuals. A credit-card is issued to each person, which he presents at a national distributing shop when in need of anything, and the amount due the government is punched out. The yearly allowance made to each person Mr. Bellamy does not put into figures. . . . Every person is free to spend his income as he pleases; but it is the same for all, the sole basis on which it is awarded being the fact that the person is a human being. Consequently, cripples and idiots, as well as children, are entitled to the same share of the products of the national industries as is allowed the most stalwart or the most capable, a certain amount of effort only being required, not of performance. Such is the force of public opinion that no one of able body or able mind refuses to exert himself: the comparative results of his effort are not considered. Absolute equality of recompense is thus the rule; and the notion of charity with respect to the infirm in body or mind is dismissed, a credit-card of the usual amount being issued to every such person as his natural right. 'The account of every person, man, woman, and child . . . is always with the nation directly, and never through any intermediary, except, of course, that parents to a certain extent act for children as their guardians. . . . It is by virtue of the relation of individuals to the nation, of their membership in it, that they are entitled to support.' . . . The idea naturally occurred to a considerable number of Bostonians, who had read Mr. Bellamy's socialistic romance with an enthusiastic conviction that here at last the true social gospel was delivered, that associations for the purpose of disseminating the views set forth in the book could not be formed too soon, as the forerunners of this National party of the future. Accordingly, a club, called 'The Boston Bellamy Club,' was started in September, 1888, which was formally organized as 'The Nationalist Club,' in the following December."— N. P. Gilman, "*Nationalism*" *in the United States* (*Quarterly Journal of Economics, Oct.*, 1889).— The Nationalists "have very generally entered into the Populist movement, not because they accept that in its present form as ideal, but because that movement has seemed to give them the best opportunity for the diffusion of their principles; and there can be no doubt that they have given a socialistic bias to this movement. They have also influenced the labor movement, and, with the Socialistic Labor Party, they have succeeded in producing a strong sentiment in favor of independent political action on the part of the wage-earners. Especially noteworthy was the platform for independent political action offered at the meeting of the American Federation of Labor in Chicago in December, 1893."— R. T. Ely, *Socialism, p.* 69.

A. D. 1894.—The American Railway Union and the Pullman Strike.— In May, 1894, some 4,000 workmen, employed in the car shops of the Pullman Company, at the town of Pullman, near Chicago, stopped work, because of the refusal of the company to restore their wages to the standard from which they had been cut down during the previous year and because of its refusal to arbitrate the question. While this strike was in progress, the American Railway Union, a comparatively new but extensive organization of railway employees, formed by and under the presidency of Eugene V. Debs, met in convention at Chicago, and was induced to make the cause of the Pullman workmen its own. The result was a decision on the part of the Union to "boycott" all Pullman cars, ordering its members to refuse to handle cars of that company, on the railways which center at Chicago. This order went into effect on the evening of June 26, and produced the most extensive and alarming paralysis of traffic and business that has ever been experienced in the United States. Acts of violence soon accompanied the strike of the railway employees, but how far committed by the strikers and how far by responsive mobs, has never been made clear. The interruption of

mails brought the proceedings of the strikers within the jurisdiction of the federal courts and within reach of the arm of the United States government. The powers of the national courts and of the national executive were both promptly exercised, to restore order and to stop a ruinous interference with the general commerce of the country. The leaders of the strike were indicted and placed under arrest; United States troops were sent to the scene; President Cleveland, by two solemn proclamations, made known the determination of the Government to suppress a combination which obstructed the United States mails and the movements of commerce between the states. Urgent appeals were addressed by the leaders of the American Railway Union to other labor organizations, with the hope of bringing about a universal strike, in all departments of industry throughout the country; but it failed. The good sense of workingmen in general condemned so suicidal a measure. By the 15th of July the Pullman strike was practically ended, and the traffic of the railways was resumed. President Cleveland appointed a commission to investigate and report on the occurrence and its causes, but the report of the commission has not been published at the time this is printed (November, 1894).

A. D. 1894.—The Coxey Movement.—"A peculiar outcome of the social and political conditions of the winter [of 1893–4] was the organization of various 'armies of the unemployed' for the purpose of marching to Washington and petitioning Congress for aid. The originator of the idea seems to have been one Coxey, of Massillon, Ohio, who took up the proposition that, as good roads and money were both much needed in the country, the government should in the existing crisis issue $500,000,000 in greenbacks, and devote it to the employment of workers in the improvement of the roads. He announced that he would lead an 'Army of the Commonweal of Christ' to Washington to proclaim the wants of the people on the steps of the Capitol on May 1, and he called upon the unemployed and honest laboring classes to join him. On March 25 he set out from Massillon at the head of about a hundred men and marched by easy stages and without disorder through Ohio, Pennsylvania and Maryland, provisions being donated by the towns and villages on the way, or purchased with funds which had been subscribed by sympathizing friends. The numbers of the army increased as it advanced, and groups of volunteers set out to join it from distant states. On May 1 the detachment, numbering about 350, marched to the Capitol, but under an old District law was prevented by the police from entering the grounds. Coxey and another of the leaders, attempting to elude the police and address the assembled crowds, were arrested and were afterwards convicted of a misdemeanor. . . . Somewhat earlier than the start from Massillon, another organization, 'The United States Industrial Army,' headed by one Frye, had started from Los Angeles, California, for Washington, with purposes similar to those of the Coxey force, though not limiting their demands to work on the roads. This force, numbering from six to eight hundred men, availed themselves of the assistance, more or less involuntary, of freight trains on the Southern Pacific Railway as far as St. Louis, from which place they continued on foot. Though observing a degree of military discipline, the various 'armies' were unarmed, and the disturbances that arose in several places in the latter part of April were mostly due to the efforts of the marchers, or their friends in their behalf, to press the railroads into service for transportation. Thus a band under a leader named Kelly, starting from San Francisco, April 4, secured freight accommodations as far as Omaha by simply refusing to leave Oakland until the cars were furnished. The railroads eastward from Omaha refused absolutely to carry them, and they went into camp near Council Bluffs, in Iowa. Then sympathizing Knights of Labor seized a train by force and offered it to Kelly, who refused, however, to accept it under the circumstances, and ultimately continued on foot as far as Des Moines, in Iowa. After a long stay at that place he was finally supplied with flatboats, on which, at the close of this Record, his band, now swollen to some 1,200 men, was floating southward. A band coming east on a stolen train on the Northern Pacific, after overpowering a squad of United States marshals, was captured by a detachment of regular troops at Forsyth, Montana, April 26. Two days later the militia were called out to rescue a train from a band at Mount Sterling, Ohio."—*Political Science Quarterly: Record of Political Events, June*, 1894.—There were straggling movements, from different quarters of the country, in imitation of those described, prolonged through most of the summer of 1894; but the public feeling favorable to them was limited, and they commonly came to an ignominious end.

SOCIAL WAR: In the Athenian Confederacy. See ATHENS: B. C. 378–357.

Of the Achaian and Ætolian Leagues. See GREECE: B. C. 280–146.

Of the Italians. See ROME: B. C. 90–88.

SOCIALIST PARTIES IN GERMANY.—Some matter first placed under this title, and so referred to, has been incorporated in the more general article above, entitled SOCIAL MOVEMENTS, which see.

SOCIETY OF JESUS. See JESUITS.

SOCII, The.—The Italian subject-allies of Rome were called Socii before the Roman franchise was extended to them. See ROME: B. C. 90–88.

SOCMEN.—Mr. Hallam thinks the Socmen, enumerated in Domesday Book, to have been ceorls who were small landowners.—H. Hallam, *The Middle Ages, ch.* 8, *note* 3 (*v.* 2).

SOCRATES: As soldier and citizen. See ATHENS: B. C. 424–406; and GREECE: B. C. 406. . . . . **As teacher.** See EDUCATION, ANCIENT: GREECE.

SODALITATES.—"There were [among the Romans] . . . unions originally formed for social purposes, which were named 'sodalitates,' 'sodalitia,' and these may be compared with our clubs. These associations finally were made the centres of political parties, and we may assume that they were sometimes formed solely for political purposes."—G. Long, *Decline of the Roman Republic, v.* 3, *ch.* 11.—See, also, COLLEGIA.

SODOR AND MAN, The Bishopric of.—In the 11th century, the peculiar naval empire which the Norsemen had established in the Heb-

rides, and on the neighboring coasts of Ireland and Scotland, under the rulers known as the Hy Ivar, became divided into two parts, called Nordureyer or Norderies and Sudureyer or Suderies, the northern and southern division. The dividing-line was at the point of Ardnamurchan, the most westerly promontory of the mainland of Scotland. "Hence the English bishopric of Sodor and Man — Sodor being the southern division of the Scottish Hebrides, and not now part of any English diocese. . . . The Bishop of Sodor and Man has no seat in the House of Lords, owing, as it is commonly said, to Man not having become an English possession when bishops began to sit as Lords by tenure."—J. H. Burton, *Hist. of Scotland, ch.* 15, *foot-note* (*v.* 2). — See, also, Normans. — Northmen: 10-13th Centuries.

SOFT-SHELL DEMOCRATS, The. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1845–1846.

SOGDIANA.—"North of the Bactrians, beyond the Oxus, on the western slope of Belurdagh, in the valley of the Polytimetus (Zarefshan, i. e. strewing gold), which flows towards the Oxus from the east, but, instead of joining it, ends in Lake Dengis, lay the Sogdiani of the Greeks, the Suguda of the Old Persian inscriptions, and Çughdha of the Avesta, in the region of the modern Sogd. As the Oxus in its upper course separates the Bactrians from the Sogdiani, the Jaxartes, further to the north, separates the latter from the Scyths. According to Strabo, the manners of the Bactrians and Sogdiani were similar, but the Bactrians were less rude. Maracanda (Samarcand), the chief city of the Sogdiani, on the Polytimetus, is said to have had a circuit of 70 stades in the fourth century B. C." — M. Duncker, *Hist. of Antiquity, bk.* 7, *ch.* 1 (*v.* 5). — See, also, Bokhara.

Occupied by the Huns. See Huns, The White.

SOHR, Battle of (1745). See Austria: A. D. 1744–1745.

SOISSONS: Origin of the name. See Belgæ.

A. D. 457-486. — Capital of the kingdom of Syagrius. See Gaul: A. D. 457–486; also, Franks: A. D. 481–511.

A. D. 486. — The capital of Clovis. See Paris: The capital of Clovis.

A. D. 511-752. — One of the Merovingian capitals. See Franks: A. D. 511–752.

A. D. 1414.—Pillage and destruction by the Armagnacs.—In the civil wars of Armagnacs and Burgundians, during the reign of the insane king Charles VI., the Armagnacs, then having the king in their hands, and pretendedly acting under his commands, laid siege to Soissons and took the city by storm, on the 21st of May, A. D. 1414. "In regard to the destruction committed by the king's army in Soissons, it cannot be estimated. . . . There is not a Christian but would have shuddered at the atrocious excesses committed by this soldiery in Soissons: married women violated before their husbands, young damsels in the presence of their parents and relatives, holy nuns, gentle women of all ranks, of whom there were many in the town: all, or the greater part, were violated against their wills, and known carnally by divers nobles and others, who, after having satiated their own brutal passions, delivered them over without mercy to their servants; and there is no remembrance of such disorder and havoc being done by Christians. . . . Thus was this grand and noble city of Soissons, strong from its situation, walls and towers, full of wealth, and embellished with fine churches and holy relics, totally ruined and destroyed by the army of king Charles, and of the princes who accompanied him. The king, however, before his departure, gave orders for its rebuilding." — Monstrelet, *Chronicles* (*tr. by Johnes*), *bk.* 1, *ch.* 120 (*v.* 1).

SOISSONS, Battle of (718). See Franks: A. D. 511–752.

Battle of (923).—The revolt against Charles the Simple, which resulted in the overthrow of the Carolingian dynasty, had its beginning in 918. In 922, Robert, Duke of France and Count of Paris, grandfather of Hugh Capet, was chosen and crowned king by the malcontents. On the 15th of June in the next year the most desperate and sanguinary battle of the civil war was fought at Soissons, where more than half of each army perished. The Capetians won the field, but their newly crowned king was among the slain.—Sir F. Palgrave, *Hist. of Normandy and Eng.*, *v.* 2, *p.* 40.

SOISSONS, Peace Congress of. See Spain: A. D. 1726–1731.

SOKEMANNI. See Slavery, Mediæval: England.

SOLEBAY, Naval battle of (1672). See Netherlands (Holland): A. D. 1672–1674.

SOLES, Society of. See Cuba: A. D. 1514–1851.

SOLFERINO, Battle of (1859). See Italy: A. D. 1856–1859.

SOLIDUS, The.—"The solidus or aureus is computed equivalent in weight of gold to twenty-one shillings one penny English money." —C. Merivale, *Hist. of the Romans, ch.* 32, *foot-note.*

SOLON, The Constitution of. See Athens: B. C. 594; also, Debt, Laws concerning: Ancient Greek.

SOLWAY-FRITH, OR SOLWAY MOSS, The Battle of. See Scotland: A. D. 1542.

SOLYMAN, Caliph, A. D. 715–717. . . . . Soly-man I., Turkish Sultan, 1520–1566. . . . . Soly-man II., Turkish Sultan, 1687–1691.

SOLYMI, The. See Lycians.

SOMA.—HAOMA.—"It is well known that both in the Veda and the Avesta a plant is mentioned, called Soma (Zend, haoma). This plant, when properly squeezed, yielded a juice, which was allowed to ferment and, when mixed with milk and honey, produced an exhilarating and intoxicating beverage. This Soma juice has the same importance in Vedic and Avestic sacrifices as the juice of the grape had in the worship of Bacchus. The question has often been discussed what kind of plant this Soma could have been. When Soma sacrifices are performed at present, it is confessed that the real Soma can no longer be procured, and that some ci-près, such as Pûtikâs, etc., must be used instead." The Soma of later times seems to have been identified with a species of Sarcostemma. The ancient Soma is conjectured by some to have been the grape, and by others to have been the hop plant.—F. Max

Müller, *Biog. of Words, appendix* 3.—See, also, Zoroastrians.

SOMASCINES, The.—The Somascines, or the Congregation of Somasca, so called from the town of that name, were an order of regular clergy founded in 1540 by a Venetian noble, Girolamo Miani. They devoted themselves to the establishment and maintenance of hospitals, asylums for orphans, and the education of the poor.—L. Ranke, *Hist. of the Popes, bk.* 2, *sect.* 3 (*v.* 1).

SOMATOPHYLAX.—"A somatophylax in the Macedonian army was no doubt at first, as the word means, one of the officers who had to answer for the king's safety; perhaps in modern language a colonel in the body-guards or household troops; but as, in unmixed monarchies, the faithful officer who was nearest the king's person, to whose watchfulness he trusted in the hour of danger, often found himself the adviser in matters of state, so, in the time of Alexander, the title of somatophylax was given to those generals on whose wisdom the king chiefly leaned, and by whose advice he was usually guided."—S. Sharpe, *Hist. of Egypt, ch.* 6, *sect.* 18 (*v.* 1).

SOMERS, Lord, and the shaping of constitutional government in England. See England: A. D. 1710–1712.

SOMERSETT, The case of the negro. See Slavery, Negro: A. D. 1685–1772.

SOMNAUTH, The gates of. See Afghanistan: A. D. 1842–1869.

SONCINO, Battle of (1431). See Italy: A. D. 1412–1447.

SONDERBUND, The. See Switzerland: A. D. 1803–1848.

SONOMA: A. D. 1846.—The raising of the Bear Flag. See California: A. D. 1846–1847.

SONS OF LIBERTY. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1765 The reception of the news.

SONS OF LIBERTY, Knights of the Order of the. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1864 (October).

SOPHENE, Kingdom of. See Armenia.

SOPHERIM. See Scribes.

SOPHI I., Shah of Persia, A. D. 1628–1641. ....Sophi II., Shah of Persia, 1666–1694.

SOPHI, The. See Megistanes.

SORA, The School of. See Jews: 7th Century.

SORABIANS, The.—A Sclavonic tribe which occupied, in the eighth century, the country between the Elbe and the Saale. They were subdued by Charlemagne in 806.—J. I. Mombert, *Hist. of Charles the Great, bk.* 2, *ch.* 11.

SORBIODUNUM.—A strong Roman fortress in Britain which is identified in site with Old Sarum of the present day.—T. Wright, *Celt, Roman and Saxon, ch.* 5.

SORBONNE, The. See Education, Mediæval: France.—University of Paris.

SORDONES, The.—A people of the same race as the ancient Aquitanians, who inhabited the eastern Pyrenees and the Aude.—Napoleon III., *Hist. of Cæsar, bk.* 3, *ch.* 2 (*v.* 2).

SOTIATES, The. See Aquitaine: The Ancient Tribes.

SOTO, Hernando de, The expedition of. See Florida: A. D. 1528–1542.

SOUDAN, The. See Sudan.

SOUFFRANCE, A.—"The word is translated as a truce, but it means something very different from a modern truce. . . . The Souffrance was more of the nature of a peace at the present day; and the reason why of old it was treated as distinct from a peace was this: The wars of the time generally arose from questions of succession or of feudal superiority. When it became desirable to cease fighting, while yet neither side was prepared to give in to the other, there was an agreement to give up fighting in the mean time, reserving all rights entire for future discussion. A Souffrance or truce of this kind might last for centuries."—J. H. Burton, *Hist. of Scotland, ch.* 21 (*v.* 2).

SOULT, Marshal, Campaigns of. See Germany: A. D. 1806 (October); 1807 (February—June); Spain: A. D. 1808 (September—December) to 1812–1814; Germany: A. D. 1813 (May—August); France: A. D. 1815 (June).

SOUTH AFRICA: The aboriginal inhabitants.—"South Africa in its widest extent is peopled by two great and perfectly distinct indigenous races—the Kafirs and the Hottentots. The affinity of the Kafir tribes, ethnographically including the Kafirs proper and the people of Congo, is based upon the various idioms spoken by them, the direct representatives of a common but now extinct mother tongue. The aggregate of languages is now conventionally known as the A-bantu, or, more correctly, the Bantu linguistic system. The more common term Kafir, from the Arabic Kâfir = infidel, really represents but a small section of this great family, and being otherwise a term of reproach imposed upon them by strangers, is of course unknown to the people themselves. All the Bantu tribes are distinguished by a dark skin and woolly hair, which varies much in length and quality, but is never sleek or straight. . . . According to its geographical position the Bantu system is divided into the Eastern group, from its principal representatives known as the Ama-Zulu and Ama-Khosa or Kafir proper, the Central, or Be-tchuana group, and the Western or O-va-Herero, or Damara group. . . . The northern division of these Bantus bears the name of Ama-Zulu, and they are amongst the best representatives of dark-coloured races. The Zulus are relatively well developed and of large size, though not surpassing the average height of Europeans, and with decidedly better features than the Ama-Khosa. . . . The most wide-spread and most numerous of all these Kafir tribes are the Bechuanas [including the Basutos], their present domain stretching from the upper Orange river northwards to the Zambesi, and over the west coast highland north of Namaqualand; of this vast region, however, they occupy the outskirts only. . . . The Hottentots, or more correctly Koi-Koin (men), have no material features in common with the great Bantu family, except their woolly hair, though even this presents some considerable points of difference. Their general type is that of a people with a peculiar pale yellow-brown complexion, very curly 'elf-lock' or matted hair, narrow forehead, high cheek-bones projecting side-ways, pointed chin, body of medium size, rather hardy than strong, with small hands and feet, and platynocephalous cranium. . . . The Hottentots are properly divided into three groups: the Colonial, or Hottentots properly so called,

dwelling in Cape Colony, and thence eastwards to the borders of Kafirland . . . ; the Korana, settled mainly on the right bank of the Orange river . . . ; lastly, the Namaqua, whose domain embraces the western portion of South Africa, bordering eastwards on the Kalahari desert."—Hellwald-Johnston, *Africa* (*Stanford's Compendium*), *ch.* 25.—See, also, AFRICA: THE INHABITING RACES.

A. D. 1486-1806.—Portuguese discovery.—Dutch possession.—English acquisition.—The Cape of Good Hope, "as far as we know, was first doubled by Bartholomew Diaz in 1486 [see PORTUGAL: A. D. 1463–1498]. He, and some of the mariners with him, called it the Cape of Torments, or Capo Tormentoso, from the miseries they endured. The more comfortable name which it now bears was given to it by King John of Portugal, as being the new way discovered by his subjects to the glorious Indies. Diaz, it seems, never in truth saw the Cape, but was carried past it to Algoa Bay. . . . Vasco da Gama, another sailor hero, said to have been of royal Portuguese descent, followed him in 1497. He landed to the west of the Cape. . . . Vasco da Gama did not stay long at the Cape, but proceeding on went up the East Coast as far as our second South African colony, which bears the name which he then gave to it. He called the land Tierra de Natal, because he reached it on the day of our Lord's Nativity. The name has stuck to it ever since and no doubt will now be preserved. From thence Da Gama went on to India. . . . The Portuguese seem to have made no settlement at the Cape intended even to be permanent; but they did use the place during the 16th and first half of the next century as a port at which they could call for supplies and assistance on their way out to the East Indies. The East had then become the great goal of commerce to others besides the Portuguese. In 1600 our own East India Company was formed, and in 1602 that of the Dutch. Previous to those dates, in 1591, an English sailor, Captain Lancaster, visited the Cape, and in 1620 Englishmen landed and took possession of it in the name of James I. But nothing came of these visitings and declarations, although an attempt was made by Great Britain to establish a house of call for her trade out to the East. For this purpose a small gang of convicts was deposited on Robben Island, which is just off Capetown, but as a matter of course the convicts quarrelled with themselves and the Natives, and came to a speedy end. In 1595 the Dutch came, but did not then remain. It was not till 1652 that the first Europeans who were destined to be the pioneer occupants of the new land were put on shore at the Cape of Good Hope, and thus made the first Dutch settlement. Previous to that the Cape had in fact been a place of call for vessels of all nations going and coming to and from the East. But from this date, 1652, it was to be used for the Dutch exclusively. . . . The home Authority at this time was not the Dutch Government, but the Council of Seventeen at Amsterdam, who were the Directors of the Dutch East India Company. . . . From 1658, when the place was but six years old, there comes a very sad record indeed. The first cargo of slaves was landed at the Cape from the Guinea Coast. In this year, out of an entire population of 360, more than a half were slaves. The total number of these was 187. To control them and to defend the place there were but 113 European men capable of bearing arms. This slave element at once became antagonistic to any system of real colonization, and from that day to this has done more than any other evil to retard the progress of the people. It was extinguished, much to the disgust of the old Dutch inhabitants, under Mr. Buxton's Emancipation Act in 1834;—but its effects are still felt." The new land of which the Dutch had taken possession "was by no means unoccupied or unpossessed. There was a race of savages in possession, to whom the Dutch soon gave the name of Hottentots. [The name was probably taken from some sound in their language which was of frequent occurrence; they seem to have been called 'Ottentoos,' 'Hotnots,' 'Hottentotes,' 'Hodmodods,' and 'Hadmandods,' promiscuously.—Foot-note.] . . . Soon after the settlement was established the burghers were forbidden to trade with these people at all, and then hostilities commenced. The Hottentots found that much, in the way of land, had been taken from them and that nothing was to be got. They . . . have not received, as Savages, a bad character. They are said to have possessed fidelity, attachment, and intelligence. . . . But the Hottentot, with all his virtues, was driven into rebellion. There was some fighting, in which the natives of course were beaten, and rewards were offered, so much for a live Hottentot, and so much for a dead one. This went on till, in 1672, it was found expedient to purchase land from the natives. A contract was made in that year to prevent future cavilling, as was then alleged, between the Governor and one of the native princes, by which the district of the Cape of Good Hope was ceded to the Dutch for a certain nominal price. . . . But after a very early period—1684—there was no further buying of land. . . . The land was then annexed by Europeans as convenience required. In all this the Dutch of those days did very much as the English have done since. . . . The Hottentot . . . is said to be nearly gone, and, being a yellow man, to have lacked strength to endure European seductions. But as to the Hottentot and his fate there are varied opinions. I have been told by some that I have never seen a pure Hottentot. Using my own eyes and my own idea of what a Hottentot is, I should have said that the bulk of the population of the Western Province of the Cape Colony is Hottentot. The truth probably is that they have become so mingled with other races as to have lost much of their identity; but that the race has not perished, as have the Indians of North America and the Maoris. . . . The last half of the 17th and the whole of the 18th century saw the gradual progress of the Dutch depôt,—a colony it could hardly be called,—going on in the same slow determined way, and always with the same purpose. It was no colony because those who managed it at home in Holland, and they who at the Cape served with admirable fidelity their Dutch masters, never entertained an idea as to the colonization of the country. . . . In 1795 came the English. In that year the French Republican troops had taken possession of Holland [see FRANCE: A. D. 1795 (JUNE—DECEMBER)], and the Prince of Orange, after the manner of dethroned potentates, took refuge in England. He gave an authority, which was dated from Kew, to the

Governor of the Cape to deliver up all and everything in his hands to the English forces. On the arrival of the English fleet there was found to be, at the same time, a colonist rebellion. . . . In this double emergency the poor Dutch Governor, who does not seem to have regarded the Prince's order as an authority, was sorely puzzled. He fought a little, but only a little, and then the English were in possession. . . . In 1797 Lord Macartney came out as the first British Governor. Great Britain at this time took possession of the Cape to prevent the French from doing so. No doubt it was a most desirable possession, as being a half-way house for us to India as it had been for the Dutch. But we should not, at any rate then, have touched the place had it not been that Holland, or rather the Dutch, were manifestly unable to retain it. . . . Our rule over the Dutchmen was uneasy and unprofitable. Something of rebellion seems to have been going on during the whole time. . . . When at the peace of Amiens in 1802 it was arranged that the Cape of Good Hope should be restored to Holland [see FRANCE: A. D. 1801–1802], English Ministers of State did not probably grieve much at the loss. . . . But the peace of Amiens was delusive, and there was soon war between England and France. Then again Great Britain felt the necessity of taking the Cape, and proceeded to do so on this occasion without any semblance of Dutch authority. At that time whatever belonged to Holland was almost certain to fall into the hands of France. In 1805 . . . Sir David Baird was sent with half a dozen regiments to expel, not the Dutch, but the Dutch Governor and the Dutch soldiers from the Cape. This he did easily, having encountered some slender resistance; and thus in 1806, on the 19th January, after a century and a half of Dutch rule, the Cape of Good Hope became a British colony."—A. Trollope, *South Africa, v.* 1, *ch.* 2.

ALSO IN: W. Greswell, *Our South African Empire, v.* 1, *ch.* 1–4.—R. Russell, *Natal, pt.* 2, *ch.* 1–3.—Sir B. Frere, *Historical Sketch of S. Africa* (*Royal Hist. Soc. Trans. N. S., v.* 2 *and* 4).

A. D. 1806-1881.—The English and the Dutch Boers.—The "Great Trek."—Successive Boer republics of Natal, Orange Free State, and the Transvaal, absorbed in the British dominions.—The Boer War.—The early history of the Cape Colony, after it became a dependency of the British Crown, "is a record of the struggles of the settlers, both English and Dutch, against the despotic system of government established by Lord Charles Somerset; of Kaffir wars, in which the colonists were often hard put to it to hold their own; and of the struggle for the liberty of the Press, sustained with success by John Fairbairn, and Thomas Pringle, the poet of South Africa, the Ovid of a self-chosen exile. For a time the Dutch and English settlers lived in peace and amity together, but the English efforts to alleviate the condition of, and finally emancipate the slaves, severed the two races. The Dutch settlers held the old Biblical notions about slavery, and they resented fiercely the law of 1833 emancipating all slaves throughout the colony in 1834. The Boers at once determined to 'trek,' to leave the colony which was under the jurisdiction of the English law, and find in the South African wilderness, where no human law prevailed, food for their flocks, and the pastoral freedom of Jacob and of Abraham. The Boers would live their own lives in their own way. They had nothing in common with the Englishman, and they wished for nothing in common. . . . They were a primitive people, farming, hunting, reading the Bible, pious, sturdy, and independent; and the colonial Government was by no means willing to see them leaving the fields and farms that they had colonised, in order to found fresh states outside the boundaries of the newly acquired territory. But the Government was powerless; it tried, and tried in vain, to prevent this emigration. There was no law to prevent it. . . . So, with their waggons, their horses, their cattle and sheep, their guns, and their few household goods, the hardy Boers struck out into the interior and to the north-east, in true patriarchal fashion [the migration being known as the Great Trek], seeking their promised land, and that 'desolate freedom of the wild ass' which was dear to their hearts. They founded a colony at Natal, fought and baptized the new colony in their own blood. The Zulu chief, Dingaan, who sold them the territory, murdered the Boer leader, Peter Retief, and his 79 followers as soon as the deed was signed. This was the beginning of the Boer hatred to the native races. The Boers fought with the Zulus successfully enough, fought with the English who came upon them less successfully. The Imperial Government decided that it would not permit its subjects to establish any independent Governments in any part of South Africa. In 1843, after no slight struggle and bloodshed, the Dutch republic of Natal ceased to be, and Natal became part of the British dominion. Again the Boers, who were unwilling to remain under British rule, 'trekked' northward; again a free Dutch state was founded—the Orange Free State. Once again the English Government persisted in regarding them as British subjects, and as rebels if they refused to admit as much. Once again there was strife and bloodshed, and in 1848 the Orange settlement was placed under British authority, while the leading Boers fled for their lives across the Vaal River, and, obstinately independent, began to found the Transvaal Republic. After six years, however, of British rule in the Orange territory the Imperial Government decided to give it back to the Boers, whose stubborn desire for self-government, and unchanging dislike for foreign rule, made them practically unmanageable as subjects. In April 1854 a convention was entered into with the Boers of the Orange territory, by which the Imperial Government guaranteed the future independence of the Orange Free State. Across the Vaal River the Transvaal Boers grew and flourished after their own fashion, fought the natives, established their republic and their Volksraad. But in 1877 the Transvaal republic had been getting rather the worst of it in some of these struggles, and certain of the Transvaal Boers seem to have made suggestions to England that she should take the Transvaal republic under her protection. Sir Theophilus Shepstone was sent out to investigate the situation. He seems to have entirely misunderstood the condition of things, and to have taken the frightened desires of a few Boers as the honest sentiments of the whole Boer nation. In an evil hour he hoisted the English flag in the Transvaal, and declared the little republic a portion of the

territory of the British Crown. As a matter of fact, the majority of the Boers were a fierce, independent people, very jealous of their liberty, and without the least desire to come under the rule, to escape which they had wandered so far from the earliest settlements of their race. . . . The Boers of the Transvaal sent deputation after deputation to England to appeal, and appeal in vain, against the annexation. Lord Carnarvon had set his whole heart upon a scheme of South African confederation; his belief in the ease with which this confederation might be accomplished was carefully fostered by judiciously coloured official reports. . . . Sir Bartle Frere, 'as a friend,' advised the Boers 'not to believe one word' of any statements to the effect that the English people would be willing to give up the Transvaal. 'Never believe,' he said, 'that the English people will do anything of the kind.' When the chief civil and military command of the eastern part of South Africa was given to Sir Garnet Wolseley, Sir Garnet Wolseley was not less explicit in his statements. . . . In spite of the announcements of Sir Bartle Frere, Sir Garnet Wolseley, and Sir Owen Lanyon, the disaffected Boers were not without more or less direct English encouragement. The Boer deputations had found many friends in England. . . . One of those who thus sympathised was Mr. Gladstone. In his Midlothian speeches he denounced again and again the Conservative policy which had led to the annexation of the Transvaal. . . . While all the winds of the world were carrying Mr. Gladstone's words to every corner of the earth, it is not surprising that the Boers of the Transvaal . . . should have caught at these encouraging sentences, and been cheered by them, and animated by them to rise against the despotism denounced by a former Prime Minister of England. . . . For some time there seemed to be no reasonable chance of liberty, but in the end of 1880 the Boers saw their opportunity. . . . There were few troops in the Transvaal. The Boer hour had come. As in most insurrections, the immediate cause of the rising was slight enough. A Boer named Bezhuidenot was summoned by the landdrost of Potchefstrom to pay a claim made by the Treasury officials at Pretoria. Bezhuidenot resisted the claim, which certainly appears to have been illegal. . . . The landdrost attached a waggon of Bezhuidenot's, and announced that it would be sold to meet the claim. On November 11 the waggon was brought into the open square of Potchefstrom, and the sheriff was about to begin the sale, when a number of armed Boers pulled him off and carried the waggon away in triumph. They were unopposed, as there was no force in the town to resist them. The incident, trifling in itself, of Bezhuidenot's cart, was the match which fired the long-prepared train. Sir Owen Lanyon sent some troops to Potchefstrom; a wholly unsuccessful attempt was made to arrest the ringleaders of the Bezhuidenot affair; it was obvious that a collision was close at hand. . . . On Monday, December 13, 1880, almost exactly a month after the affair of Bezhuidenot's waggon, a mass meeting of Boers at Heidelberg proclaimed the Transvaal once again a republic, established a triumvirate Government, and prepared to defend their republic in arms. . . . The news of the insurrections aroused the Cape Government to a sense of the seriousness of the situation. Movements of British troops were at once made to put the insurgents down with all speed. It is still an unsettled point on which side the first shot was fired. There were some shots exchanged at Potchefstrom on December 15. . . . Previously to this the 94th regiment had marched from Leydenberg to reinforce Pretoria on December 5, and had reached Middleburgh about a week later. On the way came rumours of the Boer rising. . . . Colonel Anstruther seems to have felt convinced that the force he had with him was quite strong enough to render a good account of any rebels who might attempt to intercept its march. The whole strength of his force, however, officers included, did not amount to quite 250 men. The troops crossed the Oliphants River, left it two days' march behind them, and on the morning of the 20th were marching quietly along with their long line of waggons and their band playing 'God save the Queen' under the bright glare of the sun. Suddenly, on the rising ground near the Bronkhorst Spruit a body of armed Boers appeared. A man galloped out from among them — Paul de Beer — with a flag of truce. Colonel Anstruther rode out to meet him, and received a sealed despatch warning the colonel that the British advance would be considered as a declaration of war. Colonel Anstruther replied simply that he was ordered to go to Pretoria, and that he should do so. Each man galloped back to his own force, and firing began. In ten minutes the fight, if fight it can be called, was over. The Boers were unrivalled sharpshooters, had marked out every officer; every shot was aimed, and every shot told. The Boers were well covered by trees on rising ground; the English were beneath them, had no cover at all, and were completely at their mercy. In ten minutes all the officers had fallen, some forty men were killed, and nearly double the number wounded. Colonel Anstruther, who was himself badly wounded, saw that he must either surrender or have all his men shot down, and he surrendered. . . . Colonel Anstruther, who afterwards died of his wounds, bore high tribute in his despatch to the kindness and humanity of the Boers when once the fight was done. . . . Sir George Colley struggled bravely for a while to make head against the Boers. At Lang's Nek and Ingago he did his best, and the men under him fought gallantly, but the superior positions and marksmanship of the Boers gave them the advantage in both fights. Under their murderous fire the officers and men fell helplessly. Officer after officer of a regiment would be shot down by the unerring aim of the Boers while trying to rally his men, while the British fire did comparatively slight damage, and the troops seldom came to sufficiently close quarters to use the bayonet. But the most fatal battle of the campaign was yet to come. Sir Evelyn Wood had arrived at the Cape with reinforcements, had met Sir George Colley, and had gone to Pietermaritzburg to await the coming of further reinforcements. On Saturday night, February 26, Sir George Colley with a small force moved out of the camp at Mount Prospect, and occupied the Majuba Hill, which overlooked the Boer camps on the flat beyond Lang's Nek. Early next morning the Boers attacked the hill; there was some desultory firing for a while, under cover of which three Boer storming parties ascended the hill almost unseen. The British

were outflanked and surrounded, a deadly fire was poured in upon them from all sides. The slaughter was excessive. As usual the officers were soon shot down. Sir George Colley, who was directing the movements as coolly as if at review, was killed just as he was giving orders to cease firing. The British broke and fled, fired upon as they fled by the sharpshooters. Some escaped; a large number were taken prisoners. So disastrous a defeat had seldom fallen upon British arms. The recent memory of Maiwand was quite obliterated. That was the last episode of the war. General Wood agreed to a temporary armistice. There had been negotiations going on between the Boers and the British before the Majuba Hill defeat, which need never have occurred if there had not been a delay in a reply of Kruger's to a letter of Sir George Colley's. The negotiations were now resumed, and concluded in the establishment of peace, on what may be called a Boer basis. The republic of the Transvaal was to be re-established, with a British protectorate and a British Resident indeed, but practically granting the Boers the self-government for which they took up arms."—J. H. McCarthy, *England under Gladstone, ch.* 5.

Also in: J. Nixon, *Complete Story of the Transvaal.*—T. F. Carter, *Narrative of the Boer War.*

A. D. 1811-1868.—The Kafir wars.—British absorption of Kafraria.—"In 1811 the first Kafir war was brought on by the depredations of those warlike natives on the Boers of the eastern frontier; a war to the knife ensued, the Kafirs were driven to the other side of the Great Fish River, and military posts were formed along the border. A second war, however, broke out in 1818, when the Kafirs invading the colony drove the farmers completely out of the country west of the Great Fish River, penetrating as far as Uitenhage. But the Kafirs could not stand against the guns of the colonists, and the second war terminated in the advance of an overwhelming force into Kafirland, and the annexation of a large slice of territory, east of the Great Fish River, to the colony. . . . For a third time, in 1835, a horde of about 10,000 fighting men of the Kafirs spread fire and slaughter and pillage over the eastern districts, a war which led, as the previous ones had done, to a more extended invasion of Kafraria by the British troops, and the subjugation of the tribes east of the Kei river. . . . A fourth great Kafir war in 1846, provoked by the daring raids of these hostile tribes and their bold invasions of the colony was also followed up by farther encroachments on Kafir territory, and in 1847 a proclamation was issued extending the frontier to the Orange river on the north and to the Keiskamma river in the east, British sovereignty being then also declared over the territory extending from the latter river eastward to the Kei, though this space was at first reserved for occupation by the Kafirs and named British Kafraria. But peace was restored only for a brief time; in 1857 a fresh Kafir rebellion had broken out, and for two years subsequently a sort of guerilla warfare was maintained along the eastern frontier, involving great losses of life and destruction of property. In 1863 this last Kafir war was brought to a conclusion, and British Kafraria was placed under the rule of European functionaries and incorporated with the colony. In 1868 the Basutos [or Eastern Bechuanas], who occupy the territory about the head of the Orange river, between its tributary the Caledon and the summits of the Drakenberg range, and who had lived under a semi-protectorate of the British since 1848, were proclaimed British subjects. . . . Subsequently large portions of formerly independent Kafraria between the Kei river and the southern border of Natal have passed under the government of the Cape."—Hellwald-Johnston, *Africa* (*Stanford's Compendium*), *ch.* 23.

A. D. 1867-1871.—Discovery of Diamonds. —Annexation of Griqualand west to Cape Colony. See Griquas.

A. D. 1877-1879.—The Zulu War.—"At this time [1877] besides the three English Colonies of Cape Town, Natal, and the lately formed Griqualand, there were two independent Dutch Republics,—the Orange Free State, and the Transvaal. Much of the white population even of the English Provinces was Dutch, and a still larger proportion consisted of reclaimed or half-reclaimed natives. Thus . . . there lay behind all disputes the question which invariably attends frontier settlements—the treatment of the native population. This difficulty had become prominent in the year 1873 and 1874, when the fear of treachery on the part of a chief of the name of Langalibalele located in Natal had driven the European inhabitants to unjustifiable violence. The tribe over which the chief had ruled had been scattered and driven from its territory, the chief himself brought to trial, and on most insufficient evidence sentenced to transportation. It was the persuasion that he was intriguing with external tribes which had excited the unreasoning fear of the colonists. For beyond the frontier there lay the Zulus, a remarkable nation, organised entirely upon a military system, and forming a great standing army under the despotic rule of their King Cetchwayo. Along the frontier of Natal the English preserved friendly relations with this threatening chief. But the Dutch Boers of the Transvaal, harsh and arbitrary in their treatment of natives, had already involved themselves in a war with a neighbouring potentate of the name of Secocoeni, and had got into disputes with Cetchwayo, which threatened to bring upon the European Colonies an indiscriminate assault." Lord Carnarvon thought it practicable to cure the troubles in South Africa by a confederation of the colonies. "The difficulty of the situation was so obvious to the Colonial Minister that he had chosen as High Commissioner a man whose experience and energy he could thoroughly trust. Unfortunately in Sir Bartle Frere he had selected a man not only of great ability, but one who carried self-reliance and imperialist views to an extreme. . . . The danger caused by the reckless conduct of the Boers upon the frontier, and their proved incapacity to resist their native enemies, had made it a matter of the last importance that they should join the proposed Confederation, and thus be at once restrained and assisted by the central power. Sir Theophilus Shepstone had been charged with the duty of bringing the Transvaal Republic to consent to an arrangement of this sort. . . . Unable to persuade the Boers to accept his suggestions for an amicable arrangement, he proceeded, in virtue of powers intrusted to him, to declare the Republic annexed, and to take over the government. This high-handed act brought with it, as some of its

critics in the House of Commons had prophesied, disastrous difficulties. Not only were the Boers themselves almost as a matter of course disaffected, but they handed over to the Imperial Government all their difficulties and hostilities. They were involved in disputes with both their barbarous neighbours. . . . In 1875 they had made demands upon Cetchwayo, the most important of which was a rectification of frontier largely in their own favour. . . . Commissioners were appointed in 1878 to inquire into the rights of the case. . . . The Commissioners arrived at a unanimous decision against the Dutch claims. . . . But before the Treaty could be carried out it required ratification from the High Commissioner, and it came back from his hands clogged with formidable conditions. . . . While . . . he accepted the boundary report, he determined to make it an opportunity for the destruction of Cetchwayo's power. In December a Special Commission was despatched to meet the Zulu Envoys, to explain the award, but at the same time to demand corresponding guarantees from the King. When these were unfolded they appeared to be the abolition of his military system and the substitution of a system of tribal regiments approved bythe British Government, the acceptance of a British Resident by whose advice he was to act, the protection of missionaries, and the payment of certain fines for irregularities committed by his subjects. These claims were thrown into the form of an ultimatum, and Cetchwayo was given thirty days to decide. . . . It was to be submission or war. It proved to be war. Sir Bartle Frere had already prepared for this contingency; he had detained in South Africa the troops which should have returned to England, and had applied to the Home Government for more. . . . Lord Chelmsford was appointed to the command of the troops upon the frontier, and on the 12th, the very day on which the time allowed for the acceptance of the ultimatum expired, the frontier was crossed. The invasion was directed towards Ulundi, the Zulu capital. . . . The first step across the frontier produced a terrible disaster. The troops under the immediate command of Lord Chelmsford encamped at Isandlana without any of the ordinary precautions, and in a bad position. . . . In this unprotected situation Lord Chelmsford, while himself advancing to reconnoitre, left two battalions of the 24th with some native allies under Colonel Pulleine, who were subsequently joined by a body of 3,000 natives and a few Europeans under Colonel Durnford. The forces left in the camp were suddenly assaulted by the Zulus in overwhelming numbers and entirely destroyed [January 22, 1879]. It was only the magnificent defence by Chard and Bromhead of the post and hospital at Rorke's Drift which prevented the victorious savages from pouring into Natal. Lord Chelmsford on returning from his advance hurried from the fearful scene of slaughter back to the frontier. For the moment all was panic; an immediate irruption of the enemy was expected. But when it was found that Colonel Wood to the west could hold his own though only with much rough fighting, and that Colonel Pearson, towards the mouth of the river, after a successful battle had occupied and held Ekowe, confidence was re-established. But the troops in Ekowe were cut off from all communication except by means of heliographic signals, and the interest of the war was for a while centred upon the beleaguered garrison. With extreme caution, in spite of the clamorous criticism levelled against him, Lord Chelmsford refused to move to its rescue till fully reinforced. Towards the end of March however it was known that the provisions were running low, and on the 29th an army of 6,000 men again crossed the frontier. On this occasion there was no lack of precaution. . . . As they approached the fortress, they were assaulted at Gingilovo, their strong formation proved efficient against the wild bravery of their assailants, a complete victory was won, and the garrison at Ekowe rescued. A day or two earlier an even more reckless assault upon Colonel Wood's camp at Kambula was encountered with the same success. But for the re-establishment of the English prestige it was thought necessary to undertake a fresh invasion of the country. . . . Several attempts at peace had been made on the part of the Zulus. But their ambassadors were never, in the opinion of the English generals, sufficiently accredited to allow negotiations to be opened. Yet it would appear that Cetchwayo was really desirous of peace, according to his own account even the assault at Isandlana was an accident, and the two last great battles were the result of local efforts. At length in July properly authorised envoys came to the camp. Terms of submission were dictated to them, but as they were not at once accepted a final battle was fought resulting completely in favour of the English, who then occupied and burnt Ulundi, the Zulu capital. . . . Sir Garnet Wolseley was . . . again sent out with full powers to effect a settlement. His first business was to capture the King. When this was done he proceeded to divide Zululand into thirteen districts, each under a separate chief; the military system was destroyed; the people were disarmed and no importation of arms allowed; a Resident was to decide disputes in which British subjects were involved. The reception of missionaries against the will of the people was not however insisted on."—J. F. Bright, *Hist. of England, period* 4, *pp.* 545-550.

Also in: F. E. Colenso and E. Durnford, *Hist. of the Zulu War.*—A. Wilmot, *Hist. of the Zulu War.*—C. J. Norris-Newman, *In Zululand with the British.*—C. Vijn, *Cetswayo's Dutchman.*

A. D. 1885-1893.—British acquisition of Matabeleland or Zambesia.—Dominion of the British South Africa Company.—War with King Lobengula.—"The Boers, ever on the lookout for new lands into which to trek, had long ago fixed their eyes on the country north of the Limpopo, known generally as Matabeleland, ruled over by Lobengula, the son of the chief of the Matabeles. . . . The reports of Mauch, Baines, and others, of the rich gold mines contained in this territory, were well known. . . . Other travellers and sportsmen, Mohr, Oates, Selous, gave the most favourable accounts not only of the gold of the country, but of the suitability of a large portion of the high plateau known as Mashonaland for European settlement and agricultural operations. When Sir Charles Warren was in Bechuanaland in 1885, several of his officers made journeys to Matabeleland, and their reports all tended to show the desirability of taking possession of that country; indeed Sir Charles was assured that Lobengula would welcome a British alliance as a protection against

the Boers, of whose designs he was afraid. . . . As a result of Sir Charles Warren's mission to Bechuanaland, and of the reports furnished by the agents he sent into Matabeleland, the attention of adventurers and prospectors was more and more drawn towards the latter country. The Portuguese . . . had been electrified into activity by the events of the past two years. That the attention of the British Government was directed to Matabeleland even in 1887 is evident from a protest in August of that year, on the part of Lord Salisbury, against an official Portuguese map claiming a section of that country as within the Portuguese sphere. Lord Salisbury then clearly stated that no pretensions of Portugal to Matabeleland could be recognised, and that the Zambesi should be regarded as the natural northern limit of British South Africa. The British Prime Minister reminded the Portuguese Government that according to the Berlin Act no claim to territory in Central Africa could be recognised that was not supported by effective occupation. The Portuguese Government maintained (it must be admitted with justice) that this applied only to the coast, but Lord Salisbury stood firmly to his position. . . . Germans, Boers, Portuguese, were all ready to lay their hands on the country claimed by Lobengula. England stepped in and took it out of their hands; and at the worst she can only be accused of obeying the law of the universe, 'Might is Right.' By the end of 1887 the attempts of the Transvaal Boers to obtain a hold over Matabeleland had reached a crisis. It became evident that no time was to be lost if England was to secure the Zambesi as the northern limit of extension of her South African possessions. Lobengula himself was harassed and anxious as to the designs of the Boers on the one hand, and the doings of the Portuguese on the north of his territory on the other. In the Rev. J. Smith Moffat, Assistant Commissioner in Bechuanaland, England had a trusty agent who had formerly been a missionary for many years in Matabeleland, and had great influence with Lobengula. Under the circumstances, it does not seem to have been difficult for Mr. Moffat to persuade the King to put an end to his troubles by placing himself under the protection of Great Britain. On 21st March 1888, Sir Hercules Robinson, Governor of Cape Colony, and Her Majesty's High Commissioner for South Africa, was able to inform the Home Government that on the previous 11th February Lobengula had appended his mark to a brief document which secured to England supremacy in Matabeleland over all her rivals. . . . The publication of the treaty was, as might be expected, followed by reclamations both on the part of the Transvaal and of Portugal. Before the British hold was firmly established over the country attempts were made by large parties of Boers to trek into Matabeleland. . . . Individual Boers as well, it must be said, as individual Englishmen at the kraal of Lobengula, attempted to poison the mind of the latter against the British. But the King remained throughout faithful to his engagements. Indeed, it was not Lobengula himself who gave any cause for anxiety during the initial stage of the English occupation. He is, no doubt, a powerful chief, but even he is obliged to defer to the wishes of his 'indunas' and his army. . . . Lobengula himself kept a firm hand over his warriors, but even he was at times apprehensive that they might burst beyond all control. Happily this trying initial period passed without disaster. . . . No sooner was the treaty signed than Lobengula was besieged for concessions of land, the main object of which was to obtain the gold with which the country was said to abound, especially in the east, in Mashonaland." The principal competitors for what was looked upon as the great prize were two syndicates of capitalists, which finally became amalgamated, in 1889, under the skilful diplomacy of Mr. Cecil J. Rhodes, forming the great British South Africa Company, about which much has been heard in recent years. "The principal field of the operations of the British South Africa Company was defined in the charter to be 'the region of South Africa lying immediately to the north of British Bechuanaland,' and to the north and west of the South African Republic, and to the west of the Portuguese dominions.' The Company was also empowered to acquire any further concessions, if approved of by 'Our Secretary of State.' . . . The Company was empowered to act as the representative of the Imperial Government, without, however, obtaining any assistance from the Government to bear the expense of the administration. . . . The capital of the Company was a million sterling. It is not easy to define the relations of the Chartered Company to the various other companies which had mining interests in the country. In itself it was not a consolidation of the interests of those companies. Its functions were to administer the country and to work the concessions on behalf of the Concessionaires, in return for which it was to retain fifty per cent. of the profits. . . . When the British South African Company was prepared to enter into active occupation of the territories which they were authorised to exploit, they had on the one hand the impis of Lobengula eager to wash their spears in white blood; on the south the Boers of the Transvaal, embittered at being prevented from trekking to the north of the Limpopo, and on the east and on the north-east the Portuguese trying to raise a wall of claims and historical pretensions against the tide of English energy. . . . An agreement was concluded between England and Portugal in August 1890, by which the eastern limits of the South Africa Company's claims were fixed, and the course of the unknown Sabi River, from north to south, was taken as a boundary. But this did not satisfy either Portugal or the Company, and the treaty was never ratified. . . . A new agreement [was] signed on the 11th June 1891, under which Portugal can hardly be said to have fared so well as she would have done under the one repudiated by the Cortes in the previous year. The boundary between the British Company's territories was drawn farther east than in the previous treaty. The line starting from the Zambesi near Zumbo runs in a general south-east direction to a point where the Mazoe River is cut by the 33rd degree of east longitude. The boundary then runs in a generally south direction to the junction of the Lunde and the Sabi, where it strikes south-west to the north-east corner of the South African Republic, on the Limpopo. In tracing the frontier along the slope of the plateau, the Portuguese sphere was not allowed to come farther west than 32° 30′ E. of Greenwich, nor the British sphere east

of 33° E. A slight deflection westwards was made so as to include Massi Kessi in the Portuguese sphere. . . . According to the terms of the arrangement, the navigation of the Zambesi and the Shiré was declared free to all nations." —J. S. Keltie, *The Partition of Africa, ch.* 18.— By the spring of 1893 the British South Africa Company had fairly laid hands upon its great dominion of Zambesia. Matabele was swarming with searchers for gold; a railroad from the port of Beira, through Portuguese territory, was in progress; a town at Fort Salisbury was rising. Lobengula, the Matabele king, repented speedily of his treaty and repudiated the construction put on it by the English. Quarrels arose over the Mashonas, whom the Matabeles held in slavery and whom the new lords of the country protected. Both parties showed impatience for war, and it was not long in breaking out. The first shots were exchanged early in October; before the end of the year the British were complete masters of the country, and Lobengula had fled from his lost kingdom, to die, it is said, during the flight. There were two pitched battles, in which the natives suffered terribly. They obtained revenge in one instance, only, by cutting off a party of thirty men, not one of whom survived.

SOUTH AFRICA COMPANY, The British. See AFRICA: A. D. 1884–1891, and SOUTH AFRICA: A. D. 1885–1893.

SOUTH AUSTRALIA. See AUSTRALIA: A. D. 1800–1840.

SOUTH CAROLINA: The aboriginal inhabitants. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: ALGONQUIAN FAMILY, CHEROKEES, MUSKHOGEAN FAMILY, SHAWANESE, TIMUQUANAN FAMILY.

A. D. 1520.—The coast explored by Vasquez de Ayllon and called Chicora. See AMERICA: A. D. 1519–1525.

A. D. 1562-1563.—The short-lived Huguenot colony on Broad River. See FLORIDA: A. D. 1562–1563.

A. D. 1629.—Embraced in the Carolina grant to Sir Robert Heath. See AMERICA: A. D. 1629.

A. D. 1663-1670.—The grant to Monk, Clarendon, Shaftesbury, and others.—The first settlement. See NORTH CAROLINA: A. D. 1663–1670.

A. D. 1669-1693.—Locke's Constitution and its failure. See NORTH CAROLINA: A. D. 1669–1693.

A. D. 1670-1696.—The founding of Charleston.—The growth of the Colony.—The expedition of Captain Sayle in 1670 (see NORTH CAROLINA: A. D. 1663–1670) resulted in a settlement, made in 1671, which is historically referred to as that of "Old Charleston." This continued to be for some years the capital of the southern colony; "but, as the commerce of the colony increased, the disadvantages of the position were discovered. It could not be approached by large vessels at low water. In 1680, by a formal command of the proprietors, a second removal took place, the government literally following the people, who had in numbers anticipated the legislative action; and the seat of government was transferred to a neck of land called Oyster Point, admirably conceived for the purposes of commerce, at the confluence of two spacious and deep rivers, the Kiawah and Etiwan, which, in compliment to Lord Shaftesbury, had already been called after him, Ashley and Cooper. Here the foundation was laid of the present city of Charleston. In that year 30 houses were built, though this number could have met the wants of but a small portion of the colony. The heads of families at the Port Royal settlement alone, whose names are preserved to us, are 48 in number; those brought from Clarendon by Yeamans could not have been less numerous; and the additions which they must have had from the mother-country, during the seven or eight years of their stay at the Ashley river settlement, were likely to have been very considerable. Roundheads and cavaliers alike sought refuge in Carolina, which, for a long time, remained a pet province of the proprietors. Liberty of conscience, which the charter professed to guaranty, encouraged emigration. The hopes of avarice, the rigor of creditors, the fear of punishment and persecution, were equal incentives to the settlement of this favored but foreign region. . . . In 1674, when Nova Belgia, now New York, was conquered by the English, a number of the Dutch from that place sought refuge in Carolina. . . . Two vessels filled with foreign, perhaps French, Protestants, were transported to Carolina, at the expense of Charles II., in 1679; and the revocation of the edict of Nantz, a few years afterwards, . . . contributed still more largely to the infant settlement, and provided Carolina with some of the best portions of her growing population. . . . In 1696, a colony of Congregationalists, from Dorchester in Massachusetts, ascended the Ashley river nearly to its head, and there founded a town, to which they gave the name of that which they had left. Dorchester became a town of some importance. . . . It is now deserted; the habitations and inhabitants have alike vanished; but the reverend spire, rising through the forest trees which surround it, still attests (1840) the place of their worship, and where so many of them yet repose. Various other countries and causes contributed to the growth and population of the new settlement."—W. G. Simms, *Hist. of South Carolina, bk.* 2, *ch.* 1.

A. D. 1680.—Spanish attack from Florida. —Indian and Negro Slavery.—"About 1680 a few leading Scotch Presbyterians planned the establishment of a refuge for their persecuted brethren within the bounds of Carolina. The plan shrunk to smaller dimensions than those originally contemplated. Finally Lord Cardross, with a colony of ten Scotch families, settled on the vacant territory of Port Royal. The fate of the settlement foreshadowed the miseries of Darien. It suffered alike from the climate and from the jealousy of the English settlers. . . . For nearly ten years the dread of a Spanish attack had hung over South Carolina. . . . In 1680 the threatened storm broke upon the colony. Three galleys landed an invading force at Edisto, where the Governor and secretary had private houses, plundered them of money, plate, and slaves, and killed the Governor's brother-in-law. They then fell upon the Scotch settlement, which had now shrunk to 25 men, and swept it clean out of existence. The colonists did not sit down tamely under their injuries. They raised a force of 400 men and were on the point of making a retaliatory attack when they were checked by an order

from the Proprietors. . . . The Proprietors may have felt . . . that, although the immediate attack was unprovoked, the colonists were not wholly blameless in the matter. The Spaniards had suffered from the ravages of pirates who were believed to be befriended by the inhabitants of Charlestown. In another way too the settlers had placed a weapon in the hands of their enemies. The Spaniards were but little to be dreaded, unless strengthened by an Indian alliance. . . . But from the first settlement of Carolina the colony was tainted with a vice which imperilled its relations with the Indians. Barbadoes . . . had a large share in the original settlement of Carolina. In that colony negro slavery was already firmly established as the one system of industry. At the time when Yeamans and his followers set sail for the shores of Carolina, Barbadoes had probably two negroes for every one white inhabitant. The soil and climate of the new territory did everything to confirm the practice of slavery, and South Carolina was from the outset what she ever after remained, the peculiar home of that evil usage. To the West India planter every man of dark colour seemed a natural and proper object of traffic. The settler in Carolina soon learnt the same view. In Virginia and Maryland there are but few traces of any attempt to enslave the Indians. In Carolina . . . the Indian was kidnapped and sold, sometimes to work on what had once been his own soil, sometimes to end his days as an exile and bondsman in the West Indies. As late as 1708 the native population furnished a quarter of the whole body of slaves. It would be unfair to attribute all the hostilities between the Indians and the colonists to this one source, but it is clear that it was an important factor. From their very earliest days the settlers were involved in troubles with their savage neighbours."—J. A. Doyle, *The English in America: Virginia, Maryland, and the Carolinas, ch.* 12.—"Of the original thirteen states, South Carolina alone was from its origin essentially a planting state with slave labor. . . . The proprietaries tempted emigrants by the offer of land at an easy quit-rent, and 150 acres were granted for every able man-servant. 'In that they meant negroes as well as Christians.' . . . It became the great object of the emigrant 'to buy negro slaves, without which,' adds Wilson, 'a planter can never do any great matter'; and the negro race was multiplied so rapidly by importations that, in a few years, we are told, the blacks in the low country were to the whites in the proportion of 22 to 12."—G. Bancroft, *Hist. of the U. S.* (*Author's last revision*), *pt.* 2, *ch.* 8 (*v.* 1).

A. D. 1688-1696.—Beginning of distinctions between the two Carolinas, North and South. See North Carolina: A. D. 1688–1729.

A. D. 1701-1706.—Prosperity of the colony.—Attack on St. Augustine.—French attack on Charleston.—"At the opening of the new century, we must cease to look upon South Carolina as the home of indigent emigrants, struggling for subsistence. While numerous slaves cultivated the extensive plantations, their owners, educated gentlemen, and here and there of noble families in England, had abundant leisure for social intercourse, living as they did in proximity to each other, and in easy access to Charles Town, where the Governor resided, the courts and legislature convened, and the public offices were kept. . . . Hospitality, refinement, and literary culture distinguished the higher class of gentlemen." But party strife at this period raged bitterly, growing mainly out of an attempt to establish the Church of England in the colony. Governor Moore, who had gained power on this issue, sought to strengthen his position by an attack on St. Augustine. "The assembly joined in the scheme. They requested him to go as commander, instead of Colonel Daniel, whom he nominated. They voted £2,000; and thought ten vessels and 350 men, with Indian allies, would be a sufficient force. . . . Moore with about 400 men sets sail, and Daniel with 100 Carolina troops and about 500 Yemassee Indians march by land. But the inhabitants of St. Augustine had heard of their coming, and had sent to Havana for reinforcements. Retreating to their castle, they abandoned their town to Colonel Daniel, who pillaged it before Moore's fleet arrived. Governor Moore and Colonel Daniel united their forces and laid siege to the castle; but they lacked the necessary artillery for its reduction, and were compelled to send to Jamaica for it." Before the artillery arrived, "two Spanish ships appeared off St. Augustine. Moore instantly burned the town and all his own ships and hastened back by land. . . . The expense entailed on the colony was £6,000. When this attack on St. Augustine was planned, it must have been anticipated in the colony that war would be declared against Spain and France." Four years later, the War of the Spanish Succession being then in progress, a French fleet appeared (August, 1706) in the harbor of Charleston and demanded the surrender of the town. Although yellow fever was raging at the time, the governor, Sir Nathaniel Johnson, organized so effective a resistance that the invaders were driven off with considerable loss.—W. J. Rivers, *The Carolinas* (*Narrative and Critical Hist. of Am.*, *v.* 5, *ch.* 5).

A. D. 1740.—War with the Spaniards of Florida. See Georgia: A. D. 1738–1743.

A. D. 1759-1761.—The Cherokee War.—"The Cherokees, who had accompanied Forbes in his expedition against Fort Du Quesne [see Canada: A. D. 1758], returning home along the mountains, had involved themselves in quarrels with the back settlers of Virginia and the Carolinas, in which several, both Indians and white men, had been killed. Some chiefs, who had proceeded to Charleston to arrange this dispute, were received by Governor Littleton in very haughty style, and he presently marched into the Cherokee country at the head of 1,500 men, contributed by Virginia and the Carolinas, demanding the surrender of the murderers of the English. He was soon glad, however, of any apology for retiring. His troops proved very insubordinate; the small-pox broke out among them; and, having accepted 22 Indian hostages as security for peace and the future delivery of the murderers, he broke up his camp, and fell back in haste and confusion. . . . No sooner was Littleton's army gone, than the Cherokees attempted to entrap into their power the commander of [Fort Prince George, at the head of the Savannah], and, apprehensive of some plan for the rescue of the hostages, he gave orders to put them in irons. They resisted; and a soldier having been wounded in the struggle, his infuriated companions fell upon the prisoners and put

them all to death. Indignant at this outrage, the Cherokees beleaguered the fort, and sent out war parties in every direction to attack the frontiers. The Assembly of South Carolina, in great alarm, voted 1,000 men, and offered a premium of £25 for every Indian scalp. North Carolina offered a similar premium, and authorized, in addition, the holding of Indian captives as slaves. An express, asking assistance, was sent to General Amherst, who detached 1,200 men, under Colonel Montgomery, chiefly Scotch Highlanders, lately stationed on the western frontier, with orders to make a dash at the Cherokees, but to return in season for the next campaign against Canada. . . . Joining his forces with the provincial levies, Montgomery entered the Cherokee country, raised the blockade of Fort Prince George, and ravaged the neighboring district. Marching then upon Etchoe, the chief village of the Middle Cherokees, within five miles of that place he encountered [June, 1760] a large body of Indians, strongly posted in a difficult defile, from which they were only driven after a very severe struggle; or, according to other accounts, Montgomery was himself repulsed. At all events, he retired to Charleston, and, in obedience to his orders, prepared to embark for service at the north. When this determination became known, the province was thrown into the utmost consternation. The Assembly declared themselves unable to raise men to protect the frontiers; and a detachment of 400 regulars was presently conceded" to the solicitations of lieutenant governor Bull, to whom the administration of South Carolina had lately been resigned. Before the year closed, the conquest of the French dominions in America east of the Mississippi had been practically finished and the French and Indian War at the north was closed. But, "while the northern colonies exulted in safety, the Cherokee war still kept the frontiers of Carolina in alarm. Left to themselves by the withdrawal of Montgomery, the Upper Cherokees had beleaguered Fort Loudon. After living for some time on horse-flesh, the garrison, under a promise of safe-conduct to the settlements, had been induced to surrender. But this promise was broken; attacked on the way, a part were killed, and the rest detained as prisoners; after which, the Indians directed all their fury against the frontiers. On a new application presently made to Amherst for assistance, the Highland regiment, now commanded by Grant, was ordered back to Carolina. New levies were also made in the province, and Grant presently marched into the Cherokee country [June, 1761] with 2,600 men. In a second battle, near the same spot with the fight of the previous year, the Indians were driven back with loss. . . . The Indians took refuge in the defiles of the mountains, and, subdued and humbled, sued for peace. As the condition on which alone it would be granted, they were required to deliver up four warriors to be shot at the head of the army, or to furnish four green Indian scalps within twenty days. A personal application to Governor Bull, by an old chief long known for his attachment to the English, procured a relinquishment of this brutal demand, and peace was presently made." —R. Hildreth, *Hist. of the U. S., ch.* 27 (*v.* 2).

Also in: D. Ramsay, *Hist. of South Carolina, v.* 1, *ch.* 5, *sect.* 2.—S. G. Drake, *Aboriginal Races of North Am., bk.* 4, *ch.* 4.

A. D. 1760-1766.—The question of taxation by Parliament.—The Stamp Act.—The first Continental Congress.—The repeal of the Stamp Act and the Declaratory Act. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1760–1775; 1763–1764; 1765; and 1766.

A. D. 1766-1774.—Opening events of the Revolution. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1766–1767, to 1774; and Boston: 1768, to 1773.

A. D. 1775.—The beginning of the War of the American Revolution.—Lexington.—Concord.—Action taken on the news.—Ticonderoga.—The siege of Boston.—Bunker Hill.—The Second Continental Congress. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1775.

A. D. 1775.—Rapid progress of Revolution.—Flight of the Royal Governor.—In January, 1775, a provincial convention for South Carolina was called together at Charleston, under the presidency of Charles Pinckney. It appointed delegates to the second Continental Congress, and took measures to enforce the non-importation agreements in which the colony had joined. At a second session, in June, this convention or Provincial Congress of South Carolina "appointed a Committee of Safety, issued $600,000, of paper money, and voted to raise two regiments, of which Gadsden and Moultrie were chosen colonels. Lieutenant-governor Bull was utterly powerless to prevent or interrupt these proceedings. While the Convention was still in session, Lord William Campbell, who had acquired by marriage large possessions in the province, arrived at Charleston with a commission as governor. Received with courtesy, he presently summoned an Assembly; but that body declined to proceed to business, and soon adjourned on its own authority. The Committee of Safety pursued with energy measures for putting the province in a state of defense. A good deal of resistance was made to the Association [for commercial non-intercourse], especially in the back counties. Persuasion failing, force was used. . . . A vessel was fitted out by the Committee of Safety, which seized an English powder ship off St. Augustine and brought her into Charleston. Moultrie was presently sent to take possession of the fort in Charleston harbor. No resistance was made. The small garrison, in expectation of the visit, had already [September] retired on board the ships of war in the harbor. Lord Campbell, the governor, accused of secret negotiations with the Cherokees and the disaffected in the back counties, was soon obliged to seek the same shelter. A regiment of artillery was voted; and measures were taken for fortifying the harbor, from which the British ships were soon expelled."—R. Hildreth, *Hist. of the U. S., ch.* 30–31 (*v.* 3).

Also in: D. Ramsay, *Hist. of South Carolina, v.* 1, *ch.* 7, *sect.* 1.

A. D. 1776 (February—April).—Allegiance to King George renounced, independence assumed, and a state constitution adopted.—"On the 8th of February 1776, the convention of South Carolina, by Drayton their president, presented their thanks to John Rutledge and Henry Middleton for their services in the American congress, which had made its appeal to the King of kings, established a navy, treasury, and general post-office, exercised control over commerce, and granted to colonies permission to

create civil institutions, independent of the regal authority. The next day arrived Gadsden, the highest officer in the army of the province, and he in like manner received the welcome of public gratitude. . . . When, on the 10th, the report on reforming the provincial government was considered and many hesitated, Gadsden spoke out for the absolute independence of America. The majority had thus far refused to contemplate the end toward which they were irresistibly impelled. . . . But the criminal laws could not be enforced for want of officers; public and private affairs were running into confusion; the imminent danger of invasion was proved by intercepted letters, so that necessity compelled the adoption of some adequate system of rule. While a committee of eleven was preparing the organic law, Gadsden, on the 13th, began to act as senior officer of the army. Companies of militia were called down to Charleston, and the military forces augmented by two regiments of riflemen. In the early part of the year Sullivan's Island was a wilderness, thickly covered with myrtle, live-oak, and palmettos; there, on the 2d of March, William Moultrie was ordered to complete a fort large enough to hold 1,000 men. Within five days after the convention received the act of parliament of the preceding December which authorized the capture of American vessels and property, they gave up the hope of reconciliation; and, on the 26th of March 1776, asserting 'the good of the people to be the origin and end of all government,' and enumerating the unwarrantable acts of the British parliament, the implacability of the king, and the violence of his officers, they established a constitution for South Carolina. . . . On the 27th, John Rutledge was chosen president, Henry Laurens vice-president, and William Henry Drayton chief justice. . . . On the 23d of April the court was opened at Charleston, and the chief justice after an elaborate exposition charged the grand jury in these words: 'The law of the land authorizes me to declare, and it is my duty to declare the law, that George III., king of Great Britain, has abdicated the government, that he has no authority over us, and we owe no obedience to him.'"—G. Bancroft, *Hist. of the U. S.* (*Author's last revision*), *epoch* 3, *ch.* 25 (*v.* 4).

Also in: W. G. Simms, *Hist. of S. Carolina*, *bk.* 4, *ch.* 5.—See, also, United States of Am.: A. D. 1776–1779.

A. D. 1776 (June).—Sir Henry Clinton's repulse from Charleston. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1776 (June).

A. D. 1776-1778.—The war in the North.—The Articles of Confederation.—The alliance with France. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1776, to 1778.

A. D. 1778.—State Constitution framed and adopted. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1776–1779.

A. D. 1778-1779.—The war carried into the South.—Savannah taken and Georgia subdued.—Unsuccessful attempt to recover Savannah. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1778–1779 The war carried into the South; and 1779 (September—October).

A. D. 1780.—Siege and surrender of Charleston.—Defeat of Gates at Camden.—British subjugation of the state. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1780 (February—August).

A. D. 1780.—Partisan warfare of Marion and his Men. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1780 (August—December).

A. D. 1780-1781.—Greene's campaign.—King's Mountain.—The Cowpens.—Guilford Court House.—Hobkirk's Hill.—Eutaw Springs.—The British shut up in Charleston. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1780–1781.

A. D. 1781-1783.—The campaign in Virginia.—Siege of Yorktown and surrender of Cornwallis.—Peace with Great Britain. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1781, to 1783.

A. D. 1787.—Cession of Western land claims to the United States. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1781–1786.

A. D. 1787-1788.—Formation and adoption of the Federal Constitution. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1787; and 1787–1789.

A. D. 1828-1833.—The Nullification movement and threatened Secession. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1828–1833.

A. D. 1831.—The first railroad. See Steam Locomotion on Land.

A. D. 1860.—The plotting of the Rebellion.—Passage of the Ordinance of Secession. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1860 (November—December).

A. D. 1860 (December).—Major Anderson at Fort Sumter. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1860 (December) Major Anderson.

A. D. 1861 (April).—Beginning the War of Rebellion.—The bombardment of Fort Sumter. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1861 (March—April).

A. D. 1861 (October—December).—Capture of Hilton Head and occupation of the coast islands by Union forces. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1861 (October—December: South Carolina—Georgia).

A. D. 1862 (May).—The arming of the Freedmen at Hilton Head. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1862 (May: South Carolina).

A. D. 1863 (April).—The repulse of the Monitor-fleet at Charleston. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1863 (April: South Carolina).

A. D. 1863 (July).—Lodgment of Union forces on Morris Island, and assault on Fort Wagner. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1863 (July: South Carolina).

A. D. 1863 (August—December).—Siege of Fort Wagner.—Bombardment of Fort Sumter and Charleston. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1863 (August—December: South Carolina).

A. D. 1865 (February).—Evacuation of Charleston by the Confederates. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1865 (February: South Carolina).

A. D. 1865 (February—March).—Sherman's march through the state.—The burning of Columbia. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1865 (February—March: The Carolinas).

A. D. 1865 (June).—Provisional Government set up under President Johnson's Plan of Reconstruction. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1865 (May—July).

A. D. 1865-1876.—Reconstruction.—"After the close of the war, two distinct and opposing plans were applied for the reconstruction, or restoration to the Union, of the State. The first, known as the Presidential plan [see United

States of Am.: A. D. 1865 (May—July)], was quickly superseded by the second, known as the Congressional plan; but it had worked vast mischief by fostering delusive hopes, the reaction of which was manifest in long enduring bitterness. Under the latter plan, embodied in the Act of Congress of March 2, 1867 [see United States of Am.: A. D. 1867 (March)], a convention was assembled in Charleston, January 14, 1868, 'to frame a Constitution and Civil Government.' The previous registration of voters made in October, 1867, showed a total of 125,328, of whom 46,346 were whites, and 78,982 blacks. . . . On the question of holding a constitutional convention the vote cast in November, 1867, was 71,087; 130 whites and 68,876 blacks voting for it, and 2,801 whites against it. Of the delegates chosen to the convention 34 were whites and 63 blacks. The new Constitution was adopted at an election held on the 14th, 15th, and 16th of April, 1868, all State officers to initiate its operation being elected at the same time. At this election the registration was 133,597; the vote for the Constitution 70,758; against it, 27,288; total vote, 98,046; not voting, 35,551. Against the approval by Congress of this Constitution the Democratic State Central Committee forwarded a protest," which declared: "The Constitution was the work of Northern adventurers, Southern renegades, and ignorant negroes. Not one per cent. of the white population of the State approves it, and not two per cent. of the negroes who voted for its adoption understood what this act of voting implied." "The new State officers took office July 9, 1868. In the first Legislature, which assembled on the same day, the Senate consisted of 33 members, of whom 9 were negroes and but 7 were Democrats. The House of Representatives consisted of 124 members, of whom 48 were white men, 14 only of these being Democrats. The whole Legislature thus consisted of 72 white and 85 colored members. At this date the entire funded debt of South Carolina amounted to $5,407,306.27. At the close of the four years (two terms) of Governor R. K. Scott's administration, December, 1872, the funded debt of the State amounted to $18,515,033.91, including past-due and unpaid interest for three years."—W. Allen, *Governor Chamberlain's Administration in South Carolina, ch.* 1.—"Mr. James S. Pike, late Minister of the United States at the Hague, a Republican and an original abolitionist, who visited the state in 1873, after five years' supremacy by Scott and his successor Moses, and their allies, has published a pungent and instructive account of public affairs during that trying time, under the title of 'The Prostrate State.' The most significant of the striking features of this book is that he undertakes to write a correct history of the state by dividing the principal frauds, already committed or then in process of completion, into eight distinct classes, which he enumerates as follows:—1. Those which relate to the increase of the state debt. 2. The frauds practiced in the purchase of lands for the freedmen. 3. The railroad frauds. 4. The election frauds. 5. The frauds practiced in the redemption of the notes of the Bank of South Carolina. 6. The census fraud. 7. The fraud in furnishing the legislative chamber. 8. General and legislative corruption. . . . Mr. Pike in his 'Prostrate State,' speaking of the state finances in 1873, says: 'But, as the treasury of South Carolina has been so thoroughly gutted by the thieves who have hitherto had possession of the state government, there is nothing left to steal. The note of any negro in the state is worth as much on the market as a South Carolina bond.'" This reign of corruption was checked in 1874 by the election to the governorship of Daniel H. Chamberlain, the regular Republican nominee, who had been Attorney-General during Scott's administration. "Governor Chamberlain, quite in contrast with his predecessors, talked reform after his election as well as before it," and was "able to accomplish some marked and wholesome reforms in public expenditures." In 1876 the Democrats succeeded in overpowering the negro vote and acquired control of the state, electing General Wade Hampton governor.—J. J. Hemphill, *Reconstruction in South Carolina* (*Why the Solid South? ch.* 4).—Generally, for an account of the measures connected with "Reconstruction," see United States of Am.: A. D. 1865 (May—July), to 1868–1870.

SOUTH DAKOTA: A. D. 1889.—Admission to the Union. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1889–1890.

SOUTH MOUNTAIN, Battle of. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1862 (September: Maryland) Lee's first invasion.

SOUTH RIVER, The.—The Delaware and the Hudson were called respectively the South River and the North River by the Dutch, during their occupation of the territory of New Netherland.

SOUTH SEA: The name and its application. See Pacific Ocean.

SOUTH SEA BUBBLE, The.—"The South Sea Company was first formed by Harley [Earl of Oxford, Lord Treasurer of England] in 1711, his object being to improve public credit, and to provide for the floating debts, which at that period amounted to nearly £10,000,000. The Lord Treasurer, therefore, established a fund for that sum. He secured the interest by making permanent the duties on wine, vinegar, tobacco, and several others; he allured the creditors by promising them the monopoly of trade to the Spanish coasts in America; and the project was sanctioned both by Royal Charter and by Act of Parliament. Nor were the merchants slow in swallowing this gilded bait; and the fancied Eldorado which shone before them dazzled even their discerning eyes. . . . This spirit spread throughout the whole nation, and many, who scarcely knew whereabouts America lies, felt nevertheless quite certain of its being strewed with gold and gems. . . . The negotiations of Utrecht, however, in this as in other matters, fell far short of the Ministerial promises and of the public expectation. Instead of a free trade, or any approach to a free trade, with the American colonies, the Court of Madrid granted only, besides the shameful Asiento for negro slaves, the privilege of settling some factories, and sending one annual ship. . . . This shadow of a trade was bestowed by the British Government on the South Sea Company, but it was very soon disturbed. Their first annual ship, the Royal Prince, did not sail till 1717; and next year broke out the war with Spain. . . . Still, however, the South Sea Company continued, from its other resources, a flourishing and wealthy corporation; its funds were high, its influence considerable,

and it was considered on every occasion the rival and competitor of the Bank of England." At the close of 1719 the South Sea Company submitted to the government proposals for buying up the public debt. "The great object was to buy up and diminish the burthen of the irredeemable annuities granted in the two last reigns, for the term mostly of 99 years, and amounting at this time to nearly £800,000 a year." The Bank of England became at once a competitor for the same undertaking. "The two bodies now displayed the utmost eagerness to outbid one another, each seeming almost ready to ruin itself, so that it could but disappoint its rival. They both went on enhancing their terms, until at length the South Sea Company rose to the enormous offer of seven millions and a half. . . . The South Sea Bill finally passed the Commons by a division of 172 against 55. In the Lords, on the 4th of April [1720], the minority was only 17. . . . On the passing of the Bill very many of the annuitants hastened to carry their orders to the South Sea House, before they even received any offer, or knew what terms would be allowed them!—ready to yield a fixed and certain income for even the smallest share in vast but visionary schemes. The offer which was made to them on the 29th of May (eight years and a quarter's purchase) was much less favourable than they had hoped; yet nevertheless, six days afterwards, it is computed that nearly two-thirds of the whole number of annuitants had already agreed. In fact, it seems clear that, during this time, and throughout the summer, the whole nation, with extremely few exceptions, looked upon the South Sea Scheme as promising and prosperous. Its funds rapidly rose from 130 to above 300. . . . As soon as the South Sea Bill had received the Royal Assent in April, the Directors proposed a subscription of one million, which was so eagerly taken that the sum subscribed exceeded two. A second subscription was quickly opened, and no less quickly filled. . . . In August, the stocks, which had been 130 in the winter, rose to 1,000. Such general infatuation would have been happy for the Directors, had they not themselves partaken of it. They opened a third, and even a fourth subscription, larger than the former; they passed a resolution, that from Christmas next their yearly dividend should not be less than fifty per cent.; they assumed an arrogant and overbearing tone. . . . But the public delusion was not confined to the South Sea Scheme; a thousand other mushroom projects sprung up in that teeming soil. . . . Change Alley became a new edition of the Rue Quincampoix [see FRANCE: A. D. 1717–1720]. The crowds were so great within doors, that tables with clerks were set in the street. . . . Some of the Companies hawked about were for the most extravagant projects; we find amongst the number, 'Wrecks to be fished for on the Irish Coast — Insurance of Horses, and other Cattle (two millions) — Insurance of losses by servants — To make Salt Water Fresh — For Building of Hospitals for Bastard Children — For Building of Ships against Pirates — For making of Oil from Sun-flower Seeds — For improving of Malt Liquors — For recovering of Seamen's Wages — For extracting of Silver from Lead — For the transmuting of Quicksilver into a malleable and fine Metal — For making of Iron with Pit-coal — For importing a Number of large Jack Asses from Spain — For trading in Human Hair — For fatting of Hogs — For a Wheel for a Perpetual Motion.' But the most strange of all, perhaps, was 'For an Undertaking which shall in due time be revealed.' Each subscriber was to pay down two guineas, and hereafter to receive a share of one hundred with a disclosure of the object; and so tempting was the offer that 1,000 of these subscriptions were paid the same morning, with which the projector went off in the afternoon. . . . When the sums intended to be raised had grown altogether, it is said, to the enormous amount of £300,000,000, the first check to the public infatuation was given by the same body whence it had first sprung. The South Sea Directors . . . obtained an order from the Lords Justices, and writs of scire facias, against several of the new bubble Companies. These fell, but in falling drew down the whole fabric with them. As soon as distrust was excited, all men became anxious to convert their bonds into money. . . . Early in September, the South Sea stock began to decline: its fall became more rapid from day to day, and in less than a month it had sunk below 300. . . . The decline progressively continued, and the news of the crash in France [of the contemporary Mississippi Scheme of John Law — see FRANCE: A. D. 1717–1720] completed ours. Thousands of families were reduced to beggary. . . . The resentment and rage were universal." —Lord Mahon (Earl Stanhope), *Hist. of Eng.*, 1713–1783, *ch.* 11 (*v.* 2).

ALSO IN: A. Anderson, *Hist. and Chronolog. Deduction of the Origin of Commerce, v.* 3, *p.* 43, *and after.*—J. Toland, *Secret Hist. of the South Sea Scheme* (*Works, v.* 1).—C. Mackay, *Memoirs of Extraordinary Popular Delusions, ch.* 2.

SOUTHERN CONFEDERACY, The.—The organization of the so called Confederate States of America, formed among the states which attempted in 1861 to secede from the American Union, is commonly referred to as the Southern Confederacy. For an account of the Constitution of the Confederacy, and the establishing of its government, see UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1861 (FEBRUARY).

SOUTHERN CROSS, Order of the.—A Brazilian order of knighthood instituted in 1826 by the Emperor, Pedro I.

SPA-FIELDS MEETING AND RIOT, The. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1816–1820.

SPAHIS.—In the Turkish feudal system, organized by Mahomet II. (A. D. 1451–1481), "the general name for the holders of military fiefs was Spahi, a Cavalier, a title which exactly answers to those which we find in the feudal countries of Christian Europe. . . . The Spahi was the feudal vassal of his Sultan and of his Sultan alone. . . . Each Spahi . . . was not only bound to render military service himself in person, but, if the value of his fief exceeded a certain specified amount, he was required to furnish and maintain an armed horseman for every multiple of that sum."—Sir E. S. Creasy, *Hist. of the Ottoman Turks, ch.* 6 *and* 10.—"The Spahis cannot properly be considered as a class of nobles. In the villages they had neither estates nor dwellings of their own; they had no right to jurisdiction or to feudal service. . . . No real rights of property were ever bestowed on them; but, for a specific service a certain revenue was granted them."—L. Ranke, *Hist. of Servia, ch.* 3. —See, also, TIMAR.

SPAIN.

Aboriginal Peoples.—"Spain must either have given birth to an aboriginal people, or was peopled by way of the Pyrenees and by emigrants crossing the narrow strait at the columns of Hercules. The Iberian race actually forms the foundation of the populations of Spain. The Basks, or Basques, now confined to a few mountain valleys, formerly occupied the greater portion of the peninsula, as is proved by its geographical nomenclature. Celtic tribes subsequently crossed the Pyrenees, and established themselves in various parts of the country, mixing in many instances with the Iberians, and forming the so-called Celtiberians. This mixed race is met with principally in the two Castiles, whilst Galicia and the larger portion of Portugal appear to be inhabited by pure Celts. The Iberians had their original seat of civilisation in the south; they thence moved northward along the coast of the Mediterranean, penetrating as far as the Alps and the Apennines. These original elements of the population were joined by colonists from the great commercial peoples of the Mediterranean. Cádiz and Málaga were founded by the Phœnicians, Cartagena by the Carthaginians, Sagonte by immigrants from Zacynthe, Rosas is a Rhodian colony, and the ruins of Ampurias recall the Emporium of the Massilians. But it was the Romans who modified the character of the Iberian and Celtic inhabitants of the peninsula."—É. Reclus, *The Earth and its Inhabitants: Europe, v.* 1, *p.* 372.

B. C. 237-202.—The rule of Hamilcar, Hasdrubal and Hannibal in the south.—Beginning of Roman conquest. See Punic Wars: The Second.

B. C. 218-25.—Roman conquest.—"The nations of Spain were subjugated one after another by the Romans. The contest began with the second Punic war [B. C. 218], and it ended with the defeat of the Cantabri and Astures by Augustus, B. C. 25. From B. C. 205 the Romans had a dominion in Spain. It was divided into two provinces, Hispania Citerior, or Tarraconensis, and Hispania Ulterior, or Baetica. At first extraordinary proconsuls were sent to Spain, but afterwards two praetors were sent, generally with proconsular authority and twelve fasces. During the Macedonian war the two parts of Spain were placed under one governor, but in B. C. 167 the old division was restored, and so it remained to the time of Augustus. The boundary between the two provinces was originally the Iberus (Ebro). . . . The country south of the Ebro was the Carthaginian territory, which came into the possession of the Romans at the end of this [the second Punic] war. The centre, the west, and north-west parts of the Spanish peninsula were still independent. At a later time the boundary of Hispania Citerior extended further south, and it was fixed at last between Urci and Murgis, now Guardias Viejas, in 36° 41′ N. lat."—G. Long, *Decline of the Roman Republic, v.* 1, *ch.* 1.—See, also, Celtiberians; Lusitania; and Numantian War.

B. C. 83-72.—Sertorius.—Quintus Sertorius, who was the ablest and the best of the leaders of the Popular Party, or Italian Party, or Marian Party, as it is variously designated, which contended against Sulla and the senate, in the first Roman civil war, left Italy and withdrew to Spain, or was sent thither (it is uncertain which) in 83 or 82 B. C. before the triumph of Sulla had been decided. His first attempts to make a stand in Spain against the authority of Sulla failed completely, and he had thoughts it is said of seeking a peaceful retreat in the Madeira Islands, vaguely known at that period as the Fortunate Isles, or Isles of the Blest. But after some adventures in Mauritania, Sertorius accepted an invitation from the Lusitanians to become their leader in a revolt against the Romans which they meditated. Putting himself at the head of the Lusitanians, and drawing with them other Iberian tribes, Sertorius organized a power in Spain which held the Romans at bay for nearly ten years and which came near to breaking the peninsula from their dominion. He was joined, too, by a large number of the fugitives from Rome of the proscribed party, who formed a senate in Spain and instituted a government there which aspired to displace, in time, the senate and the republic on the Tiber, which Sulla had reduced to a shadow and a mockery. First Metellus and then Pompey, who were sent against Sertorius (see Rome: B. C. 78-68), suffered repeated defeats at his hands. In the end, Sertorius was only overcome by treachery among his own officers, who conspired against him and assassinated him, B. C. 72.—G. Long, *Decline of the Roman Republic, v.* 2, *ch.* 31-33.

Also in: H. G. Liddell, *Hist. of Rome, bk.* 7, *ch.* 62.

B. C. 49.—Cæsar's first campaign against the Pompeians. See Rome: B. C. 49.

B. C. 45.—Cæsar's last campaign against the Pompeians.—His victory at Munda. See Rome: B. C. 45.

3d Century.—Early Christainity. See Christianity: A. D. 100-312 (Spain).

A. D. 408.—Under the usurper Constantine. See Britain: A. D. 407.

A. D. 409-414.—Invasion of the Vandals, Sueves, and Alans.—From the end of the year 406 to the autumn of 409, the barbaric torrent of Alans, Sueves and Vandals which had swept away the barriers of the Roman empire beyond the Alps, spent its rage on the unhappy provinces of Gaul. On the 13th of October, 409, the Pyrenees were passed and the same flood of tempestuous invasion poured into Spain. "The misfortunes of Spain may be described in the language of its most eloquent historian [Mariana], who has concisely expressed the passionate, and perhaps exaggerated, declamations of contemporary writers. 'The irruption of these nations was followed by the most dreadful calamities; as the barbarians exercised their indiscriminate cruelty on the fortunes of the Romans and the Spaniards, and ravaged with equal fury the cities and the open country. The progress of famine reduced the miserable inhabitants to feed on the flesh of their fellow-creatures; and even the wild beasts, who multiplied without control in the desert, were exasperated by the taste of blood and the impatience of hunger boldly to attack and devour their human prey. Pestilence soon appeared, the inseparable companion of famine; a large proportion of the people was swept away; and the groans of the dying excited only the envy of their surviving friends. At length the barbarians, satiated with carnage

and rapine, and afflicted by the contagious evils which they themselves had introduced, fixed their permanent seats in the depopulated country. The ancient Galicia, whose limits included the kingdom of Old Castile, was divided between the Suevi and the Vandals; the Alani were scattered over the provinces of Carthagena and Lusitania, from the Mediterranean to the Atlantic Ocean; and the fruitful territory of Bætica was allotted to the Silingi, another branch of the Vandalic nation. . . . The lands were again cultivated; and the towns and villages were again occupied by a captive people. The greatest part of the Spaniards was even disposed to prefer this new condition of poverty and barbarism to the severe oppressions of the Roman government; yet there were many who still asserted their native freedom, and who refused, more especially in the mountains of Galicia, to submit to the barbarian yoke.'"—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, ch.* 31.

A. D. 414-418.—First conquests of the Visigoths. See GOTHS (VISIGOTHS): A. D. 410–419.

A. D. 428.—Conquests of the Vandals. See VANDALS: A. D. 428.

A. D. 477-712.—The Gothic kingdom. See GOTHS (VISIGOTHS): A. D. 453–484; and 507–711.

A. D. 573.—The Suevi overcome by the Visigoths. See SUEVI: A. D. 409–573.

A. D. 616.—First expulsion of the Jews. See JEWS: 7TH CENTURY.

A. D. 711-713.—Conquest by the Arab-Moors.—The last century of the Gothic kingdom in Spain was, on the whole, a period of decline. It gained some extension of boundaries, it is true, by the expulsion of Byzantine authority from one small southern corner of the Spanish peninsula, in which it had lingered long; but repeated usurpations had shaken the throne; the ascendancy of church and clergy had weakened the Gothic nobility without strengthening the people; frequent recurrences of political disorder had interfered with a general prosperity and demoralized society in many ways. The condition of Spain, in fact, was such as might plainly invite the flushed armies of Islam, which now stood on the African side of the narrow strait of Gibraltar. That another invitation was needed to bring them in is not probable. The story of the great treason of Count Illan, or Ilyan, or Julian, and of the betrayed daughter, Florinda, to whose wrongs he made a sacrifice of his country, has been woven into the history of the Moorish conquest of Spain by too many looms of romance and poetry to be easily torn away,—and it may have some bottom of fact in its composition; but sober reason requires us to believe that no possible treason in the case could be more than a chance incident of the inevitable catastrophe. The final conquest of North Africa had been completed by the Arab general Musa Ibn Nosseyr,—except that Ceuta, the one stronghold which the Goths held on the African side of the straits, withstood them. They had not only conquered the Berbers or Moors, but had practically absorbed and affiliated them. Spain, as they learned, was distracted by a fresh revolution, which had brought to the throne Roderick—the last Gothic king. The numerous Jews in the country were embittered by persecution and looked to the more tolerant Moslems for their deliverance. Probably their invitation proved more potent than any which Count Ilyan could address to Musa, or to his master at Damascus. But Ilyan commanded at Ceuta, and, after defending the outpost for a time, he gave it up. It seems, too, that when the movement of invasion occurred, in the spring of 711, Count Ilyan was with the invaders. The first expedition to cross the narrow strait from Ceuta to Gibraltar came under the command of the valiant one-eyed chieftain, Tarik Ibn Zeyud Ibn Abdillah. "The landing of Tarik's forces was completed on the 30th of April, 711 (8th Regeb. A. H. 92), and his enthusiastic followers at once named the promontory upon which he landed, Dschebel-Tarik [or Gebel-Tarik], the rock of Tarik. The name has been retained in the modernized form, Gibraltar. It is also spoken of in the Arabian chronicles as Dschebalu-l-Fata, the portal or mountain of victory." Tarik entered Spain with but 7,000 men. He afterwards received reinforcements to the extent of 5,000 from Musa. It was with this small army of 12,000 men that, after a little more than two months, he encountered the far greater host which King Roderick had levied hastily to oppose him. The Gothic king despised the small numbers of his foe and rashly staked everything upon the single field. Somewhere not far from Medina Sidonia,—or nearer to the town of Xeres de la Frontera—on the banks of the Guadalete, the decisive battle began on the 19th day of July, A. D. 711. It lasted obstinately for several days, and success appeared first on the Gothic side; but treason among the Christians and discipline among the Moslems turned the scale. When the battle ended the conquest of Spain was practically achieved. Its Gothic king had disappeared, whether slain or fled was never known, and the organization of resistance disappeared with him. Tarik pursued his success with audacious vigor, even disobeying the commands of his superior, Musa. Dividing his small army into detachments, he pushed them out in all directions to seize the important cities. Xeres, Moron, Carmona, Cordova, Malaga, and Gharnatta—Granada—(the latter so extensively peopled with Jews that it was called "Gharnatta-al-Yahood," or Granada of the Jews) were speedily taken. Toledo, the Gothic capital, surrendered and was occupied on Palm Sunday, 712. The same spring, Musa, burning with envy of his subordinate's unexpected success, crossed to Spain with an army of 18,000 and took up the nearly finished task. He took Seville and laid siege to Merida—the Emerita Augusta of the Romans—a great and splendid city of unusual strength. Merida resisted with more valor than other cities had shown, but surrendered in July. Seville revolted and was punished terribly by the merciless Moslem sword. Before the end of the second year after Tarik's first landing at Gibraltar, the Arab, or Arab-Moorish, invaders had swept the whole southern, central and eastern parts of the peninsula, clear to the Pyrenees, reducing Saragossa after a siege and receiving the surrender of Barcelona, Valencia, and all the important cities. Then, in the summer of 713, Musa and Tarik went away, under orders from the Caliph, to settle their jealous dissensions at Damascus, and to report the facts of the great conquest they made.—H. Coppée, *Hist. of the Conquest of Spain, bk.* 2–3 (*v.* 1).

ALSO IN: J. A. Condé, *Hist. of the Arabs in Spain, ch.* 8-17 (*v.* 1).—For preceding events see GOTHS (VISIGOTHS); and MAHOMETAN CONQUEST AND EMPIRE.

A. D. 713-910.—The rally of the fugitive Christians.—"The first blow [of the Moslem conquest] had stunned Gothic Spain; and, before she could recover her consciousness, the skilful hands of the Moslemah had bound her, hand and foot. From the first stupor they were not allowed to recover. The very clemency of the Moslems robbed the Christians of argument. If their swords were sharp, their conduct after battle was far better than the inhabitants had any right to expect, far better than that of the Roman or Gothic conquerors had been, when they invaded Spain. Their religion, the defence of which might have been the last rallying-point, was respected under easy conditions; their lives rendered secure and comfortable; they were under tribute, but a tribute no more exacting than Roman taxes or Gothic subsidies. . . . It was the Gothic element, and not the Hispano-Romans, that felt the humiliation most. . . . The Spanish Goths, at first impelled by the simple instinct of self-preservation, had fled in all directions before the fiery march of the Moslemah, after the first fatal battle in the plains of Sidonia. They had taken with them in their flight all the movable property they could carry and the treasures of the churches. Some had passed the Pyrenees to join their kinsmen in Septimania; and others had hidden in the mountain valleys of the great chain-barrier; while a considerable number, variously stated, had collected in the intricate territory of the Asturias and in Galicia, where strength of position made amends for the lack of numbers and organization, and where they could find shelter and time for consultation as to the best manner of making head against the enemy. The country is cut up in all directions by inaccessible, scarped rocks, deep ravines, tangled thickets, and narrow gorges and defiles." This band of refugees in the Asturias — the forlorn hope of Christian Spain — are said to have found a gallant leader in one Pelayo, whose origin and history are so covered with myth that some historians even question his reality. But whether by Pelayo or another prince, the Asturian Spaniards were held together in their mountains and began a struggle of resistance which ended only, eight centuries later, in the recovery of the entire peninsula from the Moors. Their place of retreat was an almost inaccessible cavern — the Cave of Covadonga — in attacking which the Moslems suffered a terrible and memorable repulse (A. D. 717). "In Christian Spain the fame of this single battle will endure as long as time shall last; and La Cueva de Covadonga, the cradle of the monarchy, will be one of the proudest spots on the soil of the Peninsula. . . . This little rising in the Asturias was the indication of a new life, new interests, and a healthier combination. . . . Pelayo was the usher and the representative of this new order, and the Christian kingdom of Oviedo was its first theatre. . . . The battle of Covadonga, in which it had its origin, cleared the whole territory of the Asturias of every Moslem soldier. The fame of its leader, and the glad tidings that a safe retreat had been secured, attracted the numerous Christians who were still hiding in the mountain fastnesses, and infused a new spirit of patriotism throughout the land. . . . Pelayo was now king in reality, as well as in name. . . . With commendable prudence, he contented himself with securing and slowly extending his mountain kingdom by descending cautiously into the plains and valleys. . . . Adjacent territory, abandoned by the Moslems, was occupied and annexed; and thus the new nation was made ready to set forth on its reconquering march."— H. Coppée, *Conquest of Spain by the Arab-Moors, bk.* 5, *ch.* 1-2 (*v.* 1).—"The small province thus preserved by Pelayo [whose death is supposed to have occurred A. D. 737] grew into the germs of a kingdom called at different times that of Gallicia, Oviedo, and Leon. A constant border warfare fluctuated both ways, but on the whole to the advantage of the Christians. Meanwhile to the east other small states were growing up which developed into the kingdom of Navarre and the more important realm of Aragon. Castile and Portugal, the most famous among the Spanish kingdoms, are the most recent in date. Portugal as yet was unheard of, and Castile was known only as a line of castles on the march between the Saracens and the kingdom of Leon."— E. A. Freeman, *Hist. and Conquests of the Saracens, lect.* 5. —"The States of Pelagio [Pelayo] continued, during his reign and that of his son Favila, to be circumscribed to the Asturian mountains; but . . . Alfonso I., the son-in-law of Pelagio, ascended the throne after Favila, and he soon penetrated into Galicia up to the Douro, and to Leon and Old Castile. . . . Canicas, or Cangas, was the capital of the Asturias since the time of Pelagio. Fruela [brother of Alfonso I.] founded Oviedo, to the west, and this State became later on the head of the monarchy." About a century later, in the reign of the vigorous king Alfonso III. [A. D. 866-910], the city of Leon, the ancient Legio of the Romans, was raised from its ruins, and Garcia, the eldest son of Alfonso, established his court there. One of Garcia's brothers held the government of the Asturias, and another one that of Galicia, "if not as separate kingdoms, at least with a certain degree of independence. This equivocal situation of the two princes was, perchance, the reason why the King of Oviedo changed his title to that of Leon, and which appears in the reign of Garcia as the first attempt towards dismembering the Spanish Monarchy. Previous to this, in the reign of King Alfonso III., Navarre, always rebellious, had shaken off the Asturian yoke."— E. McMurdo, *Hist. of Portugal, introd., pt.* 3.

A. D. 756-1031.—The Caliphate of Cordova. See MAHOMETAN CONQUEST AND EMPIRE: A. D. 756-1031.

A. D. 778.—Charlemagne's conquests.—The invasion of Spain by Charlemagne, in 778, was invited by a party among the Saracens, disaffected towards the reigning Caliph, at Cordova, who proposed to place the northern Spanish frontier under the protection of the Christian monarch and acknowledge his suzerainty. He passed the Pyrenees with a great army and advanced with little serious opposition to Saragossa, apparently occupying the country to the Ebro with garrisons and adding it to his dominions as the Spanish March. At Saragossa he encountered resistance and undertook a siege, the results of which are left uncertain. It would seem that he was called away, by threatening news from the northern part of his dominions, and left the

conquest incomplete. The return march of the army, through a pass of the Pyrenees, was made memorable by the perfidious ambuscade and hopeless battle of Roncesvalles, which became immortalized in romance and song. It was in the country of the Gascons or Wascones (Basques) that this tragic event occurred, and the assailants were not Saracens, as the story of the middle ages would have it, but the Gascons themselves, who, in league with their neighbors of Aquitaine, had fought for their independence so obstinately before, against both Charlemagne and his father. They suffered the Franks to pass into Spain without a show of enmity, but laid a trap for the return, in the narrow gorge called the Roscida Vallis—now Roncesvalles. The van of the army, led by the king, went through in safety. The rear-guard, "oppressed with baggage, loitered along the rocky and narrow pathway, and as it entered the solitary gap of Ibayeta, from the lofty precipices on either side an unknown foe rolled suddenly down enormous rocks and trunks of uprooted trees. Instantly many of the troops were crushed to death, and the entire passage was blockaded. . . . The Franks who escaped the horrible slaughter were at once assailed with forks and pikes; their heavy armor, which had served them so well in other fights, only encumbered them amid the bushes and brambles of the ravine; and yet they fought with obstinate and ferocious energy. Cheered on by the prowess of Eghihard, the royal seneschal, of Anselm, Count of the Palace, of Roland, the warden of the Marches of Brittany, and of many other renowned chiefs, they did not desist till the last man had fallen, covered with wounds and blood. . . . How many perished in this fatal surprise was never told; but the event smote with profound effect upon the imagination of Europe; it was kept alive in a thousand shapes by tales and superstitions; heroic songs and stories carried the remembrance of it from generation to generation; Roland and his companions, the Paladins of Karl, untimely slain, became, in the Middle Ages, the types of chivalric valor and Christian heroism; and, seven centuries after their only appearance in history, the genius of Pulci, Boiardo, and Ariosto still preserved in immortal verse the traditions of their glory. . . . Roland is but once mentioned in authentic history, but the romance and songs, which make him a nephew of Karl, compensate his memory for this neglect."—P. Godwin, *Hist. of France: Ancient Gaul, ch.* 16, *with foot-note.*

Also in: J. I. Mombert, *Hist. of Charles the Great, bk.* 2, *ch.* 5.—G. P. R. James, *Hist. of Charlemagne, bk.* 5.—J. O'Hagan, *Song of Roland.*—T. Bulfinch, *Legends of Charlemagne.*—H. Coppée, *Conquest of Spain by the Arab-Moors, bk.* 7, *ch.* 3 (*v.* 2).

A. D. 778-885 (?).—Rise of the kingdom of Navarre. See Navarre: Origin of the Kingdom.

A. D. 1026-1230.—The rise of the kingdom of Castile.—"Ancient Cantabria, which the writers of the 8th century usually termed Bardulia, and which, at this period [the 8th century] stretched from the Biscayan sea to the Duero, towards the close of the same century began to be called Castella—doubtless from the numerous forts erected for the defence of the country by Alfonso I. [the third king of Oviedo, or Leon]. As the boundaries were gradually removed towards the south, by the victories of the Christians, the same denomination was applied to the new as well as to the former conquests, and the whole continued subject to the same governor, who had subordinate governors dependent on him. Of the first governors or counts, from the period of its conquest by that prince in 760, to the reign of Ordoño I. (a full century), not even the names are mentioned in the old chroniclers; the first we meet with is that of Count Rodrigo, who is known to have possessed the dignity at least six years,—viz. from 860 to 866." The last count of Castile, Garcia Sanchez, who was the eighth of the line from Rodrigo, perished in his youth by assassination (A. D. 1026), just as he was at the point of receiving the title of king from the sovereign of Leon, together with the hand of the latter's daughter. Castile was then seized by Sancho el Mayor, king of Navarre, in right of his queen, who was the elder sister of Garcia. He assumed it to be a kingdom and associated the crown with his own. On his death, in 1035, he bequeathed this new kingdom of Castile to one of his sons, Fernando, while leaving Navarre to another, and Aragon, then a lordship, to a third. Fernando of Castile, being involved soon afterwards in war with the young king of Leon, won the kingdom of the latter in a single battle, where the last of the older royal dynasty of Spain fell fighting like a valiant knight. The two kingdoms of Castile and Leon were united under this prosperous king (see, also, Portugal: Early history) until his death, A. D. 1065, when Castile passed to Sancho, the eldest of his sons, and Leon to Alfonso, the second. But Sancho soon ousted Alfonso, and Alfonso, biding his time, acquired both crowns in 1072, when Sancho was assassinated. It was this Alfonso who recovered the ancient capital city, Toledo, from the Moslems, and it was in his reign that the famous Cid Campeador, Rodrigo de Bivar, performed his fabulous exploits. The two kingdoms were kept in union until 1157, when they fell apart again and continued asunder until 1230. At that time a lasting union of Castile and Leon took place, under Fernando III., whom the church of Rome has canonized.—S. A. Dunham, *Hist. of Spain and Portugal, bk.* 3, *sect.* 2, *ch.* 1.

A. D. 1031-1086.—Petty and short-lived Moorish kingdoms.—"The decline and dissolution of the Mohammedan monarchy, or western caliphate, afforded the ambitious local governors throughout the Peninsula the opportunity for which they had long sighed—that of openly asserting their independence of Cordova, and of assuming the title of kings. The wali of Seville, Mohammed ben Ismail ben Abid, . . . appears to have been the first to assume the powers of royalty; . . . he declared war against the self-elected king of Carmona, Mohammed ben Abdalla, on whose cities, Carmona and Ecija, he had cast a covetous eye. The brother of Yahia, Edris ben Ali, the son of Hamud, governed Malaga with equal independence. Algeziras had also its sovereigns. Elvira and Granada obeyed Habus ben Maksan: Valencia had for its king Abdelasis Abul Hassan, Almeria had Zohair, and Denia had Mugehid; but these two petty states were soon absorbed in the rising sphere of Valencia. Huesca and Saragossa were also subject to rulers, who though slow to assume the title of kings were not the less independent, since their

BURK & McFETRIDGE CO. LITH PHILA

SPAIN
AT ABOUT THE YEAR 1150.
NAVARRE
LEON
CASTILE
ARAGON
PORTUGAL
EMP. OF THE ALMOHADES
EMPIRE OF SPAIN
KG'D'M OF GALLICIA
KG'D'M OF PORTUGAL
KG'D'M OF CASTILE
KG'D'M OF LEON
KG'D'M OF ARAGON
KG'D'M BARCELONA
PRINCIPALITY OF CATALONIA
EMP. OF THE ALMOHADES
FRANCE
Corunna
Santander
Toulouse
Bayonne
Carcassonne
Narbonne
Oviedo
Compostella
Leon
Burgos
Pampelona
Tudela
Huesca
Lerida
Barcelona
Tarragona
Tortosa
Braga
Oporto
Lamego
Viseo
Salamanca
Coimbra
Coria
Avila
Segovia
Valladolid
Guadalajara
Toledo
Teruel
Cuenca
Castellon
Tagus R.
Leiria
Santarem
Lisbon
Alcantara
Trugillo
Merida
Evora
Alcarer do Sal
Beja
Ourique
Mertola
Silves
ALGARVE
Cordova
Jaen
Murcia
Carthagena
Huelva
Seville
Granada
Malaga
Almeria
Gibraltar
Ceuta
Tangiers
Valencia
Alicante
Xativa
MINORCA
MAJORCA
IVIZA
BALEARIC ISLES
SPAIN
AT THE CLOSE OF THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY.
CASTILE AND LEON
ARAGON
PORTUGAL
GRANADA
THE GEOGRAPHICAL CONDITIONS AS SHOWN ON THIS MAP REMAINED PRACTICALLY UNCHANGED UP TO THE LATTER PART OF THE FIFTEENTH CENTURY.

sway extended over most of Aragon. The sovereign of Badajos, Abdalla Muslema ben Alaftas, was the acknowledged head of all the confederated governors of Algarve and Lusitania; and Toledo was subject to the powerful Ismail ben Dyluun, who, like the king of Seville, secretly aspired to the government of all Mohammedan Spain."—S. A. Dunham, *Hist. of Spain and Portugal, bk.* 3, *sect.* 1, *ch.* 1 (*v.* 2).—"These petty kings were sometimes fighting against each other, and sometimes joining hands to oppose the down-coming of Christians, until they were startled by a new incursion from Africa . . . which, in consolidating Islam, threatened destruction to the existing kingdoms by the absorption of every one of them in this African vortex. I refer to the coming of the Almoravides."—H. Coppée, *Conquest of Spain by the Arab-Moors, bk.* 8, *ch.* 2 (*v.* 2).

A. D. 1035-1258.—The Rise of the Kingdom of Aragon.—The province of Aragon, with Navarre to the west of it and Catalonia to the east, was included in the Spanish March of Charlemagne. Navarre took the lead among these provinces in acquiring independence, and Aragon became for a time a lordship dependent on the Navarrese monarchy. "The Navarre of Sancho the Great [the same who gathered Castile among his possessions, making it a kingdom, and who reigned from 970 to 1035] stretched some way beyond the Ebro; to the west it took in the ocean lands of Biscay and Guipuzcoa, with the original Castile; to the east it took in Aragon, Ripacurcia and Sobrarbe. . . . At the death of Sancho the Great [A. D. 1035] his momentary dominion broke up. . . . Out of the break-up of the dominion of Sancho came the separate kingdom of Navarre, and the new kingdoms of Castile, Aragon, and Sobrarbe. Of these the two last were presently united, thus beginning the advance of Aragon. . . . The power of Aragon grew, partly by conquests from the Mussulmans, partly by union with the French fiefs to the east. The first union between the crown of Aragon and the county of Barcelona [by marriage, 1131] led to the great growth of the power of Aragon on both sides of the Pyrenees and even beyond the Rhone. This power was broken by the overthrow of King Pedro at Muret—[Pedro II. of Aragon, who allied himself with the Albigenses—see ALBIGENSES: A. D. 1210–1213—and was defeated and slain by Simon de Montfort, at Muret, near Toulouse, September 12, 1213]. But by the final arrangement which freed Barcelona, Roussillon, and Cerdagne, from all homage to France [A. D. 1258], all trace of foreign superiority passed away from Christian Spain. The independent kingdom of Aragon stretched on both sides of the Pyrenees, a faint reminder of the days of the West-Gothic kings."—E. A. Freeman, *Hist. Geog. of Europe, ch.* 12, *sect.* 1.

ALSO IN: S. A. Dunham, *Hist. of Spain and Portugal, bk.* 3, *sect.* 2, *ch.* 4.—See, also, PROVENCE: A. D. 1179–1207.

A. D. 1086-1147.—Domination of the Almoravides. See ALMORAVIDES.

A. D. 1140.—Separation of Portugal from Castile.—Its erection into an independent kingdom. See PORTUGAL: A. D. 1095–1325.

A. D. 1146-1232.—Invasion and dominion of the Almohades and the decisive battle of Tolosa.—The invasion of Spain by the Moorish Almohades (see ALMOHADES), and their struggle for dominion with the Almoravides, produced, at the outset, great alarm in Christendom, but was productive in the end of many opportunities for the advancement of the Christian cause. In the year 1212 Pope Innocent III. was moved by an appeal from Alfonso VIII. of Castile to call on all Christian people to give aid to their brethren in Spain, proclaiming a plenary indulgence to those who would take up arms in the holy cause. Thousands joined the crusade thus preached, and flocked to the Castilian standards at Toledo. The chief of the Almohades retorted on his side by proclaiming the Algihed or Holy War, which summoned every Moslem in his dominions to the field. Thus the utmost frenzy of zeal was animated on both sides, and the shock of conflict could hardly fail to be decisive, under the circumstances. Substantially it proved to be so, and the fate of Mahometanism in Spain is thought to have been sealed on Las Navas de Tolosa—the Plains of Tolosa—where the two great hosts came to their encounter in July, 1212. The rout of the Moors was complete; "the pursuit lasted till nightfall, and was only impeded by the Moslem corpses."—H. Coppée, *Conquest of Spain by the Arab-Moors, bk.* 8, *ch.* 4 (*v.* 2).

12-15th Centuries.—The old monarchical constitution.—The Castilian and Aragonese Cortes. See CORTES, THE EARLY SPANISH.

A. D. 12-16th Centuries.—Commercial importance and municipal freedom of Barcelona. See BARCELONA: 12–16TH CENTURIES.

A. D. 1212-1238.—Progress of the arms of Castile, Leon, and Aragon.—Succession of the count of Champagne to the throne of Navarre.—Permanent union of the crowns of Leon and Castile.—The founding of the Moorish kingdom of Granada.—Castilian conquest of Cordova.—"Alfonso of Castile died two years after his great victory [of 'las navas de Tolosa']. He left his crown to his only son Henry, a boy of eleven, and the regency to his daughter Berenguela, queen of Leon, who was separated, upon the almost always available plea of too near consanguinity, from her husband Alfonso. Berenguela administered her delegated power ably, but held it only three years: at the end of that time the young king was accidentally killed by a tile falling upon his head. Berenguela was her brother's natural heiress; but idolizing her only son, Ferdinand, whom she had nursed and educated herself, she immediately renounced her claim to the throne in his favour, . . . and caused Ferdinand III. to be acknowledged king: Alfonso IX., however, long continued to disturb his wife and son's government. The king of Aragon [Pedro II.] was recalled immediately after the great battle to the concerns of his French dominions," where he joined his kinsman, the count of Toulouse, as stated above, in resisting the Albigensian crusade, and fell (1213) at Muret. "Whilst Pedro's uncles and brothers were struggling for his succession, the queen-dowager obtained from the Pope an order to Simon de Montfort, the leader of the crusade, to deliver her son [whom the father had given up as hostage before he resolved to commit himself to war with the crusaders] into her hands. Having thus got possession of the rightful heir, she procured the assembling of the Cortes of Aragon, to whom she presented the young king, when nobles, clergy, and town deputies voluntarily swore

allegiance to him. This was the first time such an oath was taken in Aragon, the most limited of monarchies. It had been usual for the Aragonese kings at their coronation to swear observance of the laws, but not to receive in return an oath of fidelity from the people. Henceforward this corresponding oath of fidelity was regularly taken under the following form, celebrated for its singularly bold liberty. 'We, who are as good as you, make you our king to preserve our rights; if not, not.' The Catalans followed the example of their Aragonese brethren in proclaiming James king; but many years elapsed ere he could sufficiently allay the disorders excited by his ambitious uncles to prosecute the war against the Moors. At length the several kings of Castile, Leon, Aragon, and Portugal, were ready, unconnectedly, to invade Mussulman Spain, where Almohade princes and Mohammed aben Hud, a descendant of the kings of Saragossa, were contending for the sovereignty, and many 'walis' were struggling for independent royalty; all far more intent upon gratifying their mutual jealousies and enmities than upon resisting the common foe, with whom, on the contrary, all were willing to enter into alliance in furtherance of their separate views. Under these circumstances, James of Aragon made himself master of the greater part of Valencia, and of the island of Majorca [and subsequently of Minorca]; Ferdinand of Castile extended his conquests in Andalusia; Alfonso of Leon his in Estremadura; and Sancho II. of Portugal, who had lately succeeded to his father Alfonso II., acquired the city of Elvas. . . . Sancho of Navarre took no part in these wars. After . . . the battle of 'las navas de Tolosa' he quitted the career of arms, devoting himself wholly to the internal administration of his kingdom. He had no children, neither had his eldest sister, the queen of England [Berengaria, wife of Richard Cœur de Lion], any. Thence his youngest sister's son, Thibalt, count of Champagne, became his natural heir. But Sancho, judging that the distance between Navarre and Champagne unfitted the two states for being governed by one prince, adopted his kinsman, James of Aragon, and to him, as heir, the Navarrese clergy and nobility, and the count of Champagne himself, prospectively swore fealty. Upon Sancho's death, in 1234, however, the Navarrese, preferring independence under the lineal heir to an union with Aragon, entreated king James to release them from their oaths. He was then engaged in the conquest of Valencia; and unwilling, it may be hoped, to turn his arms from Mahometan enemies against his fellow-Christians, he complied with the request, and Thibalt was proclaimed king of Navarre. Thibalt neglected the wars carried on by his Spanish brother kings against the Mahometans, to accept the command of a crusade for the recovery of Jerusalem. The expedition was unsuccessful, but the reputation of the leader did not suffer. Upon his return, Thibalt followed the example of his uncle in studying only to promote the internal welfare of the country. He introduced the cultivation of the grape and the manufacture of wine into Navarre, with other agricultural improvements. Thibalt is more known as one of the most celebrated troubadours or poets of his day. Prior to Thibalt's accession, the conquering progress of Leon and Castile had been temporarily interrupted. Alfonso of Leon died in 1230, and by his will divided Leon and Galicia between two daughters of his first marriage, wholly overlooking his son Ferdinand. . . . By negociation, however, and the influence which the acknowledged wisdom and virtues of queen Berenguela appear to have given her over every one but her husband, the superior claims of Ferdinand were admitted. The two infantas were amply endowed, and the crowns of Leon and Castile were thenceforward permanently united. With power thus augmented, Ferdinand III. renewed his invasion of the Mussulman states, about the time that Yahie, the last of the Almohade candidates for sovereignty, died, bequeathing his pretensions to Mohammed abu Abdallah aben Alhamar, an enterprising leader, who, in the general confusion, had established himself as king of Jaen, and was the sworn enemy of Yahie's chief rival, Abdallah aben Hud. Ferdinand invaded the dominions of Abdallah, and Mohammed took that opportunity of materially enlarging his own. After a few years of general war, Abdallah aben Hud was assassinated by the partisans of the king of Jaen, and his brother Aly, who succeeded to his pretensions, met a similar fate. Mohammed ben Alhamar was immediately received into the city of Granada, which he made his capital; and thus, in 1238, founded the kingdom of Granada, the last bright relic of Moorish domination in Spain, and the favourite scene of Spanish romance. Had Mohammed succeeded to the Almohade sovereignty in Spain, and his authority been acknowledged by all his Mussulman countrymen, so able and active a monarch might probably have offered effective resistance to Christian conquest. But his dominions consisted only of what is still called the kingdom of Granada, and a small part of Andalusia. The remaining Mahometan portions of Andalusia, Valencia, and Estremadura, as well as Murcia and Algarve, swarmed with independent 'walis' or kings. James of Aragon completed the subjugation of Valencia the following year. Cordova, so long the Moorish capital, was taken by Ferdinand [1235], with other places of inferior note. The Murcian princes avoided invasion by freely offering to become Castilian vassals; and now the conquering troops of Castile and Leon poured into the territories of Mohammed. The king of Granada, unsupported by his natural allies, found himself unequal to the contest, and submitted to become, like his Murcian neighbours, the vassal of Ferdinand. In that capacity he was compelled to assist his Christian liege lord in conquering Mussulman Seville."—M. M. Busk, *Hist. of Spain and Portugal, ch.* 7.

Also in: *Chronicle of James I., King of Aragon, surnamed the Conqueror; tr. by J. Forster.*

A. D. 1238-1273.—The Moorish kingdom of Granada.—The building of the Alhambra.—"A new era had begun in the fortunes of the Moors. Reft of their two magnificent capitals at Cordova and Seville, they had gathered into the extreme south, under the able and beneficent rule of Aben-al-Hamar, who, though a tributary to Castille, termed himself Sultan and Emir of the Faithful, and is usually called King of Granada. Karnattah, as the Arabs had named it, meant the Cream of the West. The Spaniards in later times, deceived by the likeness of the word to Granada, a pomegranate, fancied it to have been thence named, and took the fruit as its emblem.

The kingdom was a mere fragment, and did not even reach to the Straits; for Algesira, the green island, and its great fortresses, belonged to the Africans; and it had in it elements of no small danger, containing as it did the remnants of no less than thirty-two Arab and Moorish tribes, many of them at deadly feud with one another, and divided by their never-ending national enmities. The two great tribes of Abencerrages, or sons of Zeragh, and the Zegris, or refugees from Aragon, were destined to become the most famous of these. The king himself, Mohammed-Abou-Said, was of the old Arabian tribe of Al Hamar, by whose name he is usually called. He was of the best old Arabic type — prudent, just, moderate, temperate, and active, and so upright as to be worthy to belong to this age of great kings, and his plans for his little kingdom were favoured by the peace in which his Christian neighbours left him; while Alfonso X. of Castille was vainly endeavouring to become, not Emperor of Spain alone, but Roman Emperor. The Almohides of Algarvè obeyed neither Alfonso nor Al Hamar, and they united to subdue them. Ten cities were surrendered by the governor on condition that he should enjoy the estates of the King's Garden at Seville, and the tenth of the oil of an oliveyard. There was still a margin of petty walis who preferred a brief independence to a secure tenure of existence as tributaries, and these one by one fell a prey to the Castilians, the inhabitants of their cities being expelled, and adding to the Granadine population. Al Hamar received them kindly, but made them work vigorously for their maintenance. Every nook of soil was in full cultivation; the mountain-sides terraced with vineyards; new modes of irrigation invented; the breeds of horses and cattle carefully attended to; rewards instituted for the best farmers, shepherds, and artisans. The manufacture of silk and wool was actively carried on, also leather-work and sword-cutlery. Hospitals and homes for the sick and infirm were everywhere; and in the schools of Granada the remnants of the scholarship of Cordova and Seville were collected. Granada itself stood in the midst of the Vega, around two hills, each crowned by a fortress: Albayzin, so called by the fugitives from Baeza; and the Al Hâmra [or Alhambra], or Red Fortress. The wall was extended so as to take in its constantly increasing population, and the king began to render the Alhâmra one of the strongest and most beautiful places in existence. Though begun by Al Hamar it was not completed for several generations, each adding to the unrivalled beauty of the interior, for, as usual in Arabian architecture, the outside has no beauty, being a strong fortification of heavy red walls. . . . Mohammed Aben-Al-Hamar died 1273, and his son Mohammed II. followed in his steps."—C. M. Yonge, *The Story of the Christians and Moors of Spain, ch.* 20.

Also in: W. Irving, *The Alhambra.*—J. C. Murphy, *Arabian Antiquities of Spain.*

A. D. 1248-1350.—The conquest of Seville. —The reigns of St. Ferdinand, Alfonso the Learned, and their three successors in Castile. —Seville, which had become the second city of Moslem Spain, its schools and universities rivalling those of Cordova, shared the fate of the latter and surrendered to the Christians on the 22d of December, 1248. "This was the achievement of King Ferdinand III., under whom the crowns of Castile and Leon had become united. His territory extended from the Bay of Biscay to the Guadalquiver, and from the borders of Portugal as far as Arragon and Valencia. His glory was great in the estimation of his countrymen for his conquests over the Moors, and four centuries afterwards he was canonized by the Pope, and is now known as Saint Ferdinand. . . . Ferdinand lived at the same time with another king who was also canonized — Louis IX. of France, who became Saint Louis. . . . The two kings, in fact, were cousins, and the grandmother of both of them was Eleanor, daughter of Henry II. of England. . . . The son of Saint Ferdinand was Alfonso X., called 'El Sabio,' the learned, and not, as it is sometimes translated, 'the wise.' He certainly was not very wise, for he did an immense number of foolish things; but he was such a strange man that it would be interesting to know more about him than it is easy to do. It was a period when not only commerce and industry but literature and art were taking a new start in Europe — the time of Roger Bacon and Dante. Alfonso loved his books, and dabbled in science, and was really one of the learned men of his time. . . . His mind was very naturally disturbed by a glimpse he had of being emperor of Germany [or, to speak accurately, of the Holy Roman Empire]. . . . The dignity was elective," and Alfonso became the candidate of one party among the German electors; but he did not obtain the dignity (see Germany: A. D. 1250–1272). "Ferdinand de la Cerda, the son and heir of Alfonso, died during the lifetime of his father, and a difficulty arose about the succession which extended over a long time. A Cortes was assembled to decide the question, and it was agreed that Sancho, brother to Ferdinand de la Cerda, should be heir to the crown, to the exclusion of the children of Ferdinand, grandchildren of Alfonso. This decision displeased the king of France," who was the uncle of the children set aside. Alfonso "declared in favor of his son Sancho, and came near having a war with France in consequence." Yet Sancho, soon afterwards, was persuaded to rebel against his father, and the latter was reduced to sore straits, having no allies among his neighbors except the king of Morocco. "At last the goaded king assembled his few remaining adherents in Seville, and, in a solemn act, not only disinherited his rebel son Sancho, but called down maledictions on his head. In the same act he instituted his grandsons, the infantes de la Cerda, as his heirs, and after them, in default of issue, the kings of France." But Sancho fell ill after this, and the fondness of his old father revived with such intensity that he sickened of anxiety and grief. "Sancho recovered and was soon as well as ever; but the king grew worse, and soon died [1284], full of grief and affection for his son. He had not, however, revoked his will. Nobody minded the will, and Sancho was proclaimed king. He reigned, and his son and grandson reigned after him." The son was Ferdinand IV., who came to the throne in 1295; the grandson was Alfonso XI., who followed him in 1312. The latter was succeeded in 1350 by his son Pedro, or Peter, surnamed the Cruel, and quite eminent under that sinister designation, especially through the unfortunate connection of the English Black Prince with his later evil fortunes.—E. E. and S. Hale, *The Story of Spain, ch.* 18.

A. D. 1273-1460.—The slow crumbling of the Moorish kingdom of Granada.—The founder of the kingdom of Granada, Aben-Al-Hamar, or Ibnu-l-ahmar, died in 1273. He was "succeeded by his son, Abú Abdillah, known as Mohammed II. Obeying his father's injunctions, he called upon Yahúb, the Sultan of the Beni Merines at Fez, to come to his aid, and captured Algeçiras, to serve as a receptacle and magazine for these African allies. He also presented Tarifa to Yahúb. The two allied forces then went out to meet Nuño de Lara with the Christian frontier troops, and routed him. But Mohammed was soon prevailed upon by his fears to renew the Christian alliance; and the Christian troops, thus freed from one enemy, soon wrested Algeçiras, Tarifa [1291], Ronda, and other towns, from the Beni Merines, who were, all but a small remnant, driven back into Africa. . . . Mohammed II. died in 1302; and was succeeded by a greater king,—Mohammed III., another Abú Abdillah, . . . dethroned by a revolt of his brother, Nasr; but when, in 1312, Nasr in turn was forced to abdicate, he was succeeded by Isma'il Abú-l-Waled, after whom came Mohammed IV., in 1315. Meantime the Christian monarchs were always pressing the Moorish frontier. In 1309, Ferdinand IV. of Castile succeeded in taking Gibraltar, while the troops of Aragon besieged Almeria, and thus the circle was ever narrowing, but not without bloody dispute. When Don Pedro, Infante of Castile, made his great effort against Granada in 1319, he was wofully defeated in the battle of Elvira, and his rich camp despoiled by the Moors. Mohammed IV. succeeded in retaking Gibraltar from the Christians [or, rather, according to Condé, it was taken in 1331 by Mohammed's ally, the king of Fez, to whom Mohammed was forced to cede it]. . . . He was assassinated by his African allies, and succeeded by his brother Yúsuf in 1333. Prompted purely by self-interest, Abu-l-has, another leader, with 60,000 men, beside the contingent from Granada, encountered the Christians near Tarifa in the year 1340, and was defeated with immense loss [in the battle of the Guadacelito or the Salado]. Yúsuf was assassinated by a madman in 1354, and was succeeded by Mohammed V. . . . Driven from his throne by a revolt of his half-brother Isma'il, he first fled for his life to Guadix, and then to Africa, in the year 1359. And all these intestine quarrels were playing into the Christians' hands. Isma'il, the usurper, held the nominal power less than a year, when he was dethroned and put to death. His successor, Mohammed VI., surrounded by difficulties, came to the strange determination to place himself and his kingdom under the protection of that King Pedro of Castile whom history has named 'el cruel,' but whom his adherents called 'el justiciero,' the doer of justice. The Castilian king vindicated his claim to the historic title by putting Mohammed to death, and seizing 'the countless treasures which he and the chiefs who composed his suite brought with them.' To the throne, thus once more vacant by assassination, Mohammed V. returned, and ruled a second time, from 1362 to 1391. . . . Then came the reigns of Yúsuf II. and Mohammed VII., uneventful, except that, in the words of the Arabian chronicler, 'the Mohammedan empire still went on decaying, until it became an easy prey to the infidels, who surrounded it on every side, like a pack of hungry wolves.' Many portents of ruin were displayed, and the public mind was already contemplating the entire success of the Christians." A century of confused struggles ensued, in the course of which Gibraltar was several times besieged by the Christians, and was finally taken by the Duke of Medina Sidonia in 1460. Other strongholds of the Moors fell, one by one, and they "were being more and more restricted to their little kingdom of Granada, and the Christians were strengthening to dislodge and expel them."—H. Coppée, *Hist. of the Conquest of Spain by the Arab-Moors, bk.* 8, *ch.* 5 (*v.* 2).

Also in: J. A. Condé, *Hist. of the Dominion of the Arabs in Spain, pt.* 4, *ch.* 9–33.

(Aragon): A. D. 1282-1300.—Acquisition of Sicily by King Peter.—It passes as a separate kingdom to his younger son. See Italy (Southern): A. D. 1282–1300.

A. D. 1366-1369.—Pedro the Cruel of Castile and the invasion of the English Black Prince.—"Pedro the Cruel, King of Castile at this time (1350–1369), had earned his title by a series of murders, which dated from the time he was sixteen years old, and comprised his wife, his stepmother, two of his half-brothers, and a great number of the chief nobles of his kingdom. He was on bad terms with the pope, for he was the friend of Moors and Jews, and had plundered bishops and monasteries; he was hated in the court of France, for his murdered queen was the king's cousin, Blanche de Bourbon; he was at war with the King of Arragon. Instigated by this monarch and by the King of Navarre, the eldest of Pedro's half-brothers, Don Henry of Trastamere, who had been serving for some time with the Free Companions in Languedoc, conceived the idea of uniting them in a grand enterprise against the kingdom of Castile. Charles V. [of France] approved the project, and lent money and his best captain, Du Guesclin; Pope Urban V. contributed his blessing and money; and the Free Lances eagerly embraced a scheme which promised them the plunder of a new country." The expedition "succeeded without bloodshed. The people rose to welcome it, and Don Pedro was forced to escape through Portugal, and take ship hastily at Corunna. Don Henry was crowned in his palace at Burgos (April 1366). In his distress Don Pedro applied to the Prince of Wales [the Black Prince, then holding the government of Aquitaine] for support. There was no reason why England or Aquitaine should be mixed up in Spanish politics. Both countries required rest after an exhausting war. . . . But Pedro was a skilful diplomatist. He bribed the Prince of Wales by a promise to cede the province of Biscay." With the consent of his father, King Edward III. of England, the Prince took up the cause of the odious Don Pedro, and led an army of 24,000 horse, besides great numbers of archers, into Spain (A. D. 1367). At the decisive battle of Navarette the Spaniards and their allies were overwhelmingly defeated, Du Guesclin was taken prisoner, Don Henry fled, and Pedro was reinstated on the Castilian throne. "Then came disappointment. The prince demanded performance of the promises Don Pedro had made, and proposed to stay in Spain till they were acquitted. . . . For some months Edward vainly awaited the performance of his ally's promises. Then, as his troops were wasting away with

dysentery and other diseases caused by the strange climate, till it was said scarcely a fifth remained alive, Edward resolved to remove into Aquitaine, which Don Henry was attacking, and was glad to find that the passes of the Pyrenees were left open to him by the Kings of Arragon and Navarre (August 1367). . . . The results of Edward's mischievous policy soon became evident. All he had achieved in Spain was almost instantly undone by Don Henry, who crossed the Pyrenees a few weeks only after Edward had left Spain (Sept. 1367) recovered his kingdom in the course of the next year, and captured and killed Don Pedro a little later (March 1369). The whole power of Castile, which was far from being contemptible at sea, was then thrown into the scale against England." —C. H. Pearson, *Eng. Hist. in the Fourteenth Century, ch.* 8.

Also in: J. Froissart, *Chronicles (tr. by Johnes), bk.* 1, *ch.* 230–245.—P. Merimée, *Hist. of Peter the Cruel, v.* 2, *ch.* 7–11.—See, also, France: A. D. 1360–1380.

A. D. 1368-1479.— Castile under the House of Trastamere.— Discord and civil war.— Triumph of Queen Isabella.—The Castilian dynasty in Aragon.— Marriage of Isabella and Ferdinand.—"A more fortunate period began [in Castile] with the accession of Henry [of Trastamare, or Henry II.]. His own reign was hardly disturbed by any rebellion; and though his successors, John I. [1379] and Henry III. [1390], were not altogether so unmolested, especially the latter, who ascended the throne in his minority, yet the troubles of their time were slight, in comparison with those formerly excited by the houses of Lara and Haro, both of which were now happily extinct. Though Henry II.'s illegitimacy left him no title but popular choice, his queen was sole representative of the Cerdas, the offspring . . . of Sancho IV.'s elder brother. . . . No kingdom could be worse prepared to meet the disorders of a minority than Castile, and in none did the circumstances so frequently recur. John II. was but fourteen months old at his accession [1406]; and but for the disinterestedness of his uncle Ferdinand, the nobility would have been inclined to avert the danger by placing that prince upon the throne. In this instance, however, Castile suffered less from faction during the infancy of her sovereign than in his maturity. The queen dowager, at first jointly with Ferdinand, and solely after his accession to the crown of Aragon, administered the government with credit. . . . In external affairs their reigns were not what is considered as glorious. They were generally at peace with Aragon and Granada, but one memorable defeat by the Portuguese at Aljubarrota [August 14, 1385] disgraces the annals of John I., whose cause [attempting the conquest of Portugal] was as unjust as his arms were unsuccessful. This comparatively golden period ceases at the majority of John II. His reign was filled up by a series of conspiracies and civil wars, headed by his cousins John and Henry, the infants of Aragon, who enjoyed very extensive territories in Castile, by the testament of their father Ferdinand. Their brother the king of Aragon frequently lent the assistance of his arms. . . . These conspiracies were all ostensibly directed against the favourite of John II., Alvaro de Luna, who retained for 35 years an absolute control over his feeble master. . . . His fate is among the memorable lessons of history. After a life of troubles endured for the sake of this favourite, sometimes a fugitive, sometimes a prisoner, his son heading rebellions against him, John II. suddenly yielded to an intrigue of the palace, and adopted sentiments of dislike towards the man he had so long loved. . . . Alvaro de Luna was brought to a summary trial and beheaded; his estates were confiscated. He met his death with the intrepidity of Strafford, to whom he seems to have borne some resemblance in character. John II. did not long survive his minister, dying in 1454, after a reign that may be considered as inglorious, compared with any except that of his successor. If the father was not respected, the son fell completely into contempt. He had been governed by Pacheco, marquis of Villena, as implicitly as John by Alvaro de Luna. This influence lasted for some time afterwards. But the king inclining to transfer his confidence to the queen, Joanna of Portugal, and to one Bertrand de Cueva, upon whom common fame had fixed as her paramour, a powerful confederacy of disaffected nobles was formed against the royal authority. . . . They deposed Henry in an assembly of their faction at Avila with a sort of theatrical pageantry which has often been described. . . . The confederates set up Alfonso, the king's brother, and a civil war of some duration ensued, in which they had the support of Aragon. The queen of Castile had at this time borne a daughter, whom the enemies of Henry IV., and indeed no small part of his adherents, were determined to treat as spurious. Accordingly, after the death of Alfonso, his sister Isabel was considered as heiress of the kingdom. . . . Avoiding the odium of a contest with her brother, Isabel agreed to a treaty by which the succession was absolutely settled upon her [1469]. This arrangement was not long afterwards followed by the union of that princess with Ferdinand, son of the king of Aragon. This marriage was by no means acceptable to a part of the Castilian oligarchy, who had preferred a connexion with Portugal. And as Henry had never lost sight of the interests of one whom he considered, or pretended to consider, as his daughter, he took the first opportunity of revoking his forced disposition of the crown and restoring the direct line of succession in favour of the princess Joanna. Upon his death, in 1474, the right was to be decided by arms. Joanna had on her side the common presumptions of law, the testamentary disposition of the late king, the support of Alfonso king of Portugal, to whom she was betrothed, and of several considerable leaders among the nobility. . . . For Isabella were the general belief of Joanna's illegitimacy, the assistance of Aragon, the adherence of a majority both among the nobles and people, and, more than all, the reputation of ability which both she and her husband had deservedly acquired. The scale was, however, pretty equally balanced, till the king of Portugal having been defeated at Toro in 1476, Joanna's party discovered their inability to prosecute the war by themselves, and successively made their submission to Ferdinand and Isabella." Ferdinand of Aragon, by whose marriage with Isabella of Castile the two kingdoms became practically united, was himself of Castilian descent, being the grandson of that magnanimous Ferdinand who has been

mentioned above, as the uncle and joint guardian of John II. of Castile. In 1410, on the death of King Martin, the right of succession to the throne of Aragon had been in dispute, and Ferdinand was one of several claimants. Instead of resorting to arms, the contending parties were wisely persuaded to submit the question to a special tribunal, composed of three Aragonese, three Catalans, and three Valencians. "A month was passed in hearing arguments; a second was allotted to considering them; and at the expiration of the prescribed time it was announced to the people . . . that Ferdinand of Castile had ascended the throne. In this decision it is impossible not to suspect that the judges were swayed rather by politic considerations than a strict sense of hereditary right. It was therefore by no means universally popular, especially in Catalonia. . . . Ferdinand however was well received in Aragon. . . . Ferdinand's successor was his son Alfonso V., more distinguished in the history of Italy than of Spain. For all the latter years of his life he never quitted the kingdom that he had acquired by his arms [see ITALY: A. D. 1412–1447]; and, enchanted by the delicious air of Naples, intrusted the government of his patrimonial territories to the care of a brother and an heir. John II., upon whom they devolved by the death of Alfonso without legitimate progeny, had been engaged during his youth in the turbulent revolutions of Castile, as the head of a strong party that opposed the domination of Alvaro de Luna. By marriage with the heiress of Navarre he was entitled, according to the usage of those times, to assume the title of king, and administration of government, during her life. But his ambitious retention of power still longer produced events which are the chief stain on his memory. Charles, prince of Viana, was, by the constitution of Navarre, entitled to succeed his mother [1442]. She had requested him in her testament not to assume the government without his father's consent. That consent was always withheld. The prince raised what we ought not to call a rebellion; but was made prisoner. . . . After a life of perpetual oppression, chiefly passed in exile or captivity, the prince of Viana died in Catalonia [1461], at a moment when that province was in open insurrection upon his account. Though it hardly seems that the Catalans had any more general provocations, they persevered for more than ten years [until the capitulation of Barcelona, after a long siege, in 1472] with inveterate obstinacy in their rebellion, offering the sovereignty first to a prince of Portugal, and afterwards to Regnier duke of Anjou, who was destined to pass his life in unsuccessful competition for kingdoms." Ferdinand, who married Isabella of Castile, was a younger half-brother of prince Charles of Viana, and succeeded his father, John II., on the throne of Aragon, in 1479.— H. Hallam, *The Middle Ages, ch.* 4 (*v.* 2).

ALSO IN: W. H. Prescott, *Hist. of the Reign of Ferdinand and Isabella, pt.* 1, *ch.* 1–5.— See, also, NAVARRE: A. D. 1442–1521.

A. D. 1458.— Separation of the crown of Naples from those of Aragon and Sicily. See ITALY: A. D. 1447–1480.

A. D. 1476-1492.— The last struggle of the Moors.— Fall of the city and kingdom of Granada.— "The days of the Moorish kingdom were already numbered when, in 1466, Aboul Hacem succeeded Ismael; but the disturbances in Castille emboldened him, and when, in 1476, the regular demand for tribute was made, he answered: 'Those who coined gold for you are dead. Nothing is made at Granada for the Christians but sword-blades and lance-points.' Such was the last proclamation of war from the Moors. Even the Imaums disapproved, and preached in the mosques of Granada, 'Woe to the Moslems in Andalusia!' 'The end is come,' they said; 'the ruins will fall on our heads!' Nevertheless, Aboul Hacem surprised the Aragonese city of Zahara with 60,000 inhabitants, and put them all to the sword or sold them into slavery; but he was not welcomed, evil was predicted, and he became more and more hated when he put four of the Abencerrages to death. The king and queen [Ferdinand, or Fernando, and Isabella] now began to prepare the whole strength of their kingdom for a final effort, not to be relaxed till Spain should be wholly a Christian land. . . . Don Rodrigo Ponce de Leon, who had become Marquis of Cadiz, made a sudden night attack upon Alhama, only eight leagues from Granada, and though the inhabitants fought from street to street he mastered it. . . . Alhama was a terrible loss to the Moors, and was bewailed in the ballad, 'Ay de me Al Hama,' which so moved the hearts of the people that it was forbidden to be sung in the streets of Granada. It has been translated by Byron, who has in fact united two ballads. . . . Alhama had once before been taken by St. Fernando, but could not then be kept, and a council was held by the 'Reyes Catolicos' [Ferdinand and Isabella], in which it was declared that it would take 5,000 mules' burthen of provisions sent several times a year, to support a garrison thus in the heart of the enemy's country. The high spirit of the queen, however, carried the day. She declared that the right thing to do was to take Loja to support Alhama, and, after causing the three chief mosques to be purified as Christian churches, she strained every effort [1482] to equip an army with which Fernando was to besiege Loja. On the day before he set out Isabel gave birth to twins—one dead, the other a daughter; and this was viewed as an ill omen. . . . Ali Atar, one of the bravest of the Moors, defeated Fernando and forced him to retreat with the loss of his baggage. Aboul Hacem was prevented from following up his success by the struggles of the women in his harem. His favourite wife was a Christian by birth, named Isabel de Solis, the daughter of the Alcayde of Bedmar; but she had become a renegade, and was commonly called Zoraya, or the Morning Star. Childless herself, she was vehemently set on the promotion of Abou-Abd-Allah, son of another wife, Ayescha, who is generally known by the Spanish contraction of his name, Boabdil; also in Arabic as Al Zaquir, the little, and in Spanish as 'el Rey Chico.' Such disaffection was raised that Aboul Hacem was forced to return home, where he imprisoned Ayescha and her son; but they let themselves down from the window with a rope twisted of the veils of the Sultana's women, and, escaping to the palace or Albaycin, there held out against him, supported by the Abencerrages. The Zegris held by Aboul Hacem, and the streets of Granada ran red with the blood shed by the two factions till, in 1482, while the elder king was gone to relieve Loja,

the younger one seized the Alhamra; and Aboul Hacem, finding the gates closed against him, was obliged to betake himself to Malaga, where his brother Abd Allah, called Al Zagal, or the young, was the Alcayde."—C. M. Yonge, *The Story of the Christians and Moors in Spain, ch.* 24.—"The illegal power of Boabdil was contested by his uncle, Az-Zagal (El Zagal), who held a precarious sway for four years, until 1487, when Boabdil again came to the throne. This was rendered more easy by the fact that, in a battle between the Moors and Christians in the territory of Lucena, not long after his accession, Boabdil was taken prisoner by the Christian forces. By a stroke of policy, the Christian king released his royal prisoner, in the hope that through him he might make a treaty. Boabdil went to Loja, which was at once besieged by Ferdinand, and this time captured, and with it the Moorish king again fell into the Christian hands. Again released, after many difficulties he came into power. The Christian conquests were not stayed by these circumstances. In 1487, they captured Velez Malaga, on the coast a short distance east of Malaga, and received the submission of many neighboring towns. In the same year Malaga was besieged and taken. In 1489, Baeza followed; then the important city of Almeria, and at last the city of Granada stood alone to represent the Mohammedan dominion in the Peninsula. The strife between Boabdil and El Zagal now came to an end; and the latter, perhaps foreseeing the fatal issue, embarked for Africa, leaving the nominal rule and the inevitable surrender to his rival. . . . The army of Ferdinand and Isabella was in splendid condition, and reinforcements were arriving from day to day. System and order prevailed, and the troops, elated with victory, acknowledged no possibility of failure. Very different was the condition of things and very depressed the spirit of the people in Granada. Besides its own disordered population, it was crowded with disheartened fugitives, anxious for peace on any terms. The more warlike and ambitious representatives of the tribes were still quarrelling in the face of the common ruin, but all parties joined in bitter denunciations of their king. When he had been released by Ferdinand after the capture of Loja, he had promised that when Guadix should be taken and the power of El Zagal destroyed, he would surrender Granada to the Christian king, and retire to some seignory, as duke or marquis. But now that the 'casus' had arrived, he found . . . that the people would not permit him to keep his promise. . . . The only way in which Boabdil could appease the people was by an immediate declaration of war against the Christians. This was in the year 1490. When this was made known, Ferdinand and Isabella were at Seville, celebrating the marriage of the Infanta Isabel with Alfonso, crown prince of Portugal. The omen was a happy one. The armies of Spain and Portugal were immediately joined to put an end to the crusade. With 5,000 cavalry and 20,000 foot, the Spanish king advanced to the Sierra Elvira, overlooking the original site of the Granadine capital. The epic and romantic details of the conquest may be read elsewhere. . . . There were sorties on the part of the Moors, and chivalrous duels between individuals, until the coming of winter, when, leaving proper guards and garrisons, the principal Christian force retired to Cordova, to make ready for the spring. El Zagal had returned from Africa, and was now fighting in the Christian ranks. It was an imposing army which was reviewed by Ferdinand on the 26th of April, 1491, in the beautiful Vega, about six miles from the city of Granada; the force consisted of 10,000 horse and 40,000 foot, ready to take position in the final siege. . . . It was no part of the Spanish king's purpose to assault the place. . . . He laid his siege in the Vega, but used his troops in devastating the surrounding country, taking prisoners and capturing cattle. . . . Meantime the Christian camp grew like a city, and when Queen Isabella came with her train of beauty and grace, it was also a court city in miniature." In July, an accidental fire destroyed the whole encampment, and roused great hopes among the Moors. But a city of wood (which the pious queen called Santa Fé — the Holy Faith) soon took the place of the tents, and "the momentary elation of the Moors gave way to profound depression; and this induced them to capitulate. The last hour had indeed struck on the great horologe of history; and on the 25th of November the armistice was announced for making a treaty of peace and occupancy."— H. Coppée, *Hist. of the Conquest of Spain by the Arab-Moors, bk.* 8, *ch.* 5 (*v.* 2).—"After large discussion on both sides, the terms of capitulation were definitively settled. . . . The inhabitants of Granada were to retain possession of their mosques, with the free exercise of their religion, with all its peculiar rights and ceremonies; they were to be judged by their own laws, under their own cadis or magistrates, subject to the general control of the Castilian governor; they were to be unmolested in their ancient usages, manners, language, and dress; to be protected in the full enjoyment of their property, with the right of disposing of it on their own account, and of migrating when and where they would; and to be furnished with vessels for the conveyance of such as chose within three years to pass into Africa. No heavier taxes were to be imposed than those customarily paid to their Arabian sovereigns, and none whatever before the expiration of three years. King Abdallah [Boabdil] was to reign over a specified territory in the Alpuxarras, for which he was to do homage to the Castilian crown. . . . The city was to be surrendered in 60 days from the date of the capitulation;" but owing to popular disturbances in Granada, the surrender was actually made on the 2d of January, 1492. Boabdil soon tired of the petty sovereignty assigned to him, sold it to Ferdinand and Isabella, passed over to Fez, and perished in one of the battles of his kinsmen.— W. H. Prescott, *Hist. of the Reign of Ferdinand and Isabella, ch.* 15.

Also in: W. Irving, *Chronicle of the Conquest of Granada.*

A. D. 1476-1498.—The reorganization of the Hermandad, or Holy Brotherhood, in Castile. See Holy Brotherhood.

A. D. 1481-1525.—Establishment and organization of the "Spanish Inquisition."—Its horrible work. See Inquisition: A. D. 1203-1525.

A. D. 1492.—Expulsion of the Jews. See Jews: 8-15th Centuries.

A. D. 1492-1533.—Discovery of America.—First voyages, colonizations and conquests. See AMERICA: A. D. 1492, 1493–1496, and after.

A. D. 1493.—The Papal grant of the New World. See AMERICA: A. D. 1493.

A. D. 1494.—The Treaty of Tordesillas.—Amended partition of the New World with Portugal. See AMERICA: A. D. 1494.

A. D. 1495.—Alliance with Naples, Venice, Germany and the Pope against Charles VIII. of France. See ITALY: A. D. 1494–1496.

A. D. 1496-1517.—Marriage of the Infanta Joanna to the Austro-Burgundian Archduke Philip.—Birth of their son Charles, the heir of many crowns.—Insanity of Joanna.—Death of Queen Isabella.—Regency of Ferdinand.—His second marriage and his death.—Accession of Charles, the first of the Austro-Spanish dynasty.—Joanna, second daughter of Ferdinand and Isabella, was married in 1496 to "the archduke Philip, son of the emperor Maximilian, and sovereign, in right of his mother [Mary of Burgundy], of the Low Countries. The first fruit of this marriage was the celebrated Charles V., born at Ghent, February 24th, 1500, whose birth was no sooner announced to Queen Isabella than she predicted that to this infant would one day descend the rich inheritance of the Spanish monarchy. The premature death of the heir apparent, Prince Miguel, not long after [and also of the queen of Portugal, the elder daughter of Isabella and Ferdinand], prepared the way for this event by devolving the succession on Joanna, Charles's mother. From that moment the sovereigns were pressing in their entreaties that the archduke and his wife would visit Spain. . . . In the latter part of 1501, Philip and Joanna, attended by a numerous suite of Flemish courtiers, set out on their journey," passing through France and being royally entertained on the way. In Spain, they first received the usual oath of fealty from the Castilian cortes, and then "were solemnly recognized by the four 'arms' of Aragon as successors to the crown, in default of male issue of King Ferdinand. The circumstance is memorable as affording the first example of the parliamentary recognition of a female heir apparent in Aragonese history. Amidst all the honors so liberally lavished on Philip, his bosom secretly swelled with discontent, fomented still further by his followers, who pressed him to hasten his return to Flanders, where the free and social manners of the people were much more congenial to their tastes than the reserve and stately ceremonial of the Spanish court. . . . Ferdinand and Isabella saw with regret the frivolous disposition of their son-in-law. . . . They beheld with mortification his indifference to Joanna, who could boast few personal attractions, and who cooled the affections of her husband by alternations of excessive fondness and irritable jealousy." Against the remonstrances of king, queen and cortes, as well as in opposition to the wishes of his wife, Philip set out for Flanders in December, again traveling through France, and negotiating on the way a treaty with Louis XII. which arranged for the marriage of the infant Charles with princess Claude of France—a marriage which never occurred. The unhappy Joanna, whom he left behind, was plunged in the deepest dejection, and exhibited ere long decided symptoms of insanity. On the 10th of March, 1503, she gave birth to her second son, Ferdinand, and the next spring she joined her husband in Flanders, but only to be worse treated by him than before. Queen Isabella, already declining in health, was deeply affected by the news of her daughter's unhappiness and increasing disturbance of mind, and on the 26th of November, 1504, she died. By her will, she settled the crown of Castile on the infanta Joanna as "queen proprietor," and the archduke Philip as her husband, and she appointed King Ferdinand (who was henceforth king in Aragon, but not in Castile), to be sole regent of Castile, in the event of the absence or incapacity of Joanna, until the latter's son Charles should attain his majority. On the day of the queen's death Ferdinand resigned the crown of Castile, which he had worn as her consort, only, and caused to be proclaimed the accession of Joanna and Philip to the Castilian throne. "The king of Aragon then publicly assumed the title of administrator or governor of Castile, as provided by the queen's testament." He next convened a cortes at Toro, in January, 1505, which approved and ratified the provisions of the will and "took the oaths of allegiance to Joanna as queen and lady proprietor, and to Philip as her husband. They then determined that the exigency contemplated in the testament, of Joanna's incapacity, actually existed, and proceeded to tender their homage to King Ferdinand, as the lawful governor of the realm in her name." These arrangements were unsatisfactory to many of the Castilian nobles, who opened a correspondence with Philip, in the Netherlands, and persuaded him "to assert his pretensions to undivided supremacy in Castile." Opposition to Ferdinand's regency increased, and it was fomented not only by Philip and his friends, but by the king of France, Louis XII. To placate the latter enemy, Ferdinand sought in marriage a niece of the French king, Germaine, daughter of Jean de Foix, and negotiated a treaty, signed at Blois, October 12, 1505, in which he resigned his claims on Naples to his intended bride and her heirs. Louis was now detached from the interests of Philip, and refused permission to the archduke to pass through his kingdom. But Ferdinand, astute as he was, allowed himself to be deceived by his son-in-law, who agreed to a compromise, known as the concord of Salamanca, which provided for the government of Castile in the joint names of Ferdinand, Philip, and Joanna, while, at the same time, he was secretly preparing to transfer his wife and himself to Spain by sea. On the first attempt they were driven to England by a storm; but in April, 1506, Philip and Joanna landed at Coruña, in Spain, and in June Ferdinand was forced to sign and swear to an agreement "by which he surrendered the entire sovereignty of Castile to Philip and Joanna, reserving to himself only the grand-masterships of the military orders, and the revenues secured by Isabella's testament." Philip took the government into his own hands, endeavoring to obtain authority to place his wife in confinement, as one insane; but this the Castilians would not brook. Otherwise he carried things with a high hand, surrounding himself with Flemish favorites, and revolutionizing the government in every branch and the court in every feature. His insolence, extravagance and frivolity excited general disgust, and would probably have provoked serious revolts, if the country had been called

upon to endure them long. But Philip's reign was brief. He sickened, suddenly, of a fever, and died on the 25th of September, 1506. His demented widow would not permit his body to be interred. A provisional council of regency carried on the government until December. After that it drifted, with no better authoritative guidance than that of the poor insane queen, until July 1507, when Ferdinand, who had been absent, in Naples, during the year past, returned and was joyfully welcomed. His unfortunate daughter "henceforth resigned herself to her father's will. . . . Although she survived 47 years, she never quitted the walls of her habitation; and although her name appeared jointly with that of her son, Charles V., in all public acts, she never afterwards could be induced to sign a paper, or take part in any transactions of a public nature. . . . From this time the Catholic king exercised an authority nearly as undisputed, and far less limited and defined, than in the days of Isabella." He exercised this authority for nine years, dying on the 23d of January, 1516. By his last will he settled the succession of Aragon and Naples on his daughter Joanna and her heirs, thus uniting the sovereignty of those kingdoms with that of Castile, in the same person. The administration of Castile during Charles' absence was intrusted to Ximenes, and that of Aragon to the king's natural son, the archbishop of Saragossa. In September, 1517, Charles, the heir of many kingdoms, arrived in Spain from the Netherlands, where his youth had been spent. Two months later Cardinal Ximenes died, but not before Charles had rudely and ungratefully dismissed him from the government. The queen, Joanna, was still living; but her arbitrary son had already commanded the proclamation of himself as king.—W. H. Prescott, *Hist. of the Reign of Ferdinand and Isabella, pt.* 2, *ch.* 12–13, 16–17, 19–20, 24–25.—See, also, AUSTRIA: A. D. 1496–1526.

A. D. 1501-1504.—Treaty of Ferdinand with Louis XII. for the partition of Naples.—Their joint conquest.—Their quarrel and war.—The French expelled.—The Spaniards in possession. See ITALY: A. D. 1501–1504.

A. D. 1505-1510.—Conquests on the Barbary coast. See BARBARY STATES: A. D. 1505–1510.

A. D. 1508-1509.—The League of Cambrai against Venice. See VENICE: A. D. 1508–1509.

A. D. 1511-1513.—Ferdinand of Aragon in the Holy League against France. See ITALY: A. D. 1510–1513.

A. D. 1512-1515.—Conquest of Navarre.—Its incorporation in the kingdom of Castile. See NAVARRE: A. D. 1442–1521.

A. D. 1515-1557.—Discovery of the Rio de la Plata and colonization of Paraguay. See PARAGUAY: A. D. 1515–1557.

A. D. 1516-1519.—The great dominion of Charles. See AUSTRIA: A. D. 1496–1526; and NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1494–1519.

A. D. 1517.—The Treaty of Noyon, between Charles and Francis I. See FRANCE: A. D. 1516–1517.

A. D. 1518-1522.—Popular discontent.—Election of Charles to the German imperial throne.—Rebellion of the Holy Junta, and its failure.—Absolutism of the crown established.—Charles had not been long in Spain before "symptoms of discontent . . . were every where visible. Charles spoke the Spanish language imperfectly: his discourse was consequently slow, and delivered with hesitation; and from that circumstance many of the Spaniards were induced to regard him as a prince of a slow and narrow genius. But the greatest dissatisfaction arose from his attachment to his Flemish favourites, who engrossed or exposed to sale every office of honour or emolument, and whose rapacity was so unbounded that they are said to have remitted to the Netherlands no less a sum than 1,100,000 ducats in the space of ten months. . . . While Spain, agitated by a general discontent, was ready for rebellion, a spacious field was opened to the ambition of her monarch. The death of the Emperor Maximilian [1519] had left vacant the imperial throne of Germany. The Kings of Spain, of France, and of England, offered themselves as candidates for this high dignity," and Charles was chosen, entering now upon his great career as the renowned Emperor, Charles V. (see GERMANY: A. D. 1519). "Charles received the news of his election to the imperial throne with the joy that was natural to a young and aspiring mind. But his elevation was far from affording the same satisfaction to his Spanish subjects, who foresaw that their blood and their treasures would be lavished in the support of German politics." With great difficulty he obtained from the Cortes money sufficient to enable him to proceed to Germany in a suitable style. Having accomplished this, he sailed from Corunna in May, 1520, leaving his old preceptor, now Cardinal Adrian, of Utrecht, to be Regent during his absence. "As soon as it was understood that, although the Cortes had voted him a free gift, they had not obtained the redress of any grievance, the indignation of the people became general and uncontrollable. The citizens of Toledo took arms, attacked the citadel, and compelled the governor to surrender. Having, in the next place, established a democratical form of government, composed of deputies from the several parishes of the city, they levied troops, and appointed for their commander Don Juan de Padilla, son of the Commendator of Castile, a young man of an ambitious and daring spirit, and a great favourite with the populace. Segovia, Burgos, Zamora, and several other cities, followed the example of Toledo." Segovia was besieged by Fonseca, commander-in-chief in Castile, who, previously, destroyed a great part of the town of Medino del Campo by fire, because its citizens refused to deliver to him a train of artillery. Valladolid now rose in revolt, notwithstanding the presence of the Regent in the city, and forced him to disavow the proceedings of Fonseca.—J. Bigland, *Hist. of Spain, v.* 1, *ch.* 12.—"In July [1520], deputies from the principal Castilian cities met in Avila; and having formed an association called the Santa Junta, or Holy League, proceeded to deliberate concerning the proper methods of redressing the grievances of the nation. The Junta declared the authority of Adrian illegal, on the ground of his being a foreigner, and required him to resign it; while Padilla, by a sudden march, seized the person of Joanna at Tordesillas. The unfortunate queen displayed an interval of reason, during which she authorised Padilla to do all that was necessary for the safety of the kingdom; but she soon relapsed into her former imbecility, and could not be persuaded to sign any more papers. The

Junta nevertheless carried on all their deliberations in her name; and Padilla, marching with a considerable army to Valladolid, seized the seals and public archives, and formally deposed Adrian. Charles now issued from Germany circular letters addressed to the Castilian cities, making great concessions, which, however, were not deemed satisfactory by the Junta; who, conscious of their power, proceeded to draw up a remonstrance, containing a long list of grievances. . . . Charles having refused to receive the remonstrance which was forwarded to him in Germany, the Junta proceeded to levy open war against him and the nobles; for the latter, who had at first sided with the Junta, finding their own privileges threatened as well as those of the King, began now to support the royal authority. The army of the Junta, which numbered about 20,000 men, was chiefly composed of mechanics and persons unacquainted with the use of arms; Padilla was set aside, and the command given to Don Pedro de Giron, a rash and inexperienced young nobleman." From this time the insurrection failed rapidly. In December, the royalists recovered Tordesillas and the person of Queen Joanna; and in April, 1521, Padilla was defeated, taken prisoner and executed, near Villalar. "This defeat proved the ruin of the Junta. Valladolid and most of the other confederated towns now submitted, but Toledo, animated by the grief and courage of Padilla's widow, still held out." Even after the surrender of the city, "Doña Maria retired to the citadel and held it four months longer; but on the 10th Feb. 1522, she was compelled to surrender, and escaped in disguise to Portugal; after which tranquillity was re-established in Castile."—T. H. Dyer, *Hist. of Modern Europe, bk.* 2, *ch.* 3 (*v.* 1).—"The insurrection was a failure; and the blow which crushed the insurgents on the plains of Villalar deprived them [the Spaniards at large] for ever of the few liberties which they had been permitted to retain. They were excluded from all share in the government, and were henceforth summoned to the cortes only to swear allegiance to the heir apparent, or to furnish subsidies for their master. . . . The nobles, who had stood by their master in the struggle, fared no better. . . . They gradually sunk into the unsubstantial though glittering pageant of a court. Meanwhile the government of Castile, assuming the powers of both making the laws and enforcing their execution, became in its essential attributes nearly as absolute as that of Turkey."—W. H. Prescott, *Hist. of the Reign of Philip II., bk.* 6, *ch.* 1.

ALSO IN: W. Robertson, *Hist. of the Reign of Charles V., bk.* 3 (*v.* 2).

A. D. 1519-1524.—The conquest of Mexico. See MEXICO: A. D. 1519, to 1524.

A. D. 1523.—The conspiracy of Charles V. with the Constable of Bourbon against France. See FRANCE: A. D. 1520-1523.

A. D. 1523-1527.—Double-dealings of Pope Clement VII. with Charles.—The imperial revenge.—Capture and sack of Rome. See ITALY: A. D. 1523-1527; and 1527.

A. D. 1524.—Disputes with Portugal in the division of the New World.—The voyage of Magellan and the Congress of Badajos. See AMERICA: A. D. 1519-1524.

A. D. 1526.—The Treaty of Madrid.—Perfidy of Francis I. See FRANCE: A. D. 1525-1526.

A. D. 1526.—Compulsory and nominal Conversion of the Moors, or Moriscoes, completed. See MOORS: A. D. 1492-1609.

A. D. 1528-1542.—The expeditions of Narvaez and Hernando de Soto in Florida. See FLORIDA: A. D. 1528-1542.

A. D. 1531-1541.—Pizarro's conquest of Peru. See PERU: A. D. 1528-1531, to 1533-1548.

A. D. 1535.—Conquest and vassalage of Tunis. See BARBARY STATES: A. D. 1516-1535.

A. D. 1536-1544.—Renewed war between Charles V. and Francis I.—Treaty of Crespy. See FRANCE: A. D. 1532-1547.

A. D. 1541.—Disastrous expedition of Charles V. against Algiers. See BARBARY STATES: A. D. 1541.

A. D. 1556.—Abdication of Charles.—Accession of Philip II. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1555.

A. D. 1556-1559.—War with France and the Pope.—Successes in Italy and northwestern France.—Treaty of Cateau-Cambresis. See FRANCE: A. D. 1547-1559.

A. D. 1559-1563.—Early measures of Philip II.—His stupid and stifling despotism.—His attempt to shut knowledge out of the kingdom.—His destruction of commerce and industry.—His choice of Madrid for a capital.—His building of the Escorial.—"In the beginning of his reign he [Philip II.] issued a most extraordinary decree. . . . That document is a signal revelation of the policy which Philip adopted as the very soul of his Government. Determined to stop by all imaginable means the infiltration into Spain of the doctrines of the religious reformation which agitated Europe, it seems that he planned to isolate her intellect from that of the rest of the world. . . . For this purpose he ordered that none of his subjects, without any exception whatever, should leave the Kingdom 'to learn, or to teach, or to read anything,' or even 'reside' in any of the universities, colleges or schools established in foreign parts. To those who were thus engaged he prescribed that they should return home within four months. Any ecclesiastic violating this decree was to be denationalized and lose all his temporalities; any layman was to be punished with the confiscation of his property and perpetual exile. Thus a sort of Chinese legislation and policy was adopted for Spain. There was to be on her frontiers a line of custom-houses through which the thought of man could not pass without examination. No Spaniard was to receive or to communicate one idea without the leave of Philip. . . . In 1560, the Cortes of Castile had their second meeting under the reign of Philip. . . . The Cortes presented to Philip one hundred and eleven petitions. . . . To those petitions which aimed at something practicable and judicious he gave some of his usual evasive answers, but he granted very readily those which were absurd. For instance, he promulgated sumptuary ordinances which were ridiculous, and which could not possibly have any salutary effects. He also published decrees which were restrictive of commerce, and prohibited the exportation of gold, silver, grains, cattle and other products of the soil, or of the manufacturing industry of the country. . . . In the meantime, the financial condition of the Kingdom was rapidly

growing worse, and the deficit resulting from the inequality of expenditure and revenue was assuming the most alarming proportions. All the ordinary and extraordinary means and resources had been exhausted. . . . Yet, on an average, Philip received annually from his American Dominions alone more than 1,200,000 ducats — which was at least equivalent to $6,000,000 at the present epoch. The Council of Finances, or Hacienda, after consulting with Philip, could not devise anything else, to get out of difficulty, than to resort again to the sale of titles of nobility, the sale of vassals and other Royal property, the alienation of certain rights, and the concession of privileges. . . . It is difficult to give an idea of the wretched administration which had been introduced in Spain, and of those abuses which, like venomous leeches, preyed upon her vitals. Suffice it to say that in Castile, for instance, according to a census made in 1541, there was a population of near 800,000 souls, and that out of every eight men there was one who was noble and exempt from taxation, thereby increasing the weight of the burden on the shoulders of the rest; and as if this evil was not already unbearable, Philip was selling profusely letters patent of nobility. . . . In these conjunctures [1560], Philip, who had shown, on all occasions, that he preferred residing in Madrid, . . . determined to make that city the permanent seat of the Court and of the Supreme Government, and therefore the capital of the Monarchy. That barren and insalubrious locality presented but one advantage, if it be one of much value, that of being a central point. . . . Reason and common sense condemned it from the beginning. . . . Shortly after having selected Madrid as his capital, Philip had laid [1563] with his own hands, in the vicinity of that city, the first stone of the foundations of the Escorial, that eighth marvel of the world, as it is called by the Spaniards."— C. Gayarré, *Philip II. of Spain, ch.* 4.—"The common tradition that Philip built the Escorial in pursuance of a vow which he made at the time of the great battle of St. Quentin, the 10th of August, 1557, has been rejected by modern critics. . . . But a recently discovered document leaves little doubt that such a vow was actually made. However this may have been, it is certain that the king designed to commemorate the event by this structure, as is intimated by its dedication to St. Lawrence, the martyr on whose day the victory was gained. The name given to the place was 'El Sitio de San Lorenzo el Real.' But the monastery was better known from the hamlet near which it stood — El Escurial, or El Escorial — which latter soon became the orthography generally adopted by the Castilians. . . . The erection of a religious house on a magnificent scale, that would proclaim to the world his devotion to the Faith, was the predominant idea in the mind of Philip. It was, moreover, a part of his scheme to combine in the plan a palace for himself. . . . The site which, after careful examination, he selected for the building, was among the mountains of the Guadarrama, on the borders of New Castile, about eight leagues northwest of Madrid. . . . In 1584, the masonry of the Escorial was completed. Twenty-one years had elapsed since the first stone of the monastery was laid. This certainly must be regarded as a short period for the erection of so stupendous a pile. . . . Probably no single edifice ever contained such an amount and variety of inestimable treasures as the Escorial, — so many paintings and sculptures by the greatest masters, — so many articles of exquisite workmanship, composed of the most precious materials." It was despoiled by the French in 1808, and in 1837 the finest works of art surviving were removed to Madrid. "The Escorial ceased to be a royal residence. Tenantless and unprotected, it was left to the fury of the blasts which swept down the hills of the Guadarrama."— W. H. Prescott, *Hist. of the Reign of Philip II., bk.* 6, *ch.* 2 (*v.* 3).

A. D. 1560.—Disastrous expedition against Tripoli. See BARBARY STATES: A. D. 1543–1560.

A. D. 1563-1564.— Repulse of the Moors from Oran and Mazarquiver.—Capture of Penon de Velez. See BARBARY STATES: A. D. 1563–1565.

A. D. 1565.—The massacre of French Huguenots in Florida and occupation of the country. See FLORIDA: A. D. 1565; and 1567–1568.

A. D. 1566-1571.—Edict against the Moriscoes. — Their rebellion and its suppression. See MOORS: A. D. 1492–1609.

A. D. 1568-1610.—The Revolt of the Netherlands. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1568–1572, and after.

A. D. 1570-1571.—The Holy League with Venice and the Pope against the Turks.— Great battle and victory of Lepanto. See TURKS: A. D. 1566–1571.

A. D. 1572.—Rejoicing of Philip at the news of the Massacre of St. Bartholomew's day. See FRANCE: A. D. 1572 (AUGUST — OCTOBER).

A. D. 1572-1573.—Capture of Tunis by Don John of Austria, and its recovery, with Goletta, by the Turks. See TURKS: A. D. 1572–1573.

A. D. 1572-1580.—Piratical warfare of England. See AMERICA: A. D. 1572–1580.

A. D. 1580.—The crown of Portugal claimed by Philip II. and secured by force. See PORTUGAL: A. D. 1579–1580.

A. D. 1585.—Secret alliance with the Catholic League of France. See FRANCE: A. D. 1576–1585.

A. D. 1587-1588. — The expedition of the Armada, against England. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1587–1588; and 1588.

A. D. 1590.—Aid rendered to the Catholic League in France.— Parma's deliverance of Paris.—Philip's ambition to wear the French crown. See FRANCE: A. D. 1590.

A. D. 1595-1598.—War with France.—The Peace of Vervins. See FRANCE: A. D. 1593–1598.

A. D. 1596. — Capture and plundering of Cadiz by the English and Dutch.—"In the beginning of 1596, Philip won an important triumph by the capture of Calais. But this awoke the alarm of England and of the Hollanders as much as of the French. A joint expedition was equipped against Spain in which the English took the lead. Lord Admiral Howard sailed with a fleet of 150 vessels against Cadiz, and the Earl of Essex commanded the land forces. On June 21 the Spanish ships which assembled for the defence of the town were entirely defeated. Essex was the first to leap on shore, and the English troops easily took the city. The clem-

ency of the English soldiers contrasted favourably with the terrible barbarities of the Spaniards in the Netherlands. 'The mercy and the clemency that had been showed here,' wrote Lord Howard, 'will be spoken of throughout the world.' No man or woman was needlessly injured; but Cadiz was sacked, and the shipping in its harbour destroyed. Essex wished to follow up this exploit by a further attack upon Spain; but Howard, who had accomplished the task for which he had been sent, insisted on returning home."—M. Creighton, *The Age of Elizabeth, bk. 7, ch. 3.*—"The results of this expedition were considerable, for the king's navy was crippled, a great city was destroyed, and some millions of plunder had been obtained. But the permanent possession of Cadiz, which, in such case, Essex hoped to exchange for Calais, and the destruction of the fleet at the Azores—possible achievements both, and unwisely neglected—would have been far more profitable, at least to England."—J. L. Motley, *Hist. of the United Netherlands, ch. 32 (v. 3).*

A. D. 1598.—Accession of Philip III.

A. D. 1598-1700.—The first century of decline and decay.—"Spain became united and consolidated under the Catholic kings [Ferdinand and Isabella]; it became a cosmopolitan empire under Charles; and in Philip, austere, bigoted, and commanding, its height of glory was reached. Thenceforth the Austrian supremacy in the peninsula—the star of the House of Habsburg—declined, until a whiff of diplomacy was sufficient to extinguish its lights in the person of the childless and imbecile Charles II. Three reigns—Philip III. (1598–1621), Philip IV. (1621–1665), and Charles II. (1665–1700)—fill this century of national decline, full as it is of crowned idiocy, hypochondria, and madness, the result of incestuous marriages, or natural weakness. The splendid and prosperous Spanish empire under the emperor and his son—its vast conquests, discoveries and foreign wars,—becomes transformed into a bauble for the caprice of favorites, under their successors. . . . Amid its immeasurable wealth, Spain was bankrupt. The gold, and silver, and precious stones of the West, emptied themselves into a land the poorest and most debt-laden in Europe, the most spiritually ignorant despite the countless churches, the most notorious for its dissolute nobility, its worthless officials, its ignoble family relations, its horrible moral aberrations pervading all grades of the population; and all in vain. The mighty fancy, the enthusiastic loyalty, the fervid faith of the richly endowed Spaniard were not counterbalanced by humbler but more practical virtues,—love of industry, of agriculture, of manufactures. The Castilians hated the doings of citizens and peasants; the taint of the Arab and the Jew was on the profession of money-getting. Thousands left their ploughs and went to the Indies, found places in the police, or bought themselves titles of nobility, which forthwith rendered all work dishonorable. The land grew into a literal infatuation with miracles, relics, cloisters, fraternities, pious foundations of every description. The church was omnipotent. Nobody cultivated the soil. Hundreds of thousands lived in the convents. Begging soup at the monastery gates,—such is a type of the famishing Spain of the 17th century. In economic, political, physical, moral, and intellectual aspects, a decay pervaded the peninsula under the later Habsburgers, such as no civilized nation has ever undergone. The population declined from 10,000,000 under Charles V. (Charles I. of Spain) to 6,000,000 under Charles II. The people had vanished from hundreds of places in New Castile, Old Castile, Toledo, Estremadura, and Andalusia. One might travel miles in the lovely regions of the South, without seeing a solitary cultivated field or dwelling. Seville was almost depopulated. Pecuniary distress at the end of the 17th century reached an unexampled height; the soldiers wandered through the cities begging; nearly all the great fortresses from Barcelona to Cadiz were ruinous; the king's servants ran away because they were neither paid nor fed; more than once there was no money to supply the royal table; the ministers were besieged by high officials and officers seeking to extort their pay long due; couriers charged with communications of the highest importance lingered on the road for lack of means to continue their journey. Finance was reduced to tricks of low deceit and robbery. . . . The idiocy of the system of taxation was unparalleled. Even in 1594 the cortes complained that the merchant, out of every 1,000 ducats capital, had to pay 300 ducats in taxes; that no tenant-farmer could maintain himself, however low his rent might be; and that the taxes exceeded the income of numerous estates. Bad as the system was under Philip II., it became worse under his Austrian successors. The tax upon the sale of food, for instance, increased from ten to fourteen per cent. Looms were most productive when they were absolutely silent. Almost the entire household arrangements of a Spanish family were the products of foreign industries. In the beginning of the 17th century, five-sixths of the domestic and nine-tenths of the foreign trade were in the hands of aliens. In Castile, alone, there were 160,000 foreigners, who had gained complete possession of the industrial and manufacturing interests. 'We cannot clothe ourselves without them, for we have neither linen nor cloth; we cannot write without them, for we have no paper,' complains a Spaniard. Hence, the enormous masses of gold and silver annually transmitted from the colonies passed through Spain into French, English, Italian, and Dutch pockets. Not a real, it is said, of the 35,000,000 of ducats which Spain received from the colonies in 1595, was found in Castile the following year. In this indescribable retrogression, but one interest in any way prospered—the Church. The more agriculture, industry, trade declined, the more exclusively did the Catholic clergy monopolize all economic and intellectual life."—J. A. Harrison, *Spain, ch. 23.*

Also in: R. Watson, *Hist. of the Reign of Philip III.*—J. Dunlop, *Memoirs of Spain, during the Reigns of Philip IV. and Charles II.*

A. D. 1609.—Final expulsion of the Moriscoes.—The resulting ruin of the nation, materially and morally. See Moors: A. D. 1492–1609.

A. D. 1619.—Alliance with the Emperor Ferdinand against Frederick of Bohemia. See Germany: A. D. 1618–1620.

A. D. 1621.—Accession of Philip IV.

A. D. 1621.—Renewal of war in the Netherlands.—End of the truce. See Netherlands: A. D. 1621–1633.

A. D. 1624-1626.—Hostile policy of Richelieu.—The Valtelline War in Northern Italy. See FRANCE: A. D. 1624–1626.

A. D. 1627-1631.—War with France in Northern Italy over the succession to the duchy of Mantua. See ITALY: A. D. 1627–1631.

A. D. 1635.—New hostile alliances of France.—Declaration of war. See GERMANY: A. D. 1634–1639.

A. D. 1635-1636.—The Cardinal Infant in the Netherlands.—His invasion of France. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1635–1638.

A. D. 1635-1642.—The war with France and Savoy in Northern Italy. See ITALY: A. D. 1635–1659.

A. D. 1637-1640.—The war on the French frontier.—Siege and battle of Fontarabia.—French invasion of Roussillon.—Causes of disaffection in Catalonia.—In 1637, a Spanish army, 12,000 strong, crossed the Pyrenees under the command of the Duke of Medina del Rio-Seco, Admiral of Castile. "He took St Jean-de-Luz without difficulty, and was advancing to the siege of Bayonne, when the old Duke d'Epernon, governor of Guienne, . . . threw himself into it. There was little time for preparations; but the Spanish commander, on being told he would find Bayonne destitute of defence, replied that could not be said of any place which contained the Duke d'Epernon. He accordingly refrained from laying siege to Bayonne; and all his other enterprises having failed from the vigilant activity of Epernon, he abandoned St Jean-de-Luz, with some other posts in its neighbourhood, and the seat of war was speedily transferred from Guienne to Languedoc: Olivarez, in forming his plans against that province, had expected a revolt among its numerous and often rebellious inhabitants. . . . The hopes, however, entertained by Olivarez . . . proved utterly fallacious." The Spanish army, under Serbellone, invested Leucate, the first fortress reached on entering Languedoc from Roussillon, and besieged it for a month; but was attacked at the end of that time by the Duke de Halluin, son of the late Mareschal Schomberg, and driven from its works, with the loss of all its artillery, and 3,000 men. "In the following season [1638] the French, in their turn, attempted the invasion of Spain, but with as little success as the Spaniards had obtained in Guienne or Languedoc. . . . An army, amounting to not less than 15,000 infantry and 2,000 cavalry, under the orders of the Prince of Condé, the father of the great Condé, and a devoted retainer of Richelieu, crossed the frontier, took Irun, and laid siege to Fontarabia, which is situated on a peninsula, jutting into the river Bidassoa. A formidable French fleet was, at the same time, stationed on the coast of Guipuscoa, to co-operate with this army," and, after failing in one attack, it succeeded in destroying the Spanish ships sent to the succor of Fontarabia. "Fontarabia being considered as the key to Spain, on the entrance to the kingdom from Bayonne, its natural strength had been greatly improved by fortifications." Its garrison held out stoutly until the arrival of a relieving army of 13,000, led by the Admiral of Castile. Nearly a month elapsed before the latter ventured to attack the besieging force; but when he did, "while the Spaniards lost only 200 men, the French were totally defeated, and precipitately driven forth from their intrenchments. Many of them were killed in the attack, and a still greater number were drowned in attempting to pass the Bidassoa. Those who escaped fled with precipitation to Bayonne. . . . But Spain was hardly relieved from the alarm of the invasion of Navarre when she was threatened with a new danger, on the side of Roussillon. The Prince of Condé . . . was again entrusted with a military expedition against the Spanish frontiers. . . . The small county of Roussillon, which had hitherto belonged to Spain as an appendage of Catalonia, lies on the French side of the higher Pyrenees; but a lower range of mountains, called the Courbieres, branching off from them, and extending within a league of the Mediterranean shore, divides Roussillon from Languedoc. At the extremity of these hills, and about a league from the sea, stood the fortress of Salsas [or Salces], which was considered as the key of Spain on the dangerous side of Roussillon and Catalonia." Salsas was invested by the French, 1639, and taken after a siege of forty days. But Olivarez, the Spanish minister, adopted measures for the recovery of the important fortress, so energetic, so peremptory, and so unmeasured in the exactions they made upon the people of Catalonia, that Salsas was retaken in January, 1640. "The long campaign in the vicinity of Salsas, though it proved ultimately prosperous to the Spanish arms, fostered in the bosom of the kingdom the seeds of rebellion. Those arbitrary measures which Olivarez enjoined to his Generals, may have gained Salsas, but they lost Catalonia. The frequent intercourse which took place between the Catalans and French soldiery, added fuel to those flames nearly ready to burst forth, and, shortly afterwards, excited the fatal insurrection at Barcelona."—J. Dunlop, *Memoirs of Spain during the Reigns of Philip IV. and Charles II.*, *v.* 1, *ch.* 4.

ALSO IN: T. Wright, *Hist. of France*, *v.* 1, *ch.* 17.

A. D. 1639-1700.—War with the piratical Buccaneers. See AMERICA: A. D. 1639–1700.

A. D. 1640.—Revolution in Portugal.—That country resumes its independence. See PORTUGAL: A. D. 1637–1668.

A. D. 1640-1642.—Revolt of Catalonia and Portugal, with the aid of France.—French conquest of Roussillon.—After their defeat of Condé at Salces, Olivarez ordered the Castilian troops to take up their winter quarters in Catalonia; and, "commanding the Catalonians to raise and equip 6,000 soldiers for the wars of Italy, he assigned them their proportion of the expenses of the state, enjoining the states to raise it, by a decree of the king. Had the Castillian troops remained tranquil and orderly, overawing the Catalonians by their presence and their discipline, without enraging them by their excesses and their insolence, perhaps Olivarez might have carried through his bold design, and annihilated, one by one, the destructive privileges of the various provinces. But, on the contrary, they committed every sort of violence and injustice. . . . The Catalonians, stirred up to vengeance, sought retribution in chance combats, lost their dread of the Castillian troops by frequent contests with them, and were excited almost to frenzy by their violence and rapine. In the mean time, the states of Catalonia refused to obey the royal decree, and sent two deputies to remonstrate with the king and his minister. These messengers

unfortunately executed their commission in an insolent and menacing tone; and Olivarez, of a haughty and inflexible character, caused them instantly to be arrested. These tidings reached Barcelona at the moment when some fresh outrage, committed by the Castillian soldiers, had excited popular indignation to the highest pitch; and a general insurrection was the immediate consequence. The viceroy was slain upon the spot, and a negotiation was instantly entered into with France in order to procure support in rebellion. The courage of Olivarez did not fail even under this fresh misfortune: all the disposable troops in Spain were instantly directed upon Catalonia; and all the other provinces, but more especially Portugal, were ordered to arm for the suppression of the revolt. Turbulent subjects and interested allies are always sure to take advantage of the moment of difficulty. The Portuguese, hating, with even more bitter animosity than the Catalonians, the yoke of Castille, oppressed by Vasconcellos, who ruled them under the vice-queen, duchess of Mantua, and called upon to aid in suppressing an insurrection to which they looked with pleasure and hope, now instantly threw off the rule of Spain. A conspiracy burst forth, which had been preparing under the knowledge and advice of Richelieu for more than three years; and the duke of Braganza, a prince of no great abilities, was proclaimed king. . . . In the mean time the marquis de los Velez had taken the command of the army sent against the Catalonian rebels; and a willing instrument of the minister's vengeance, he exercised the most barbarous cruelties as he marched on into the refractory province. The town of Tortosa was taken and sacked by his soldiers, and the people subjected to every sort of violence. Fire, massacre, and desolation marked his progress; but, instead of inspiring crouching terror, and trembling self-abandonment, his conduct roused up lion-like revenge. Hurrying on the negotiations with France, the Catalonians accepted any terms which Richelieu chose to offer, declared themselves subject to the French crown, and pronounced the authority of Spain at an end for ever in Catalonia. A small corps of French troops was immediately thrown forward from Roussillon, and advanced to Taragona under the command of D'Espenan, a general who had shown great skill and courage at Salces. The Catalonians, with the usual bravado of their nation, had represented their army as a thousandfold stronger, both in numbers and discipline, than it really was; and the French officers were in consequence lamentably disappointed when they saw the militia which was to support them, and still more disappointed when they beheld that militia in face of an enemy. As a last resource against the large Spanish force under Los Velez, D'Espenan threw himself into Taragona, in opposition to the advice of Besançon, who was employed, on the part of France, in organizing the Catalonians. Here he was almost immediately besieged; and, being destitute both of provisions and ammunition, was soon forced to sign a capitulation, whereby he agreed to evacuate the territory of Spain with all the troops which had entered Catalonia from France. This convention he executed, notwithstanding all remonstrances and petitions on the part of the Catalonians; and, retreating at once from Taragona to the French frontier, he abandoned the field to the enemy. Had Olivarez now seized the favourable moment, . . . it is probable — it is more than probable — that Catalonia would at once have been pacified, and that her dangerous privileges would in part have been sacrificed to the desire and necessity of peace. . . . But the count-duke sought revenge as much as advantage. . . . Continued severity only produced a continuance of resistance: the Catalonians sustained themselves till the French forces returned in greater numbers, and with more experienced commanders: the tide of success turned against the Castillians; and Los Velez was recalled to give place to Leganez. . . . In various engagements . . . the Spanish armies were defeated by the French: the Catalonians themselves became better soldiers under the severe discipline of necessity; and though the Spanish fleet defeated the French off Taragona, and saved that city from the enterprises of La Mothe, the general result of the campaign was decidedly unfavourable to Spain. At the same time, the French were making progress in Roussillon; and in the year 1642 the king himself prepared to invade that small territory, with the evident intention of dissevering it from the Spanish crown. Several minor places having been taken, siege was laid to Perpignan: the people of the country were not at all unwilling to pass under the dominion of France; and another serious misfortune threatened the ministry of Olivarez. At this time was concerted the conspiracy of Cinq Mars [see FRANCE: A. D. 1641–1642] . . . and the count-duke eagerly entered into the views of the French malecontents, and promised them every assistance they demanded. The failure of the conspiracy, the arrest and execution of some of the conspirators, and the fall of Perpignan, came rapidly, one upon the other, showing the fortune of Richelieu still triumphing over all the best laid schemes of his adversaries."—G. P. R. James, *Eminent Foreign Statesmen, v.* 2: *Olivarez.*

A. D. 1643.—Invasion of France from the Netherlands.—Defeat at Rocroi. See FRANCE: A. D. 1642–1643.

A. D. 1644-1646.—The war in Catalonia.—Sieges of Lerida.—In 1644, Philip IV., "under the prudent and sagacious counsels of Don Louis de Haro, was directing his principal efforts to the recovery of Catalonia. . . . Don Philip de Sylva, an officer of experience and determination, was put at the head of the Castilian troops, and immediately advanced to the siege of the strong town of Lerida, the king himself being nominally in command of the army. The French troops in Catalonia were at that time commanded by La Mothe Houdancourt, who no sooner heard of the advance of the Spanish troops towards Lerida than he marched with great rapidity to the relief of that place;" but approached the enemy with so much carelessness that he was attacked by Sylva and totally defeated, with a loss of 3,000 men and 12 guns. He then, for a diversion, laid siege to Tarragona, and lost 3,000 more of his men, without accomplishing the reduction of the place; being forced, in the end, to retreat to Barcelona, while Lerida was surrendered to the Spaniards. "La Mothe having been recalled and imprisoned, . . . the Count de Harcourt was withdrawn from Savoy, and put at the head of fresh forces, for the purpose of repairing the disasters of the former general." Harcourt began operations (April, 1645)

by laying siege to the strong fortress of Rosas, or Roses, which commanded the principal entrance to Catalonia from Roussillon. The fortress surrendered the following month, and "the Count de Harcourt, . . . after capturing some places of minor import, passed the Segre, encountered the army of Cantelmo in the neighbourhood of Llorens, and, gaining a complete victory, made himself master of Balaguer." After these successes, the Count de Harcourt was called away from Catalonia for a time, to act against the insurgents at Barcelona, but returned in 1646 and undertook the siege of Lerida. He was now opposed by the Marquis de Leganez, whom he had successfully encountered in Italy, and whom he was foolishly disposed to regard with contempt. While he pressed his siege in careless security, Leganez surprised him, in a night attack, and drove him in utter rout from his lines. "This signal disaster caused the Count de Harcourt to be recalled; and in order to recover all that had been lost in Catalonia, the Prince de Condé was appointed to command in that province, while a considerable part of the army of Flanders was ordered to proceed towards the frontiers of Spain to serve once more under his command." But Condé, too, was to pay the penalty for despising his enemy. He reopened the siege of Lerida with ostentatious gaiety, marching into the trenches with music of violins, on the 14th of May. In little more than a month he marched out again, without music, abandoning the siege, having lost many men and obtained no sign of success.—G. P. R. James, *Life and Times of Louis XIV.*, *v.* 1, *ch.* 3.

A. D. 1645-1646.—French successes in Flanders.—Loss of Dunkirk. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1645–1646.

A. D. 1647-1648.—Campaign against France in the Netherlands.—The defeat at Lens. See NETHERLANDS (SPANISH PROVINCES): A. D. 1647–1648.

A. D. 1647-1654.—The revolt of Masaniello at Naples and its termination.—Attempts of the Duke of Guise and the French. See ITALY: A. D. 1646–1654.

A. D. 1648.—Conclusion of Peace with the United Provinces. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1646–1648.

A. D. 1648-1652.—Subjugation of Catalonia.—"During the four years which [in France] had been filled with the troubles of the Fronde, Spain endeavored, and with success, to reconquer the province which had abandoned her. In 1650, Mazarin had recognized the peril of Catalonia, and had endeavored to send assistance in war and money. It was possible, however, to do but little. In 1651 the Spanish besieged Barcelona. After Marchin's desertion they hoped to capture it at once, but it was defended with the courage and constancy of the Catalonian people. La Mothe Houdancourt was again put in command of the province. He had been unsuccessful there when France was strong, and it could hardly have been expected that he could rescue it when France was weak. He succeeded, however, in forcing his way into Barcelona, and defended the city with as much success as could, perhaps, have been anticipated from the scanty means at his command. The inhabitants endured, with constancy, the danger and want caused by the siege, rather than surrender themselves to Spain. Some French ships sailed for the rescue of the place, but they acquitted themselves with little valor. Provisions were sent into the town, but the commander claimed he was not in condition for a conflict with the Spanish fleet, and he retreated. Endeavors were made, both by the French troops and those of the Catalonians, to raise the siege, but without success. In October [1652], after a siege of fifteen months, Barcelona surrendered. Roses was captured soon after. Leucate was betrayed to Spain by its governor for 40,000 crowns. He intended to enlist under Orleans, but learning the king had reëntered Paris, he made his peace, by agreeing to betray no more. The Spanish granted an amnesty to the people of Catalonia. The whole province fell into their hands, and became again a part of the kingdom of Spain. The loss of Catalonia was chiefly due to the turbulence and disloyalty of Condé. Had it not been for the groundless rebellion which he excited in the autumn of 1651, and which absorbed the energies of the French armies during the next year, Catalonia might have been saved for France and have remained a part of that kingdom. . . . It was a national misfortune that Catalonia was lost. This great and important province would have been a valuable accession to France. Its brave and hardy population would have become loyal and industrious Frenchmen, and have added to the wealth and power of that kingdom. For the Catalonians it was still more unfortunate that their lot should thus have been determined. They were not closely related to the people of Aragon or Castile. They were now left to share in the slow decay of the Spanish kingdom, instead of having an opportunity for development in intelligence and prosperity as members of a great and progressive nation."—J. B. Perkins, *France under Mazarin*, *ch.* 15 (*v.* 2).

A. D. 1650-1651.—Alliance with the New Fronde in France.—Defeat at Rethel. See FRANCE: A. D. 1650–1651.

A. D. 1652.—Campaign on the Flemish frontier.—Invasion of France.—Recovery of Gravelines and Dunkirk. See FRANCE: A. D. 1652.

A. D. 1657-1658.—War with England in alliance with France.—Loss of Dunkirk and Gravelines. See FRANCE: A. D. 1655–1658; and ENGLAND: A. D. 1655–1658.

A. D. 1659.—The Treaty of the Pyrenees.—Territorial cessions to France.—Marriage of the Infanta to Louis XIV. See FRANCE: A. D. 1659–1661.

A. D. 1665.—Accession of Charles II.

A. D. 1667.—Conquests of Louis XIV. in the Netherlands.—The War of the Queen's Rights. See NETHERLANDS (SPANISH PROVINCES): A. D. 1667.

A. D. 1668.—Towns in Flanders ceded to Louis XIV.—Triple alliance and the Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle. See NETHERLANDS (HOLLAND): A. D. 1668.

A. D. 1668.—Peace with Portugal.—Recognition of its independence. See PORTUGAL: A. D. 1637–1668.

A. D. 1673-1679.—The War of the Coalition to resist Louis XIV. See NETHERLANDS (HOLLAND): A. D. 1672–1674, and 1674–1678; also, NIMEGUEN, PEACE OF.

A. D. 1686.—The League of Augsburg. See GERMANY: A. D. 1686.

A. D. 1690-1696.—The War of the League of Augsburg or the Grand Alliance against Louis XIV. See FRANCE: A. D. 1689–1690, to 1695–1696.

A. D. 1697.—The Peace of Ryswick.—French conquests restored. See FRANCE: A. D. 1697.

A. D. 1698-1700.—The question of the Succession.—The Treaties of Partition.—The will of Charles II.— As the 17th century approached its close, the king of Spain, Charles II., was nearing the grave. "His days had been few and evil. He had been unfortunate in all his wars, in every part of his internal administration, and in all his domestic relations. . . . He was childless; and his constitution was so completely shattered that, at little more than thirty years of age, he had given up all hopes of posterity. His mind was even more distempered than his body. . . . His sufferings were aggravated by the thought that his own dissolution might not improbably be followed by the dissolution of his empire. Several princes laid claim to the succession. The King's eldest sister had married Lewis XIV. The Dauphin would, therefore, in the common course of inheritance, have succeeded to the crown. But the Infanta had, at the time of her espousals, solemnly renounced, in her own name, and in that of her posterity, all claim to the succession [see FRANCE: A. D. 1659–1661]. This renunciation had been confirmed in due form by the Cortes. A younger sister of the King had been the first wife of Leopold, Emperor of Germany. She too had at her marriage renounced her claims to the Spanish crown, but the Cortes had not sanctioned the renunciation, and it was therefore considered as invalid by the Spanish jurists. The fruit of this marriage was a daughter, who had espoused the Elector of Bavaria. The Electoral Prince of Bavaria inherited her claim to the throne of Spain. The Emperor Leopold was son of a daughter of Philip III., and was therefore first cousin to Charles. No renunciation whatever had been exacted from his mother at the time of her marriage. The question was certainly very complicated. That claim which, according to the ordinary rules of inheritance, was the strongest, had been barred by a contract executed in the most binding form. The claim of the Electoral Prince of Bavaria was weaker. But so also was the contract which bound him not to prosecute his claim. The only party against whom no instrument of renunciation could be produced was the party who, in respect of blood, had the weakest claim of all. As it was clear that great alarm would be excited throughout Europe if either the Emperor or the Dauphin should become King of Spain, each of those Princes offered to waive his pretensions in favour of his second son; the Emperor in favour of the Archduke Charles, the Dauphin in favour of Philip, Duke of Anjou. Soon after the Peace of Ryswick, William III. and Lewis XIV. determined to settle the question of the succession without consulting either Charles or the Emperor. France, England, and Holland, became parties to a treaty [called the First Partition Treaty] by which it was stipulated that the Electoral Prince of Bavaria should succeed to Spain, the Indies, and the Netherlands. The Imperial family were to be bought off with the Milanese, and the Dauphin was to have the Two Sicilies. The great object of the King of Spain and of all his counsellors was to avert the dismemberment of the monarchy. In the hope of attaining this end, Charles determined to name a successor. A will was accordingly framed by which the crown was bequeathed to the Bavarian Prince. Unhappily, this will had scarcely been signed when the Prince died. The question was again unsettled, and presented greater difficulties than before. A new Treaty of Partition was concluded between France, England, and Holland. It was agreed that Spain, the Indies, and the Netherlands, should descend to the Archduke Charles. In return for this great concession made by the Bourbons to a rival house, it was agreed that France should have the Milanese, or an equivalent in a more commodious situation. The equivalent in view was the province of Lorraine. Arbuthnot, some years later, ridiculed the Partition Treaty with exquisite humour and ingenuity. Everybody must remember his description of the paroxysm of rage into which poor old Lord Strutt fell, on hearing that his runaway servant, Nick Frog, his clothier, John Bull, and his old enemy, Lewis Baboon, had come with quadrants, poles, and inkhorns, to survey his estate, and to draw his will for him. . . . When the intelligence of the second Partition Treaty arrived at Madrid, it roused to momentary energy the languishing ruler of a languishing state. The Spanish ambassador at the court of London was directed to remonstrate with the government of William; and his remonstrances were so insolent that he was commanded to leave England. Charles retaliated by dismissing the English and Dutch ambassadors. The French King, though the chief author of the Partition Treaty, succeeded in turning the whole wrath of Charles and of the Spanish people from himself, and in directing it against the two maritime powers. Those powers had now no agent at Madrid. Their perfidious ally was at liberty to carry on his intrigues unchecked; and he fully availed himself of this advantage." He availed himself of the advantage so successfully, in fact, that when the Spanish king died, November 3, 1700, he was found to have left a will, bequeathing the whole Spanish monarchy to Philip, Duke of Anjou, second son of the Dauphin of France. "Lewis acted as the English ministers might have guessed that he would act. With scarcely the show of hesitation, he broke through all the obligations of the Partition Treaty, and accepted for his grandson the splendid legacy of Charles. The new sovereign hastened to take possession of his dominions."—Lord Macaulay, *Mahon's War of the Succession* (*Essays*).

ALSO IN: H. Martin, *Hist. of France: Age of Louis XIV.* (*tr. by M. L. Booth*), *v.* 2, *ch.* 4.—J. W. Gerard, *The Peace of Utrecht*, *ch.* 6–10.—J. Dunlop, *Memoirs of Spain*, 1621–1700, *v.* 2, *ch.* 9.—W. Coxe, *Memoirs of the Bourbon Kings of Spain*, *v.* 1, *introd.*, *sect.* 3.

A. D. 1700.—Accession of Philip V.

A. D. 1701-1702.—The Bourbon succession, and the European League against it.—"Louis XIV. having . . . resolved to accede to the will, Philip of Anjou was proclaimed King by the Spaniards, and made his solemn entry into Madrid on the 14th of April 1701. Most of the European powers, such as the States of Italy, Sweden, England, Holland, and the kingdoms of the North, acknowledged Philip V.; the King of

Portugal and the Duke of Savoy even concluded treaties of alliance with him. Moreover, the situation of political affairs in Germany, Hungary, and the North was such that it would have been easy for Louis XIV., with prudent management, to preserve the Spanish crown on the head of his grandson; but he seemed, as if on purpose, to do everything to raise all Europe against him. It was alleged that he aimed at the chimerical project of universal monarchy, and the reunion of France with Spain. Instead of trying to do away this supposition, he gave it additional force, by issuing letters-patent in favour of Philip, at the moment when he was departing for Spain, to the effect of preserving his rights to the throne of France. The Dutch dreaded nothing so much as to see the French making encroachments on the Spanish Netherlands, which they regarded as their natural barrier against France; the preservation of which appeared to be equally interesting to England. It would have been prudent in Louis XIV. to give these maritime powers some security on this point, who, since the elevation of William, Prince of Orange, to the crown of Great Britain, held as it were in their hands the balance of Europe. Without being swayed by this consideration, he obtained authority from the Council of Madrid to introduce a French army into the Spanish Netherlands; and on this occasion the Dutch troops, who were quartered in various places of the Netherlands, according to a stipulation with the late King of Spain, were disarmed. This circumstance became a powerful motive for King William to rouse the States-General against France. He found some difficulty, however, in drawing over the British Parliament to his views, as a great majority in that House were averse to mingle in the quarrels of the Continent; but the death of James II. altered the minds and inclinations of the English. Louis XIV. having formally acknowledged the son of that prince as King of Great Britain, the English Parliament had no longer any hesitation in joining the Dutch and the other enemies of France. A new and powerful league [the Second Grand Alliance] was formed against Louis. The Emperor, England, the United Provinces, the Empire, the Kings of Portugal and Prussia, and the Duke of Savoy, all joined it in succession. The allies engaged to restore to Austria the Spanish Netherlands, the duchy of Milan, the kingdom of the Two Sicilies, with the ports of Tuscany; and never to permit the union of France with Spain."—C. W. Koch, *The Revolutions of Europe, period 7.*

Also in: Lord Macaulay, *Hist. of Eng., ch.* 25 (*v.* 5).—J. H. Burton, *Hist. of the Reign of Queen Anne, ch.* 5 (*v.* 1).—W. Coxe, *Memoirs of Marlborough, ch.* 9 (*v.* 1).—The same, *Memoirs of the Bourbon Kings of Spain, ch.* 1-7.—See, also, England: A. D. 1701-1702.

A. D. 1702.—The War of the Succession: Cadiz defended.—The treasure fleet lost in Vigo Bay.—The first approach to Spain of the War of the Succession—already raging for months in Northern Italy and the Spanish Netherlands—was in the form of an expedition against Cadiz, undertaken in the autumn of 1702 by the English and Dutch. "King William was the first to plan this expedition against Cadiz and after his decease the project was resumed. But had King William lived he would certainly not have selected as chief the Duke of Ormond, a princely nobleman, endowed with many amiable qualities, but destitute of the skill and the energy which a great enterprise requires. Under him Sir Henry Bellasys commanded the English and General Spaar a contingent of Dutch troops, amounting together to 14,000 men. Admiral Sir George Rooke had the direction of the fleet. Their proceedings have been related at full length in another history [Lord Mahon's (Earl Stanhope's) 'War of the Succession in Spain']—how the troops were set on shore near Cadiz in the first days of September—how even before they landed angry dissensions had sprung up between the Dutch and the English, the landsmen and the seamen—and how these dissensions which Ormond wanted the energy to control proved fatal to the enterprise. No discipline was kept, no spirit was displayed. Week after week was lost. . . . Finally at the close of the month it was discovered that nothing could be done, and a council of war decided that the troops should reembark. . . . On their return, and off the coast of Portugal, an opportunity arose to recover in some part their lost fame. The Spanish galleons from America, laden with treasure and making their yearly voyage at this time, were bound by their laws of trade to unload at Cadiz, but in apprehension of the English fleet they had put into Vigo Bay. There Ormond determined to pursue them. On the 22nd of October he neared that narrow inlet which winds amidst the high Gallician mountains. The Spaniards, assisted by some French frigates, which were the escort of the galleons, had expected an attack and made the best preparations in their power. They durst not disembark the treasure without an express order from Madrid—and what order from Madrid ever yet came in due time?—but they had called the neighbouring peasantry to arms; they had manned their forts; they had anchored their ships in line within the harbour; and they had drawn a heavy boom across its mouth. None of these means availed them. The English seamen broke through the boom; Ormond at the head of 2,000 soldiers scaled the forts; and the ships were all either taken or destroyed. The greater part of the treasure was thrown overboard by direction of the French and Spanish chiefs; but there remained enough to yield a large amount of booty to the victors."—Earl Stanhope, *Hist. of Eng.: Reign of Queen Anne, ch.* 2.

Also in: Col. A. Parnell, *War of the Succession in Spain, ch.* 3-4.—For the campaigns of the War of the Succession in other quarters see Italy: A. D. 1701-1713; Netherlands: A. D. 1702-1704, and after; Germany: A. D. 1702, and after.

A. D. 1703-1704.—The War of the Succession: Charles III. claims the kingdom.—The English take Gibraltar.—"The Admiral of Castile, alienated from the cause of Philip V. by having been dismissed from his office of Master of the Horse, had retired into Portugal; and he succeeded in persuading King Pedro II. to accede to the Grand Alliance, who was enticed by the promise of the American provinces between the Rio de la Plata and Brazil, as well as a part of Estremadura and Galicia (May 6th). Pedro also entered into a perpetual defensive league with Great Britain and the States-General. In the following December, Paul Methuen, the English minister at Lisbon, concluded the celebrated commercial treaty between England and

Portugal named after himself [see PORTUGAL: A. D. 1703]. It is the most laconic treaty on record, containing only two Articles, to the effect that Portugal was to admit British cloths, and England to admit Portuguese wines, at one-third less duty than those of France. Don Pedro's accession to the Grand Alliance entirely changed the plans of the allies. Instead of confining themselves to the procuring of a reasonable indemnity for the Emperor, they now resolved to drive Philip V. from the throne of Spain, and to place an Austrian Archduke upon it in his stead. The Emperor and his eldest son Joseph formally renounced their claims to the throne of Spain in favour of the archduke Charles, Leopold's second son, September 12th [1703]; and the Archduke was proclaimed King of Spain, with the title of Charles III. The new King was to proceed into Portugal, and, with the assistance of Don Pedro, endeavour to obtain possession of Spain. Charles accordingly proceeded to Holland, and embarked for England in January 1704; whence, after paying a visit to Queen Anne at Windsor, he finally set sail for Lisbon, February 17th. . . . In March 1704, the Pretender, Charles III., together with an English and Dutch army of 12,000 men, landed in Portugal, with the intention of entering Spain on that side; but so far were they from accomplishing this plan that the Spaniards, on the contrary, under the Duke of Berwick, penetrated into Portugal, and even threatened Lisbon, but were driven back by the Marquis das Minas. An English fleet under Admiral Rooke, with troops under the Prince of Darmstadt, made an ineffectual attempt on Barcelona; but were compensated for their failure by the capture of Gibraltar on their return. The importance of this fortress, the key of the Mediterranean, was not then sufficiently esteemed, and its garrison had been neglected by the Spanish Government. A party of English sailors, taking advantage of a Saint's day, on which the eastern portion of the fortress had been left unguarded, scaled the almost inaccessible precipice, whilst at the same time another party stormed the South Mole Head. The capture of this important fortress was the work of a few hours (August 4th). Darmstadt would have claimed the place for King Charles III., but Rooke took possession of it in the name of the Queen of England. . . . The Spaniards, sensible of the importance of Gibraltar, speedily made an effort to recover that fortress, and as early as October 1704, it was invested by the Marquis of Villadarias with an army of 8,000 men. The French Court afterwards sent Marshal Tessé to supersede Villadarias, and the siege continued till April 1705; but the brave defence of the Prince of Darmstadt, and the defeat of the French blockading squadron under Pointis by Admiral Leake, finally compelled the raising of the siege."—T. H. Dyer, *Hist. of Modern Europe, bk.* 5, *ch.* 6 (*v.* 3).

ALSO IN: J. H. Burton, *Hist. of the Reign of Queen Anne, ch.* 9 (*v.* 2).—F. Sayer, *Hist. of Gibraltar, ch.* 6–8.

A. D. 1704.—The War of the Succession: Blenheim. See GERMANY: A. D. 1704.

A. D. 1705.—The War of the Succession: The capture of Barcelona.—"As if to exhibit, upon a different theatre of the same great warfare, the most remarkable contrast to the patience, the caution, and the foresight of Marlborough, . . . Charles Mordaunt, earl of Peterborough, took the command of an expedition to Spain. Macaulay calls Peterborough 'the most extraordinary character of that age, the king of Sweden himself not excepted, . . . a polite, learned and amorous Charles XII.' He sailed from Portsmouth in June, 1705, having the command of 5,000 men; unlimited authority over the land forces, and a divided command with sir Cloudesley Shovel at sea. At Lisbon, Peterborough was reinforced, and he here took on board the arch-duke Charles, and a numerous suite. At Gibraltar he received two veteran battalions, in exchange for the same number of recruits which he had brought from England. The prince of Darmstadt also here joined Peterborough. The prince and the arch-duke desired to besiege Barcelona. Peterborough opposed the scheme of attempting, with 7,000 men, the reduction of a place which required 30,000 men for a regular siege. With the squadron under sir Cloudesley Shovel, the fleet sailed from Gibraltar. A landing was effected near Valencia; and here the people were found favourable to the cause of the Austrian prince, who was proclaimed, upon the surrender of the castle of Denia, as Charles III., king of Spain and the Indies. Peterborough, encouraged by this reception, conceived the enterprise of dashing upon the capital, whilst all the Spanish forces were on the frontiers of Portugal, or in Catalonia; and king Philip was at Madrid with few troops. Such an exploit had every chance of success, but Peterborough was overruled by a council of war. The troops were landed before Barcelona on the 27th of August. In three weeks there was nothing but dissensions amongst the great men of this expedition. The prince of Darmstadt and the earl of Peterborough had come to an open rupture. The Dutch officers said their troops should not join in an enterprise so manifestly impossible of success for a small force. Peterborough conceived a plan of attack totally opposed to all the routine modes of warfare. The citadel of Montjouich, built on the summit of a ridge of hills skirting the sea, commanded the town. Peterborough gave notice that he should raise the siege; sent his heavy artillery on board the ships; and made every preparation for embarking the troops. With 1,200 foot soldiers, and 200 horse, he marched out of the camp on the evening of the 13th of September, accompanied by the prince of Darmstadt, whom he had invited to join him. They marched all night by the side of the mountains; and before daybreak were under the hill of Montjouich, and close to the outer works. Peterborough told his officers that when they were discovered at daylight, the enemy would descend into the outer ditch to repel them, and that then was the time to receive their fire, leap in upon them, drive them into the outer works, and gain the fortress by following them close. The scheme succeeded, and the English were soon masters of the bastion. . . . The citadel held out for several days, but was finally reduced by a bombardment from the hills, the cannon having been relanded from the ships. The reduction of Montjouich by this extraordinary act of daring, was very soon followed by the surrender of Barcelona. . . . The possession of Barcelona, in which king Charles III. was proclaimed with great solemnity, was followed by the adhesion to his cause of the chief towns

of Catalonia. Peterborough was for following up his wonderful success by other daring operations. The German ministers and the Dutch officers opposed all his projects." He was able, notwithstanding, to raise the siege of San Mateo and to save Valencia from a threatened siege. "It was soon found that king Charles was incompetent to follow up the successes which Peterborough had accomplished for him."—C. Knight, *Crown Hist. of Eng., ch.* 38.—The above is substantially, in brief, the account of Peterborough's campaigns given by Mahon, Macaulay, and most of the later historians of the War of the Succession, who drew the narrative largely from a little book published in 1728, called the "Military Memoirs of Captain George Carleton." The story has been recently told, however, in a very different way and to a very different effect, by Colonel Arthur Parnell, who declines to accept the Carleton Memoirs as authentic history. Those Memoirs have been judged by some critics, indeed, to be a pure work of fiction and attributed to De Foe. They are included, in fact, in several editions of De Foe's works. Colonel Parnell, who seems to have investigated the matter thoroughly, recognizes Captain Carleton as a real personality, and concludes that he may have furnished some kind of a note-book or diary that was the substratum of these alleged Memoirs; but that somebody (he suspects Dean Swift), in the interest of Peterborough, built up on that groundwork a fabric of fiction which has most wrongfully become accepted history. According to Colonel Parnell, it was not Peterborough, but Prince George of Hesse Darmstadt (killed in the assault on Montjouich) and De Ruvigny, Earl of Galway, who were entitled to the credit of the successes for which Peterborough has been laurelled. "In order to extol a contemptible impostor, the memory of this great Huguenot general [Ruvigny] has been aspersed by Lord Macaulay and most English writers of the present century."—Col. A. Parnell, *The War of the Succession in Spain, pref.; ch.* 12–18; *and app. C.*

Also in: E. Warburton, *Memoir of Peterborough, ch.* 7–11 (*v.* 1).—F. S. Russell, *The Earl of Peterborough, v.* 1, *ch.* 7–9.

A. D. 1706.—The War of the Succession: Rapid changing of kings and courts at Madrid.—"The Courts of Madrid and Versailles, exasperated and alarmed by the fall of Barcelona, and by the revolt of the surrounding country, determined to make a great effort. A large army, nominally commanded by Philip, but really under the orders of Marshal Tessé, entered Catalonia. A fleet under the Count of Toulouse, one of the natural children of Lewis XIV., appeared before the port of Barcelona. The city was attacked at once by sea and land. The person of the Archduke was in considerable danger. Peterborough, at the head of about 3,000 men, marched with great rapidity from Valencia. To give battle, with so small a force, to a great regular army under the conduct of a Marshal of France, would have been madness. . . . His commission from the British government gave him supreme power, not only over the army, but, whenever he should be actually on board, over the navy also. He put out to sea at night in an open boat, without communicating his design to any person. He was picked up, several leagues from the shore, by one of the ships of the English squadron. As soon as he was on board, he announced himself as first in command, and sent a pinnace with his orders to the Admiral. Had these orders been given a few hours earlier, it is probable that the whole French fleet would have been taken. As it was, the Count of Toulouse put out to sea. The port was open. The town was relieved. On the following night the enemy raised the siege and retreated to Roussillon. Peterborough returned to Valencia, a place which he preferred to every other in Spain; and Philip, who had been some weeks absent from his wife, could endure the misery of separation no longer, and flew to rejoin her at Madrid. At Madrid, however, it was impossible for him or for her to remain. The splendid success which Peterborough had obtained on the eastern coast of the Peninsula had inspired the sluggish Galway with emulation. He advanced into the heart of Spain. Berwick retreated. Alcantara, Ciuadad Rodrigo, and Salamanca fell, and the conquerors marched towards the capital. Philip was earnestly pressed by his advisers to remove the seat of government to Burgos. . . . In the mean time the invaders had entered Madrid in triumph, and had proclaimed the Archduke in the streets of the imperial city. Arragon, ever jealous of the Castilian ascendency, followed the example of Catalonia. Saragossa revolted without seeing an enemy. The governor whom Philip had set over Carthagena betrayed his trust, and surrendered to the Allies the best arsenal and the last ships which Spain possessed. . . . It seemed that the struggle had terminated in favour of the Archduke, and that nothing remained for Philip but a prompt flight into the dominions of his grandfather. So judged those who were ignorant of the character and habits of the Spanish people. There is no country in Europe which it is so easy to overrun as Spain; there is no country in Europe which it is more difficult to conquer. Nothing can be more contemptible than the regular military resistance which Spain offers to an invader; nothing more formidable than the energy which she puts forth when her regular military resistance has been beaten down. Her armies have long borne too much resemblance to mobs; but her mobs have had, in an unusual degree, the spirit of armies. . . . Castile, Leon, Andalusia, Estremadura, rose at once; every peasant procured a firelock or a pike; the Allies were masters only of the ground on which they trod. No soldier could wander a hundred yards from the main body of the invading army without imminent risk of being poinarded; the country through which the conquerors had passed to Madrid, and which, as they thought, they had subdued, was all in arms behind them. Their communications with Portugal were cut off. In the mean time, money began, for the first time, to flow rapidly into the treasury of the fugitive king. . . . While the Castilians were everywhere arming in the cause of Philip, the Allies were serving that cause as effectually by their mismanagement. Galway staid at Madrid, where his soldiers indulged in such boundless licentiousness that one half of them were in the hospitals. Charles remained dawdling in Catalonia. Peterborough had taken Requena, and wished to march from Valencia towards Madrid, and to effect a junction with Galway; but the Archduke refused his consent to the plan. The indignant general remained accordingly in his favourite city, on the beauti-

ful shores of the Mediterranean, reading Don Quixote, giving balls and suppers, trying in vain to get some good sport out of the Valencian bulls, and making love, not in vain, to the Valencian women. At length the Archduke advanced into Castile, and ordered Peterborough to join him. But it was too late. Berwick had already compelled Galway to evacuate Madrid; and, when the whole force of the Allies was collected at Quadalaxara, it was found to be decidedly inferior in numbers to that of the enemy. Peterborough formed a plan for regaining possession of the capital. His plan was rejected by Charles. The patience of the sensitive and vainglorious hero was worn out. He had none of that serenity of temper which enabled Marlborough to act in perfect harmony with Eugene, and to endure the vexatious interference of the Dutch deputies. He demanded permission to leave the army, Permission was readily granted; and he set out for Italy. . . . From that moment to the end of the campaign, the tide of fortune ran strong against the Austrian cause. Berwick had placed his army between the Allies and the frontiers of Portugal. They retreated on Valencia, and arrived in that province, leaving about 10,000 prisoners in the hands of the enemy."—Lord Macaulay, *Mahon's War of the Succession* (*Essays*).—In the Netherlands the Allies won the important victory of Ramillies, and in Italy, Prince Eugene inflicted a sore defeat on the French and rescued Turin.—See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1706–1707; and ITALY: A. D. 1701–1713.

ALSO IN: C. T. Wilson, *The Duke of Berwick, ch.* 5-6.—W. Coxe, *Memoirs of the Bourbon Kings of Spain, ch.* 14 (*v.* 1).

A. D. 1707.—The War of the Succession: The fortunes of the Bourbons retrieved at Almanza.—"The enemy [the Allies] began to move again in February. After some weeks of manœuvring on the confines of the kingdom of Valencia and of New Castile, April 25, Galway and Las Minas, wishing to anticipate the arrival of a reinforcement expected from France, attacked Berwick at Almanza. Singularly enough, the English were commanded by a French refugee (Ruvigni, Earl of Galway), and the French by a royal bastard of England [the Duke of Berwick, natural son of James II.]. The enemy numbered, it is said, 26,000 foot and 7,000 horse; the Franco-Castilians were somewhat inferior in infantry, somewhat superior in cavalry and artillery." The battle, decided by the cavalry, was disastrous to the Allies. "The English, Dutch and Portuguese infantry were cut to pieces: the Portuguese foot showed a courage less fortunate, but not less intrepid, than the Spanish cavalry. Another corps had fought with still greater fury,—the French refugees, commanded by Jean Cavalier, the renowned Camisard chieftain. They had engaged a French regiment, and the two corps had almost destroyed each other. Six battalions were surrounded and taken in a body. Thirteen other battalions, five English, five Dutch, and three Portuguese, retired, at evening, to a wooded hill; seeing themselves cut off from the mountains of Valencia, they surrendered themselves prisoners the next morning. Hochstadt [Blenheim] was fully avenged. Five thousand dead, nearly 10,000 prisoners, 24 cannon, 120 flags or standards, were purchased on the part of the conquerors by the loss of only about 2,000 men. Many Frenchmen, taken at Hochstadt or at Ramillies, and enrolled by force in the ranks of the enemies, were delivered by the victory. The Duke of Orleans reached the army the next day. . . . He marched with Berwick on Valencia, which surrendered, May 8, without striking a blow. The generals of the enemies, both wounded, retired with the wrecks of their armies towards the mouths of the Ebro. The whole kingdom of Valencia submitted, with the exception of three or four places. Berwick followed the enemy towards the mouth of the Ebro, whilst Orleans returned to meet a French corps that was coming by the way of Navarre, and with this corps entered Aragon. Nearly all Aragon yielded without resistance. Berwick joined Orleans by ascending the Ebro; they moved together on the Segre and began the blockade of Lerida, the bulwark of Catalonia." Lerida was taken by storm on the 12th of October, and "pillaged with immense booty. . . . The castle of Lerida surrendered, November 11. A great part of the Catalan mountaineers laid down their arms. . . . Fortune had favored the Franco-Castilians on the Portuguese frontier as in the States of Aragon; Ciudad-Rodrigo had been taken by assault, October 4, with the loss of more than 3,000 men on the side of the enemy. The news of Almanza had everywhere reanimated the hearts of the French armies."—H. Martin, *Hist. of France: Age of Louis XIV.* (*tr. by M. L. Booth*), *v.* 2, *ch.* 5.

ALSO IN: Col. A. Parnell, *The War of the Succession in Spain, ch.* 23-26.—C. T. Wilson, *The Duke of Berwick, ch.* 7.

A. D. 1707-1710.—The War of the Succession: Bourbon reverses and final triumph.—"In less than a month after the victory of Almanza, the Bourbon troops had recovered all Arragon, with Valencia and Murcia, excepting the ports of Denia and Alicant; but the war still continued in Catalonia, where General Stanhope now filled the double office of ambassador to Charles and general of the English forces, and prince Staremberg was sent by the emperor Joseph to take the command of the Austrian troops. The Spanish government was reduced to still greater pecuniary distress than it had suffered before, by the success of the English squadron off Carthagena, under the command of Sir Charles Wager, which took three of the great galleons and dispersed fourteen, which were expected to furnish an unusual supply of the precious metals from America. After a short siege of Port Mahon, General Stanhope took possession of Minorca and Majorca [A. D. 1708]; the count of Cifuentes gained Sardinia; and all the efforts, spirit, and talents of the duke of Orleans were insufficient to make the slightest impression in Catalonia. He consequently complained, in his letters to Versailles, that his operations were thwarted or retarded by the intrigues of the Princess Orsini and the ambassador Amelot. He was accused in return, and that not without reason, of forming designs on the crown of Spain, and corresponding with the enemies of Philip on the subject. The fortunes of France and Spain still continued to decline, and Louis felt that peace was the only measure which could stop the progress of that ruin which menaced the house of Bourbon. Conferences were accordingly opened at the Hague, and Louis pretended that he was willing to give up the interest of Philip; at the same time his

grandson himself protested that he would never quit Spain, or yield his title to its crown. . . . The disastrous campaign of 1710 rendered Louis more desirous than ever of obtaining peace, and though his professions of abandoning his grandson were insincere, he certainly would not have scrupled to sacrifice the Spanish Netherlands and the American commerce to Holland, as the price of an advantageous peace to France. Meantime the Austrians had gained the victories of Almenara and Zaragoza, and had once more driven the Spanish court from Madrid. This time it fled to Valladolid, and the king and queen talked of taking refuge in America, and re-establishing the empire of Mexico or Peru, rather than abandon their throne. But the Castilians once more roused themselves to defend the king; the duke of Vendome's arrival supplied their greatest want, that of a skilful general; and the imprudence of the allies facilitated the recovery of the capital. The disasters of the allies began with their retreat; Staremburg, after a doubtful though bloody battle [Villa Viciosa, December 10, 1710], at the end of which he was victor, was yet obliged to retire with the disadvantages of defeat; and Stanhope, with a small body of English, after a desperate resistance [at Brihuega, December 9, 1710], was taken prisoner."—M. Callcott, *Short Hist. of Spain, ch.* 22 (*v.* 2).—"As the result of the actions at Brihuega and Villa Viciosa and the subsequent retreat, the Austrians lost 3,600 killed or wounded, and 3,936 prisoners, or a total of 7,536 men; whilst the Bourbon casualties were 6,700 placed hors-de-combat, and 100 captured, or in all 6,800 men. These operations constituted a decisive victory for Vendôme, who thus, in less than four months after the battle of Saragossa, had re-established King Philip and the Bourbon cause."—Col. A. Parnell, *The War of the Succession in Spain, ch.* 27–34.

Also in: W. Coxe, *Memoirs of the Bourbon Kings of Spain, ch.* 15–18 (*v.* 1–2).—Lord Mahon (Earl Stanhope), *Hist. of the War of Succession in Spain, ch.* 6–8.

A. D. 1711.—The Austrian claimant of the throne becomes Emperor. See Austria: A. D. 1711.

A. D. 1713-1714.—The betrayal of the Catalans.—"Alone among the Spaniards the Catalans had real reason to regret the peace. They had clung to the cause of Charles with a desperate fidelity, and the Peace of Utrecht rang the death-knell of provincial liberties to which they were passionately attached. From the beginning of 1705 they had been the steady and faithful allies of England; they had again and again done eminent service in her cause; they had again and again received from her ministers and generals the most solemn assurances that they would never be abandoned. When England first opened a separate negotiation for peace she might easily have secured the Catalonian liberties by making their recognition an indispensable preliminary of peace; but, instead of this, the English ministers began by recognising the title of Philip, and contented themselves with a simple prayer that a general amnesty might be granted. When the convention was signed for the evacuation of Catalonia by the Imperial troops, the question of the provincial liberties was referred to the definite peace, the Queen and the French King promising at that time to interpose their good offices to secure them. The Emperor, who was bound to the Catalans by the strongest ties of gratitude and honour, could have easily obtained a guarantee of their fueros at the price of an acknowledgment of the title of Philip; but he was too proud and too selfish for such a sacrifice. The English, it is true, repeatedly urged the Spanish King to guarantee these privileges, . . . but these were mere representations, supported by no action, and were therefore peremptorily refused. The English peace with Spain contained a clause granting the Catalans a general armistice, and also a promise that they should be placed in the same position as the Castilians, which gave them the right of holding employments and carrying on a direct trade with the West Indies, but it made no mention of their provincial privileges. The Peace of Rastadt was equally silent, for the dignity of the Emperor would not suffer him to enter into any negotiations with Philip. The unhappy people, abandoned by those whom they had so faithfully served, refused to accept the position offered them by treaty, and, much to the indignation of the English Government, they still continued in arms, struggling with a desperate courage against overwhelming odds. The King of Spain then called upon the Queen, as a guarantee of the treaty of evacuation, 'to order a squadron of her ships to reduce his subjects to their obedience, and thereby complete the tranquillity of Spain and of the Mediterranean commerce.' A fleet was actually despatched, which would probably have been employed against Barcelona, but for an urgent address of the House of Lords, and the whole moral weight of England was thrown into the scale against the insurgents. The conduct of the French was more decided. Though the French King had engaged himself with the Queen by the treaty of evacuation to use his good offices in the most effectual manner in favour of the Catalan liberties, he now sent an army to hasten the capture of Barcelona. The blockade of that noble city lasted for more than a year. The insurgents hung up over the high altar the Queen's solemn declaration to protect them. They continued the hopeless struggle till 14,000 bombs had been thrown into the city; till a great part of it had been reduced to ashes; till seven breaches had been made; till 10,000 of the besieging army had been killed or wounded; and till famine had been added to the horrors of war. At last, on September 11, 1714, Barcelona was taken by storm. A frightful massacre took place in the streets. Many of the inhabitants were afterwards imprisoned or transported, and the old privileges of Catalonia were finally abolished. Such was the last scene of this disastrous war."—W. E. H. Lecky, *Hist. of Eng., 18th century, ch.* 1 (*v.* 1).

Also in: Lord Mahon (Earl Stanhope), *Hist. of Eng.*, 1713–1783, *ch.* 3 (*v.* 1).—C. T. Wilson, *The Duke of Berwick, ch.* 21.

A. D. 1713-1725.—Continued war with the Emperor.—The Triple Alliance.—The Quadruple Alliance.—The Peace of Vienna.—The Alliance of Hanover.—"The treaty of Utrecht, although it had tranquilized a great part of Europe, was nevertheless defective, in as far as it had not reconciled the Emperor and the King of Spain, the two principal claimants to the Spanish succession. The Emperor Charles VI. did not recognize Philip V. in his quality of

King of Spain; and Philip, in his turn [instigated by his queen, Elizabeth Farnese—see ITALY: A. D. 1715–1735] refused to acquiesce in those partitions of the Spanish monarchy which the treaty of Utrecht had stipulated in favour of the Emperor. To defeat the projects and secret intrigues of the Spanish minister [Cardinal Alberoni], the Duke of Orleans [Regent of France], thought of courting an alliance with England, as being the power most particularly interested in maintaining the treaty of Utrecht, the fundamental articles of which had been dictated by herself. That alliance, into which the United Provinces also entered, was concluded at the Hague (January 4th, 1717). . . . Cardinal Alberoni, without being in the least disconcerted by the Triple Alliance, persisted in his design of recommencing the war. No sooner had he recruited the Spanish forces, and equipped an expedition, than he attacked Sardinia [1717], which he took from the Emperor. This conquest was followed by that of Sicily, which the Spaniards took from the Duke of Savoy (1718). France and England, indignant at the infraction of a treaty which they regarded as their own work, immediately concluded with the Emperor, at London (August 2nd, 1718) the famous Quadruple Alliance, which contained the plan of a treaty of peace, to be made between the Emperor, the King of Spain, and the Duke of Savoy. The allied powers engaged to obtain the consent of the parties interested in this proposal, and, in case of refusal, to compel them by force of arms. The Emperor was to renounce his right to the Spanish crown, and to acknowledge Philip V. as the legitimate King of Spain, in consideration of that prince renouncing the provinces of Italy and the Netherlands, which the treaty of Utrecht and the quadruple alliance adjudged to the Emperor. The Duke of Savoy was to cede Sicily to Austria, receiving Sardinia in exchange, which the King of Spain was to disclaim. The right of reversion to the crown of Spain was transferred from Sicily to Sardinia. That treaty likewise granted to Don Carlos, eldest son of Philip V., by his second marriage, the eventual reversion and investiture of the duchies of Parma and Placentia, as well as the grand duchy of Tuscany, on condition of holding them as fiefs-male of the Emperor and the Empire after the decease of the last male issue of the families of Farnese and Medici, who were then in possession. . . . The Duke of Savoy did not hesitate to subscribe the conditions of the quadruple alliance; but it was otherwise with the King of Spain, who persisted in his refusal; when France and England declared war against him. The French invaded the provinces of Guipuscoa and Catalonia [under Berwick, A. D. 1719], while the English seized Gallicia and the port of Vigo. These vigorous proceedings shook the resolutions of the King of Spain. He signed the quadruple alliance, and banished the Cardinal Alberoni from his court, the adviser of those measures of which the allies complained. The Spanish troops then evacuated Sicily and Sardinia, when the Emperor took possession of the former and Victor Amadeus, Duke of Savoy, of the latter. The war to all appearance was at an end." But fresh difficulties arose, one following another. The reversion of Tuscany, Parma, and Placentia, promised to the Infant of Spain, was stoutly opposed in Italy. The Emperor provoked commercial jealousies in England and Holland by chartering a Company of Ostend (1722) with exclusive privileges of trading to the East and West Indies and the coasts of Africa. An attempted congress at Cambrai was long retarded and finally broken up. Meantime the French court gave mortal offense to the King of Spain by sending home his daughter, who had been the intended bride of the young King Louis XV., and marrying the latter to a Polish princess. The final result was to draw the Emperor and the King of Spain—the two original enemies in the embroilment—together, and a treaty between them was concluded at Vienna, April 30, 1725. "This treaty renewed the renunciation of Philip V. to the provinces of Italy and the Netherlands, as well as that of the Emperor to Spain and the Indies. The eventual investiture of the duchies of Parma and Placentia, and that of the grand duchy of Tuscany, were also confirmed. The only new clause contained in the treaty was that by which the King of Spain undertook to guarantee the famous Pragmatic Sanction of Charles VI., which secured to the daughter of that prince the succession of all his estates. It was chiefly on this account that Philip V. became reconciled to the court of Vienna. The peace of Vienna was accompanied by a defensive alliance between the Emperor and the King of Spain." The terms of the alliance were such as to alarm England for the security of her hold on Gibraltar and Minorca, and Holland for her commerce, besides giving uneasiness to France. By the action of the latter, a league was set on foot "capable of counteracting that of Vienna, which was concluded at Herrenhausen, near Hanover, (September 3, 1725) and is known by the name of the Alliance of Hanover. All Europe was divided between these two alliances."—C. W. Koch, *The Revolutions of Europe, period* 8.

ALSO IN: Lord Mahon (Earl Stanhope), *Hist. of Eng.*, 1713–1783, *v.* 1, *ch.* 7–10.—G. P. R. James, *Eminent Foreign Statesmen, v.* 4: *Alberoni.*—W. Coxe, *Memoirs of the Bourbon Kings of Spain, ch.* 22–30.—E. Armstrong, *Elisabeth Farnese, "The Termagant of Spain," ch.* 2–10.

A. D. 1714.—The Peace of Utrecht. See UTRECHT: A. D. 1712–1714; and SLAVERY, NEGRO: A. D. 1698–1776.

A. D. 1725-1740.—The Austrian Succession.—Guarantee of the Pragmatic Sanction. See AUSTRIA: A. D. 1718–1738; and 1740.

A. D. 1726-1731.—Fresh quarrels with England.—Siege of Gibraltar.—Treaty of Seville.—Second Treaty of Vienna.—Acquisition of the Italian Duchies.—"All Europe became divided between the alliances of Vienna and Hanover; and though both sides pretended that these treaties were only defensive, yet each made extensive preparations for war. George I. entered into a treaty with the Landgrave of Hesse Cassel for the supply of 12,000 men; manifests were published, ambassadors withdrawn, armies put on foot; the sea was covered with English fleets; an English squadron under Admiral Hosier annoyed the trade of Spain; and in Feb. 1727, the Spaniards laid siege to Gibraltar, and seized at Vera Cruz a richly laden merchant vessel belonging to the English South Sea Company. But all these vast preparations led to no results of importance. Of all the European Powers, Spain alone had any real desire for war. . . . The pre-

liminaries of a general pacification were signed at Paris, May 31st 1727, by the ministers of the Emperor, France, Great Britain, and Holland, and a Congress was appointed to assemble at Aix-la-Chapelle to arrange a definitive peace. But Spain still held aloof and sought every opportunity to temporise. The hopes of Philip being again awakened by the death of George I. in July 1727, he renewed his intrigues with the Jacobites, and instigated the Pretender to proceed to a port in the Low Countries, and to seize an opportunity to pass over into England. But these unfounded expectations were soon dispelled by the quiet accession of George II. to the throne and policy of his father. . . . The Spanish Queen [Elizabeth Farnese], however, still held out; till, alarmed by the dangerous state of Philip's health, whose death might frustrate her favourite scheme of obtaining the Italian duchies, and leave her a mere cypher without any political influence, she induced her husband to accept the preliminaries by the Act of the Pardo, March 6th 1728. A congress was now opened at Soissons, to which place it had been transferred for the convenience of Fleury [French minister], who was bishop of that diocese. But though little remained to be arranged except the satisfaction of Spain in the matter of the Italian duchies, the negociations were tedious and protracted." In the end they "became a mere farce, and the various plenipotentiaries gradually withdrew from the Congress. Meanwhile the birth of a Dauphin (Sept. 4th 1729) having dissipated the hopes of Philip V. and his Queen as to the French succession, Elizabeth devoted herself all the more warmly to the prosecution of her Italian schemes; and finding all her efforts to separate France and England unavailing, she at length determined to accept what they offered. . . . She persuaded Philip to enter into a separate treaty with France and England, which was concluded at Seville, Nov. 9th 1729. England and Spain arranged their commercial and other differences; the succession of Don Carlos to the Italian duchies was guaranteed; and it was agreed that Leghorn, Porto Ferrajo, Parma, and Piacenza should be garrisoned by 6,000 Spaniards, who, however, were not to interfere with the civil government. Nothing more was said about Gibraltar. Philip, indeed, seemed now to have abandoned all hope of recovering that fortress; for he soon afterwards caused to be constructed across the isthmus the strong lines of San Roque, and thus completely isolated Gibraltar from his Spanish dominions. The Dutch acceded to the Treaty of Seville shortly after its execution, on the understanding that they should receive entire satisfaction respecting the India Company established by the Emperor at Ostend. Charles VI. was indignant at being thus treated by Spain. . . . On the death of Antonio Farnese, Duke of Parma, January 10th 1731, he took military possession of that state. . . . The versatility of the cabinets of that age, however, enabled the Emperor to attain his favourite object at a moment when he least expected it. The Queen of Spain, wearied with the slowness of Cardinal Fleury in carrying out the provisions of the Treaty of Seville, suddenly declared, in a fit of passion, that Spain was no longer bound by that treaty (January 1731). Great Britain and the Dutch States, in concert with the Spanish Court, without the concurrence of France, now entered into negociations with the Emperor, which were skilfully conducted by Lord Waldegrave, to induce him to accede to the Treaty of Seville; and, on March 16th 1731, was concluded what has been called the Second Treaty of Vienna. Great Britain and the States guaranteed the Pragmatic Sanction; and the Emperor, on his side, acceded to the provisions of Seville respecting the Italian duchies, and agreed to annihilate the commerce of the Austrian Netherlands with the Indies by abolishing the obnoxious Ostend Company. He also engaged not to bestow his daughter on a Bourbon prince, or in any other way that might endanger the balance of power in Europe. . . . In the following November an English squadron disembarked at Leghorn 6,000 Spaniards, who took possession of that place, as well as Porto Ferrajo, Parma, and Piacenza, in the name of Don Carlos, as Duke of Parma and presumptive heir of Tuscany."—T. H. Dyer, *Hist. of Modern Europe, bk.* 6, *ch.* 1 (*v.* 3).

Also in: Lord Mahon (Earl Stanhope), *Hist. of Eng.*, 1713–1783, *ch.* 14–15 (*v.* 2).—W. Coxe, *Hist. of the House of Austria, ch.* 88 (*v.* 3).—W. Coxe, *Memoirs of the Bourbon Kings of Spain, ch.* 36–40 (*v.* 3).—E. Armstrong, *Elisabeth Farnese, "The Termagant of Spain," ch.* 11–14.

A. D. 1733.— The First Bourbon Family Compact (France and Spain). See France: A. D. 1733.

A. D. 1734-1735.— Acquisition of Naples and Sicily, as a kingdom for Don Carlos. See France: A. D. 1733–1735.

A. D. 1739.— Outbreak of hostilities with England.— The War of Jenkins' Ear. See England: A. D. 1739–1741.

A. D. 1740. — Unsuccessful attack of the English on Florida. See Georgia: A. D. 1738–1743.

A. D. 1740-1741.—Beginning of the War of the Austrian Succession. See Austria: A. D. 1740–1741.

A. D. 1741-1747.—The War of the Austrian Succession: Operations in Italy. See Italy: A. D. 1741–1743, to 1746–1747.

A. D. 1743.—The Second Family Compact of the Bourbon kings.— Arrangements concerning Italy. See France: A. D. 1743 (October).

A. D. 1746.—Accession of Ferdinand VI.

A. D. 1748.—Termination and results of the War of the Austrian Succession. See Aix-la-Chapelle, The Congress.

A. D. 1759.—Accession of Charles III.

A. D. 1761-1762.—The Third Family Compact of the Bourbon kings.—England declares War. See France: A. D. 1761 (August).

A. D. 1762-1763.—Havana lost and recovered. See Cuba: A. D. 1514–1851.

A. D. 1763.—End and results of the Seven Years War.—Florida ceded to Great Britain. —Louisiana acquired from France. See Seven Years War: The Treaties.

A. D. 1766-1769.—Occupation of Louisiana. —The revolt of New Orleans and its suppression. See Louisiana: A. D. 1766–1768; and 1769.

A. D. 1767.—Suppression of the order of the Jesuits. See Jesuits: A. D. 1761–1769.

A. D. 1779-1781. — Reconquest of West Florida. See Florida: A. D. 1779–1781.

A. D. 1779-1782. — The unsuccessful siege of Gibraltar. See England: A. D. 1780–1782.

A. D. 1782.—Aims and interests in the settlement of peace between Great Britain and the United States. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1782 (SEPTEMBER—NOVEMBER).

A. D. 1783-1800.—The question of Florida boundaries and of the navigation of the Mississippi, in dispute with the United States. See FLORIDA: A. D. 1783–1787; and LOUISIANA: A. D. 1785–1800.

A. D. 1788.—Accession of Charles IV.

A. D. 1791-1793.—The Coalition against revolutionary France. See FRANCE: A. D. 1790–1791; 1791 (JULY—SEPTEMBER); and 1793 (MARCH—SEPTEMBER).

A. D. 1793.—Successes on the French frontier. See FRANCE: A. D. 1793 (JULY—DECEMBER) PROGRESS OF THE WAR.

A. D. 1794.—French successes in the Pyrenees. See FRANCE: A. D. 1794–1795 (OCTOBER—MAY).

A. D. 1795.—Peace and alliance with the French Republic.—Cession of Spanish San Domingo. See FRANCE: A. D. 1795 (JUNE—DECEMBER).

A. D. 1797.—Naval defeat by the English off Cape St. Vincent. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1797.

A. D. 1797.—Cession of western part of Hayti, or San Domingo, to France. See HAYTI: A. D. 1632–1803.

A. D. 1801.—Re-cession of Louisiana to France. See LOUISIANA: A. D. 1798–1803.

A. D. 1802.—The Peace of Amiens.—Recovery of Minorca and Port Mahon. See FRANCE: A. D. 1801–1802.

A. D. 1805.—The naval defeat at Trafalgar. See FRANCE: A. D. 1805 (MARCH—DECEMBER).

A. D. 1807-1808.—Napoleon's plots for the theft of the Spanish crown.—The popular rising.—Accession of Ferdinand VII.—"For more than ten years Spain had been drawn in the wake of revolutionary France. To Napoleon from the beginning of his reign she had been as subservient as Holland or Switzerland; she had made war and peace at his bidding, had surrendered Trinidad to make the treaty of Amiens, had given her fleet to destruction at Trafalgar. In other states equally subservient, such as Holland and the Italian Republic, Napoleon had remodelled the government at his pleasure, and in the end had put his own family at the head of it. After Tilsit he thought himself strong enough to make a similar change in Spain, and the occupation of Portugal seemed to afford the opportunity of doing this. By two conventions signed at Fontainebleau on October 27 [see PORTUGAL: A. D. 1807], the partition of Portugal was arranged with Spain. The Prince of the Peace was to become a sovereign prince of the Algarves, the King of Spain was to have Brazil with the title of Emperor of the two Americas, &c.; but the main provision was that a French army was to stand on the threshold of Spain ready to resist any intervention of England. The occupation of Portugal took place soon after, Junot arriving at Lisbon on November 30, just as the royal family with a following of several thousands set sail for Brazil under protection of the English fleet. At the same time there commenced in defiance of all treaties a passage of French troops into Spain, which continued until 80,000 had arrived, and had taken quiet possession of a number of Spanish fortresses. At last Murat was appointed to the command of the army of Spain. He entered the country on March 1, 1808, and marched on Madrid, calculating that the king would retire and take refuge at Seville or Cadiz. This act revealed to the world, and even to a large party among the French themselves, the nature of the power which had been created at Tilsit. The lawless acts of Napoleon's earlier life were palliated by the name of the French Revolution, and since Brumaire he had established a character for comparative moderation. But here was naked violence without the excuse of fanaticism; and on what a scale! One of the greater states of Europe was in the hands of a burglar, who would moreover, if successful, become king not only of Spain but of a boundless empire in the New World. The sequel was worse even than this commencement, although the course which events took seems to show that by means of a little delay he might have attained his end without such open defiance of law. The administration of Spain had long been in the contemptible hands of Manuel Godoy, supposed to be the queen's lover, yet at the same time high in the favor of King Charles IV. Ferdinand, the heir apparent, headed an opposition, but in character he was not better than the trio he opposed, and he had lately been put under arrest on suspicion of designs upon his father's life. To have fomented this opposition without taking either side, and to have rendered both sides equally contemptible to the Spanish people, was Napoleon's game. The Spanish people, who profoundly admired him, might then have been induced to ask him for a king. Napoleon, however, perpetrated his crime before the scandal of the palace broke out. The march of Murat now brought it to a head. On March 17 a tumult broke out at Aranjuez, which led to the fall of the favourite, and then to the abdication of the king, and the proclamation of Ferdinand amid universal truly Spanish enthusiasm. It was a fatal mistake to have forced on this popular explosion, and Napoleon has characteristically tried to conceal it by a supposititious letter, dated March 29, in which he tries to throw the blame upon Murat, to whom the letter professes to be addressed. It warns Murat against rousing Spanish patriotism and creating an opposition of the nobles and clergy, which will lead to a 'levée en masse,' and to a war without end. It predicts, in short, all that took place, but it has every mark of invention, and was certainly never received by Murat. The reign of Ferdinand having thus begun, all that the French could do was to abstain from acknowledging him, and to encourage Charles to withdraw his abdication as given under duress. By this means it became doubtful who was king of Spain, and Napoleon, having carefully refrained from taking a side, now presented himself as arbiter. Ferdinand was induced to betake himself to Napoleon's presence at Bayonne, where he arrived on April 21; his father and mother followed on the 30th. Violent scenes took place between father and son: news arrived of an insurrection at Madrid and of the stern suppression of it by Murat. In the end Napoleon succeeded in extorting the abdication both of Charles and Ferdinand. It was learned too late that the insurrection of Spain had not really been suppressed. This crime, as clumsy as it was monstrous, brought on that great popu-

lar insurrection of Europe against the universal monarchy, which has profoundly modified all subsequent history, and makes the Anti-Napoleonic Revolution an event of the same order as the French Revolution. A rising unparalleled for its suddenness and sublime spontaneousness took place throughout Spain and speedily found a response in Germany. A new impulse was given, out of which grew the great nationality movement of the nineteenth century." —J. R. Seeley, *Short Hist. of Napoleon I., ch.* 5, *sect.* 1.

Also in: Sir A. Alison, *Hist. of Europe*, 1800–1815, *ch.* 52 (*v.* 11).—R. Southey, *Hist. of the Peninsular War, ch.* 2–5 (*v.* 1).—M. de Bourrienne, *Private Memoirs of Napoleon, v.* 3, *ch.* 32.—P. Lanfrey, *Hist. of Napoleon, v.* 3, *ch.* 4 *and* 6–8.

A. D. 1808 (May—September).—The stolen crown conferred on Joseph Bonaparte.—National revolt.—Organization of Juntas and planning of guerilla war.—French reverses.—Quick flight of Joseph Bonaparte from Madrid.—Arrival of English forces to aid the people.— "Murat was disappointed of the crown of Spain, on which he had fixed his hopes. It had been refused with surprise and indignation by Napoleon's brother Louis, who wore reluctantly even that of Holland, but was unwilling to exchange it for a still deeper royal servitude. Joseph Bonaparte, however, consented to abandon his more tranquil throne of Naples for the dangers and discontents which surrounded that of Spain. Napoleon, who had nominated him to it June 6th, was desirous of procuring at least the apparent consent of the Spanish nation. The Council of Castile, the chief political body of Spain, when informed of the Treaties of Bayonne, was at last induced to give a cold and reluctant assent to the accession of Joseph. Its example was followed by the Supreme Junta and the municipality of Madrid. There was, indeed, no alternative but war. Ferdinand displayed on the occasion all the baseness of his soul in its true colours. He not only wrote to Napoleon to express his satisfaction at the elevation of Joseph, he even addressed a letter of congratulation to the man who had usurped his crown! thus testifying under his own hand his utter unworthiness to wear it. A Junta of 150 Spanish notables, which had been summoned to Bayonne, accepted a constitution proposed by Napoleon, July 7th, and a day or two after Joseph left Bayonne for Madrid. He had signed on the 5th a treaty with his brother Napoleon, by which he renounced the crown of Naples, made, as King of Spain, a perpetual offensive alliance with France, fixed the number of troops and ships to be provided by each nation, and agreed to the establishment of a commercial system. By an act called Constitutional Statute, July 15th, the vacant throne of Naples was bestowed upon Joachim Murat. Ferdinand had found means to despatch from Bayonne a proclamation addressed to the Asturians, and dated May 8th, in which he called upon them to assert their independence and never to submit to the perfidious enemy who had deprived him of his rights. This letter naturally made a great impression on a proud and sensitive people; nor was its effect diminished by another proclamation which Ferdinand and his brothers were compelled to sign at Bordeaux, May 12th, calling upon the Spaniards not to oppose 'the beneficent views' of Napoleon. At this last address, evidently extorted from a prisoner, a general cry of indignation arose in Spain; the people everywhere flew to arms, except where prevented by the presence of French troops. The city of Valencia renounced its obedience to the Government of Madrid, May 23rd; Seville followed its example, and on the 27th, Joseph Palafox organised at Saragossa the insurrection of Aragon. As these insurrections were accompanied with frightful massacres, principally of persons who had held high civil or military posts under Charles IV., the better classes, to put an end to these horrible scenes, established central Juntas in the principal towns. . . . They proposed not to meet the enemy in pitched battles in the open field, but to harass, wear out, and overcome him by 'guerilla,' or the discursive and incessant attacks of separate small bands. The Supreme Junta issued instructions for conducting this mode of warfare. Andalusia was better fitted for organising the revolt, if such it can be called, than any other province of Spain. Its population formed one-fifth of the whole nation, it possessed the sole cannon-foundry in the kingdom, it contained half the disposable Spanish army, and it could receive assistance from the English both by means of Gibraltar and of Collingwood's fleet that was cruising on the coast. One of the first feats of arms of the Spaniards was to compel the surrender of five French ships of the line and a frigate, which had remained in the port of Cadiz ever since the battle of Trafalgar (June 14th). Marshal Moncey was repulsed towards the end of June in an advance upon Valencia, and compelled to retreat upon Madrid with a loss of one-third of his men. In the north-west the Spaniards were less fortunate. Cuesta, with a corps of 25,000 men, was defeated by Marshal Bessières, July 14th, at Medina del Rio Seco. The consequence of this victory was the temporary submission of Leon, Palencia, Valladolid, Zamora, and Salamanca to the French. But this misfortune was more than counterbalanced by the victory of General Castaños over the French in Andalusia, a few days after. Generals Dupont and Vedel had advanced into that province as far as Cordova, but they were defeated by Castaños with the army of Andalusia at Baylen, July 20th. On this occasion, the commencement of the French reverses in Spain, 18,000 French soldiers laid down their arms. Joseph Bonaparte found it prudent to leave Madrid, August 1st, which he had only entered on the day of the battle, and fly to Burgos. This important victory not only inspired the Spaniards with confidence, but also caused them to be regarded in Europe as a substantive Power. On the day after the battle Castaños issued a proclamation which does him great honour. He invoked the Spaniards to show humanity towards the French prisoners of war, and threatened to shoot those who should maltreat them. Such, however, was the exasperation of the people against their invaders, that numbers of the French were massacred on their route to Cadiz for embarkation, and the remainder were treated with barbarous inhumanity. These cruelties had, however, been provoked by the atrocities of the French at the capture and sack of Cordova. The campaign in Aragon was still more glorious for the Spaniards. Palafox, whether or not he was the poltroon described by Napier, had at all events the merit of organising, out of almost

nothing, the means by which the French were repulsed in several desperate assaults upon Saragossa, and at length compelled to retreat after a siege of some weeks (August 14th). The patriot cause was soon after strengthened by the arrival at Corunna of General La Romana, with 7,000 of his men from Denmark (Sept. 20th). Keats, the English admiral in the Baltic, had informed him of the rising of his countrymen and provided him the means to transport his troops from Nyborg. The English Government, soon after the breaking out of the insurrection, had proclaimed a peace with the Spanish nation (July 4th 1808), and had prepared to assist them in their heroic struggle. The example of Spain had also encouraged the Portuguese to throw off the insufferable yoke of the French. A Junta was established at Oporto, June 6th, and an insurrection was organised in all parts of the kingdom where the French forces were not predominant. Sir Arthur Wellesley, with about 10,000 British troops, landed at Mondego Bay, July 31st."—T. H. Dyer, *Hist. of Modern Europe, bk.* 7, *ch.* 14 (*v.* 4).

Also in: T. Hamilton, *Annals of the Peninsular Campaigns, v.* 1, *ch.* 4–10.—Baron Jomini, *Life of Napoleon, ch.* 12 (*v.* 2).—Gen. Foy, *Hist. of the War in the Peninsula, v.* 2, *pt.* 1.—Count Miot de Melito, *Memoirs, ch.* 23–28.

A. D. 1808 (September—December).—Napoleon's overwhelming campaign against the Spanish armies.—Joseph reinstated at Madrid.—"The French disasters in the Peninsula shook the belief in Napoleon's invincibility which had prevailed throughout the Continent, and the Emperor saw that he must crush the Spaniards at once, before the English could advance from the fortified base they had acquired on the flank of the Spanish plains. To secure his power on the side of Germany, he had a prolonged interview with the Czar at Erfurt. . . . On the 14th October the two Emperors parted; and at the end of the month Napoleon set out from Paris for Bayonne, and continued his journey to Vitoria. In September the French had evacuated Tudela and Burgos, and had been driven from Bilbao by General Joachim Blake [a Spanish officer of Irish descent]. But such vast reinforcements had been poured across the Pyrenees, that the French armies in Spain now numbered 250,000 men, and of these 180,000 were drawn up behind the Ebro. On the last day of October Lefevre re-took Bilbao; and Blake, after a defeat at Tornosa, fell back upon Espinosa, where Napoleon, upon his arrival, directed Marshal Victor . . . and Lefevre to assail him with 40,000 men. The Spaniards, though numbering only 25,000, held their ground till the morning of the second day's fighting (11th November). With one part of the fugitives Blake made a stand at Reynosa on the 13th against Marshal Soult, who had achieved a victory over Belvedere at Burgos on the 10th; but they were again broken, and fled to the mountains of the Cantabrian chain. With the other part of the fugitives, about 10,000, the Marquis of La Romana made his way into Leon. Castaños and Palafox had a united force of 43,000 men and 40 guns; but they were wrangling over their plans when Marshal Lannes, the intrepid Duke of Montebello, . . . appeared with 35,000 men, and broke their centre at Tudela. But on the Spanish left, the troops who had conquered at Baylen not only maintained their ground with obstinacy, but drove back the French. At length they were outnumbered, and Castaños fell back in admirable order upon Madrid through Calatayud. The right, under Palafox, retired in disorder to Saragossa; and now the road to Madrid was blocked only by General San Juan with 12,000 men, who had entrenched the Somo Sierra Pass. But this post also was carried on the 30th November by the Polish lancers of the Imperial Guard, who rode up and speared the artillerymen at their guns. Aranjuez was at once abandoned by the central Junta, and on the 2nd December the French vanguard appeared on the heights north of Madrid. The capital became at once a scene of tumult and confusion: barricades were erected, and the bells sounded the alarm, but no discipline was visible in the assembling bands; and when the heights of the Retiro, overlooking the city, were carried by the French on the morning of the 3rd December, the authorities sent out to arrange a surrender. On the following morning . . . the French entered the city, Joseph was again installed in the palace, where deputations waited upon him to congratulate him and renew their professions of devoted attachment, and the city settled down once more to tranquil submission to the foreigner."—H. R. Clinton, *The War in the Peninsula, ch.* 3.

Also in: Gen. Vane (Marquis of Londonderry), *Story of the Peninsular War, ch.* 8.

A. D. 1808-1809 (August—January).—Wellington's first campaign.—Convention of Cintra.—Evacuation of Portugal by the French.—Napoleon in the field.—Sir John Moore's advance into Spain.—His retreat.—His repulse of Soult at Corunna.—His death.—"Sir Arthur Wellesley's division comprised 9,000 men. Another corps, under sir John Moore, which had just arrived from the Baltic, numbered 11,000 men. These two detachments were to co-operate. But their united efforts were to be directed by sir Hew Dalrymple and sir Harry Burrard, two generals whose exploits were better known in the private records of the Horse Guards than in the annals of their country. . . . Sir Arthur Wellesley landed his troops at Figuiera, a difficult task on an iron coast. On the 7th of August, major-general Spencer's corps joined the army. With 10,000 British and 5,000 Portuguese, sir Arthur Wellesley then prepared to march towards Lisbon. On the 17th he defeated at Roliça the French under Laborde. On the 20th he was at Vimiero, having been joined by general Anstruther and general Acland with their corps. He had now an army of 17,000 men. Junot had joined Laborde and Loison at Torres Vedras, and their united force was about 14,000 men, of whom 1,600 were cavalry. Early in the morning of the 21st, the French attacked the British in their position. Sir Harry Burrard had arrived on the night of the 20th, but did not land. The principal attack on the British was on the centre and left; the sea being in their rear. The attack was repulsed. Kellermann then attacked with the French reserve, and he also was driven back. Junot's left wing and centre were discomfited. The road of Torres Vedras, the shortest road to Lisbon, was uncovered. When the action was nearly over, sir Harry Burrard had landed. In a private letter, sir Arthur Wellesley wrote, 'The French got a terrible beating on the 21st. They

did not lose less, I believe, than 4,000 men, and they would have been entirely destroyed, if sir H. Burrard had not prevented me from pursuing them. Indeed, since the arrival of the great generals, we appear to have been palsied, and everything has gone on wrong.' Sir John Moore arrived with his corps on the 21st, and his troops were nearly all landed when hostilities were suspended by the Convention of Cintra for the evacuation of Portugal by the French. Sir Arthur writes to Lord Castlereagh, 'Although my name is affixed to this instrument, I beg that you will not believe that I negotiated it, that I approve of it, or that I had any hand in wording it.' On the 5th of September, he writes, 'It is quite impossible for me to continue any longer with this army; and I wish, therefore, that you would allow me to return home and resume the duties of my office.' Dalrymple, Burrard, and Wellesley were all recalled home. Sir John Moore remained at Lisbon, having been appointed to command the army. A Court of Inquiry was ordered on the subject of 'the late transactions in Portugal.' Wellesley had to bear much before the publicity of these proceedings was to set him right in public opinion. The Inquiry ended in a formal disapprobation of the armistice and convention on the part of the king being communicated to sir Hew Dalrymple. Neither of the two 'great generals' was again employed. One advantage was gained by the Convention. The Russian fleet in the Tagus was delivered up to the British. Sir John Moore, late in October, began his march into Spain, 'to co-operate,' as his instructions set forth, 'with the Spanish armies in the expulsion of the French.' He was to lead the British forces in Portugal; and to be joined by sir David Baird, with 10,000 men to be landed at Corunna. Instead of finding Spanish armies to co-operate with, he learned that the French had routed and dispersed them. Napoleon had himself come to command his troops; and had arrived at Bayonne on the 3rd of November. Moore was separated from Baird by a wide tract of country. He had been led by false information to divide his own army. He remained for some time at Salamanca, inactive and uncertain. Madrid was soon in the hands of the French. Moore made a forward movement against the advanced corps of Soult; and then, learning that the French armies were gathering all around him, he determined to retreat. Sir David Baird had previously joined him. Moore had abandoned all hopes of defending Portugal, and had directed his march towards Corunna. He commenced his retreat from Sahagun on the evening of the 24th of December. During this retreat, the retiring army constantly turned upon the pursuers, always defeating them, and on one occasion capturing general Lefebvre. The winter had set in with terrible severity; the sufferings of the troops were excessive; disorganization, the common consequence of a retreat, added to their danger. Moore saved his army from destruction by an overwhelming force when he carried it across the Esla, effectually destroying the bridge by which they passed the swollen stream. But Moore could not save his men from their own excesses, which made enemies of the inhabitants of every place through which they passed. At Lugo, on the 7th of January, 1809, the British general halted his exhausted troops, determined to give battle to Soult, to whom Napoleon had given up the pursuit of the English army, having received despatches which indicated that war with Austria was close at hand. Soult declined the conflict; and on the British marched to Corunna. On the 11th, when they had ascended the heights from which Corunna was visible, there were no transports in the bay. The troops met with a kind reception in the town; and their general applied himself to make his position as strong as possible, to resist the enemy that was approaching. On the evening of the 14th the transports arrived. The sick and wounded were got on board; and a great part of the artillery. Fourteen thousand British remained to fight, if their embarkation were molested. The battle of Corunna began at two o'clock on the 16th of January. Soult had 20,000 veterans, with numerous field-guns; and he had planted a formidable battery on the rocks, commanding the valley and the lower ridge of hills. Columns of French infantry descended from the higher ridge; and there was soon a close trial of strength between the combatants. From the lower ridge Moore beheld the 42nd and 50th driving the enemy before them through the village of Elvina. He sent a battalion of the guards to support them; but through a misconception the 42nd retired. Moore immediately dashed into the fight; exclaimed 'Forty-second, remember Egypt,' and sent them back to the village. The British held their ground or drove off their assailants; and victory was certain under the skilful direction of the heroic commander, when he was dashed to the earth by a shot from the rock battery. Sir David Baird, the second in command, had also fallen. Moore was carried into Corunna; and endured several hours of extreme torture before he yielded up his great spirit. The command had devolved upon general Hope, who thought that his first duty was now to embark the troops. . . . When the sufferers in Moore's campaign came home the hospitals were filled with wounded and sick; and some of the troops brought back a pestilential fever."—C. Knight, *Crown Hist. of Eng., ch.* 57 (*abridgment of ch.* 28, *v.* 7, *of Popular Hist. of Eng.*).

Also in: Gen. Sir W. F. P. Napier, *Hist. of the War in the Peninsula, bk.* 2–4 (*v.* 1).—J. M. Wilson, *Memoirs of the Duke of Wellington, v.* 1, *ch.* 13–16.—*Dispatches of the Duke of Wellington, v.* 4.—G. R. Gleig, *General Sir John Moore* (*Eminent British Military Commanders, v.* 3).—Baron Jomini, *Life of Napoleon, ch.* 13 (*v.* 2).—Duke de Rovigo, *Memoirs, v.* 2, *pt.* 2, *ch.* 2–3.—Gen. Foy, *Hist. of the War in the Peninsula, v.* 2, *pt.* 2.

A. D. 1808-1809 (December—March).—The siege of Saragossa.—"When Moore was pursued by Napoleon, the Duke of Infantado, who had rallied 20,000 men in New Castile after the fall of Madrid, formed the Quixotic design of re-taking the capital. Marshal Victor, Duke of Belluno, utterly crushed his force at Ucles on the 13th January, 1809, where 1,500 Spaniards were slain, and 9,000 men and all the stores and artillery were taken. The French, in retaliation for the Spaniards having hanged some soldiers who had been captured, murdered many of the prisoners in cold blood, and perpetrated infamous atrocities on the inhabitants of Ucles. The Spaniards, however, showed their extraordinary valour behind walls in their second defence of

Saragossa, the siege of which [abandoned the previous August, after a fierce struggle] was renewed by 35,000 French under Marshals Moncey and Mortier, on the 20th December, 1808. The city was defended by Palafox, who had retired into it after his defeat at Tudela. The second siege of this renowned city — though the defence eventually proved unsuccessful — crowns with everlasting glory the Spanish War of Independence. . . . 'The citizens gave up their goods, their houses, and their bodies to the war, and, mingling with the peasants and soldiers, formed one mighty garrison suited to the vast fortress they had formed. For doors and windows were built up, house-fronts loopholed, internal communications opened, streets trenched and crossed by earthen ramparts mounted with cannon, and every strong building was a separate fortification: there was no weak point — there could be none in a city which was all fortress, where the space covered by houses was the measure of the ramparts' (Napier). All the trees outside the walls were cut down, the houses destroyed, and the materials carried into the town. . . . The public magazines were provisioned for six months, and all the conventual communities and the inhabitants had large private stores. Nearly 3,000 artillerymen and sappers, and 30,000 men of the regular army, had taken refuge in the city, and at least 20,000 citizens and fugitive peasants were fit for arms. The popular leaders had recourse to all the aid which superstition could give them: denunciations of the wrath of Heaven were hurled on those who were suspected of wavering, and the clergy readily recounted stories of miracles to encourage the faithful. Saragossa was 'believed to be invincible through the protection of Our Lady of the Pillar, who had chosen it for the seat of her peculiar worship. . . . An appearance in the sky, which at other times might have passed unremembered, and perhaps unnoticed, had given strong confirmation to the popular faith. About a month before the commencement of the first siege, a white cloud appeared at noon, and gradually assumed the form of a palm-tree; the sky being in all other parts clear, except that a few specks of fleecy cloud hovered about the larger one. It was first observed over the church of N. Señora del Portillo, and moving from thence till it seemed to be immediately above that of the pillar, continued in the same form about half an hour, and then dispersed. The inhabitants were in a state of such excitement that crowds joined in the acclamation of the first beholder, who cried out, "A miracle!"— and after the defeat of the besiegers had confirmed the omen, a miracle it was universally pronounced to have been, the people proclaiming with exultation that the Virgin had by this token prefigured the victory she had given them, and promised Zaragoza her protection as long as the world should endure' (Southey). . . . At daybreak on the 21st December, General Suchet carried the works on the Monte Torrero; but Count Gazan de la Peyrière — a general highly distinguished in the Swiss and Italian campaigns — failed in his attack upon the suburbs on the left bank of the Ebro, and the confidence of the Spaniards in their leaders was restored. Three days later the town was completely invested, the siege operations being directed by General La Coste. On the 30th December, the trenches being completed, the town was summoned to surrender, and the example of Madrid was referred to; but Palafox replied proudly, 'If Madrid has surrendered, Madrid has been sold: Saragossa will neither be sold nor surrendered.' Marshal Moncey being recalled to Madrid, Junot took command of his corps. The besieged attempted several sallies, which were repulsed; and after a heavy bombardment, the St. Joseph convent was carried by the French on the 11th January, 1809. The Spanish leaders maintained the courage of their countrymen by proclaiming a forged despatch narrating the defeat of Napoleon. The guerrilla bands began to gather in round the French, and their condition was becoming perilous. But the command had now been taken by the invincible Marshal Lannes, Duke of Montebello (who had been detained by a long illness); the approaches were steadily pushed on, the breaches in the walls became wider, and on the 29th the French rushed forward and took possession of the ramparts. 'Thus the walls of Zaragoza went to the ground; but Zaragoza remained erect, and as the broken girdle fell from the heroic city, the besiegers started at her naked strength. The regular defences had crumbled, but the popular resistance was instantly called with all its terrors into action; and as if fortune had resolved to mark the exact moment when the ordinary calculations of science should cease, the chief engineers on both sides [La Coste and San Genis] were simultaneously slain' (Napier). . . . The Junta was in no degree cowed: they resolved on resistance to the last extremity, and a row of gibbets was raised for any who should dare to propose surrender. Additional barricades were constructed, and alarm-bells were rung to summon the citizens to the threatened points. As each house was in itself a fort which had to be separately attacked, mining now was had recourse to. In this art the skill of the French was unquestioned, and room after room and house after house was carried. But still the constancy of the besieged was unshaken, and the French soldiers began to murmur at their excessive toil. From so many of the women and children being huddled together in the cellars of the city, for safety from the shells and cannon-balls, a pestilence arose, and slowly spread from the besieged to the besiegers. 'The strong and the weak, the daring soldier and the shrinking child, fell before it alike; and such was the predisposition to disease, that the slightest wound gangrened and became incurable. In the beginning of February the daily deaths were from four to five hundred; — the living were unable to bury the dead; and thousands of carcases, scattered about the streets and courtyards, or piled in heaps at the doors of the churches, were left to dissolve in their own corruption, or be licked up by the flames of burning houses as the defence became concentrated' (Napier). On the 18th February a great assault took place, and so much of the town was carried that further resistance was hopeless. Terms of capitulation were offered by the besieged, but were rejected by Lannes, and on the 19th the heavy guns opened from the batteries on the left bank of the Ebro, to sweep the houses on the quays. On the 20th, when all the great leaders were dead or prostrated with fever, and none but the soldier-priest Ric remained to lead the diminished band of heroes, Saragossa surrendered, — at discretion,

according to the French; on honourable terms, according to the Spaniards. Such was the close of one of the most heroic defences in the history of the world. If any conditions were really accepted, they were ill observed by the victors: the churches were plundered, and many of the clergy and monks were put to death. . . . The other strongholds in Aragon, one after another, surrendered to the French before the end of March. In Catalonia the French, under General Gouvion St. Cyr, had met with equal success. With 30,000 men St. Cyr had taken Rosas after a month's siege — which was prolonged by the presence of that brilliant naval commander, Lord Cochrane (afterwards Earl of Dundonald), with an English frigate in the harbour — in December, 1808, had routed Reding at Cardadeu, had relieved Barcelona (where General Duhesme was shut up with 8,000 Frenchmen), and had again, on the 21st December, routed Reding at Molinos del Rey, where all the Spanish stores, including 30,000 muskets from England, were taken. In the spring of 1809 Reding made another attempt to achieve the independence of the north-east, and moved to relieve Saragossa; but on the 17th February he was met by St. Cyr at Igualada, where Reding himself was killed and his army was dispersed. The siege of Gerona alone in the north-east of Spain remained to be undertaken." —H. R. Clinton, *The War in the Peninsula, ch.* 3.

Also in: C. M. Yonge, *Book of Golden Deeds, p.* 365.—R. Southey, *Hist. of the Peninsular War, ch.* 18 (*v.* 3).—Sir W. F. P. Napier, *Hist. of the War in the Peninsula, bk.* 5, *ch.* 2–3 (*v.* 1).—Baron de Marbot, *Memoirs, v.* 1, *ch.* 40.

A. D. 1809 (February — June).—The war in Aragon.— Siege of Gerona. — "This decisive victory [of Igualada] terminated the regular war in Catalonia; and St Cyr, retiring to Vich, commenced preparations for the siege of Gerona. The undertaking was for some time delayed by the discord of St Cyr and Verdier; but in the beginning of May they appeared before the town, and on the 1st of June the investment was completed. But the prowess of the Spaniards nowhere appeared to greater advantage than in the defence of their walled towns: it was not till 12th August, after 37 days of open trenches, and two unsuccessful assaults, that the French possessed themselves of the fort of Monjuich, which commands the town: yet the gallant governor, Alvarez, still held out, and the safe arrival of a convoy sent by Blake reanimated the spirit of the garrison. The grand assault of the lower town was given (Sept. 17); but the French were repulsed from the breach with the loss of 1,600 men; and St Cyr, despairing of carrying the place by force, converted the siege into a blockade. The capture of three successive convoys, sent by Blake for their relief, reduced the besieged at last to extremity; famine and pestilence devastated the city; but it was not till the inhabitants were reduced to the necessity of eating hair that the place was yielded (Dec. 12) to Augereau, who had superseded St Cyr in the command. A more memorable resistance is not on record; but the heroic Alvarez, to the eternal disgrace of Augereau, was immured in a dungeon at Figueras, where he soon afterwards died. Junot, in the mean time, had been taken ill, and was succeeded in the command in Aragon by Suchet, a young general whose talents and success gave him a brilliant career in the later years of the empire. His first essay, however, was unfortunate; for the indefatigable Blake, encouraged by the retreat of St Cyr towards the Pyrenees, had again advanced with 12,000 men; and an action ensued (May 23) at Alcaniz, in which the French, seized with a panic, fled in confusion from the field. This unwonted success emboldened Blake to approach Saragossa; but the discipline and manœuvres of the French asserted their wonted superiority in the plains; the Spaniards were routed close to Saragossa (June 16), and more decisively at Belchite the next day. The army of Blake was entirely dispersed; and all regular resistance ceased in Aragon, as it had done in Catalonia, after the fall of Gerona."—*Epitome of Alison's Hist. of Europe, sect.* 566–567.

A. D. 1809 (February — July). — Wellington again in the English command.—The French advance into Portugal checked. — Passage of the Douro by the English.— Battle of Talavera. —"Napoleon, before Moore's corps had actually left Corunna, conceived the war at an end, and, in issuing instructions to his marshals, anticipated, with no unreasonable confidence, the complete subjugation of the Peninsula. Excepting, indeed, some isolated districts in the east, the only parts now in possession of the Spaniards or their allies were Andalusia, which had been saved by the precipitate recall of Napoleon to the north; and Portugal, which, still in arms against the French, was nominally occupied by a British corps of 10,000 men, left there under Sir John Cradock at the time of General Moore's departure with the bulk of the army for Spain. The proceedings of the French marshals for the recovery of the entire Peninsula were speedily arranged. Lannes took the direction of the siege of Saragossa, where the Spaniards, fighting as usual with admirable constancy from behind stone walls, were holding two French corps at bay. Lefebvre drove one Spanish army into the recesses of the Sierra Morena, and Victor chased another into the fastnesses of Murcia. Meantime Soult, after recoiling awhile from the dying blows of Moore, had promptly occupied Gallicia upon the departure of the English, and was preparing to cross the Portuguese frontier on his work of conquest. In aid of this design it was concerted that while the last-named marshal advanced from the north, Victor, by way of Elvas, and Lapisse by way of Almeida, should converge together upon Portugal, and that when the English at Lisbon had been driven to their ships the several corps should unite for the final subjugation of the Peninsula by the occupation of Andalusia. Accordingly, leaving Ney to maintain the ground already won, Soult descended with 30,000 men upon the Douro, and by the end of March was in secure possession of Oporto. Had he continued his advance, it is not impossible that the campaign might have had the termination he desired; but at this point he waited for intelligence of the English in his front and of Victor and Lapisse on his flank. His caution saved Portugal, for, while he still hesitated on the brink of the Douro, there again arrived in the Tagus that renowned commander before whose genius the fortunes not only of the marshals, but of their imperial master, were finally to fail. England was now at the commencement of her greatest war. The system of small expeditions and insignificant diversions,

though not yet conclusively abandoned, was soon superseded by the glories of a visible contest: and in a short time it was known and felt by a great majority of the nation, that on the field of the Peninsula England was fairly pitted against France. . . . At the commencement of the year 1809, when the prospects of Spanish independence were at their very gloomiest point, the British Cabinet had proposed and concluded a comprehensive treaty of alliance with the Provisional Administration of Spain; and it was now resolved that the contest in the Peninsula should be continued on a scale more effectual than before, and that the principal, instead of the secondary, part should be borne by England. . . . England's colonial requirements left her little to show against the myriads of the continent. It was calculated at the time that 60,000 British soldiers might have been made disposable for the Peninsular service, but at no period of the war was such a force ever actually collected under the standards of Wellington, while Napoleon could maintain his 300,000 warriors in Spain, without materially disabling the arms of the Empire on the Danube or the Rhine. We had allies, it is true, in the troops of the country; but these at first were little better than refractory recruits, requiring all the accessories of discipline, equipment, and organisation; jealous of all foreigners, even as friends, and not unreasonably suspicious of supporters who could always find in their ships a refuge which was denied to themselves. But above all these difficulties was that arising from the inexperience of the Government in continental warfare. . . . When, however, with these ambiguous prospects, the Government did at length resolve on the systematic prosecution of the Peninsular war, the eyes of the nation were at once instinctively turned on Sir Arthur Wellesley as the general to conduct it. . . . He stoutly declared his opinion that Portugal was tenable against the French, even if actual possessors of Spain, and that it offered ample opportunities of influencing the great result of the war. With these views he recommended that the Portuguese army should be organised at its full strength; that it should be in part taken into British pay and under the direction of British officers, and that a force of not less than 30,000 English troops should be despatched to keep this army together. . . . Such was the prestige already attached to Wellesley's name that his arrival in the Tagus changed every feature of the scene. No longer suspicious of our intentions, the Portuguese Government gave prompt effect to the suggestions of the English commander. . . . The command-in-chief of the native army was intrusted to an English officer of great distinction, General Beresford; and no time was lost in once more testing the efficacy of the British arms. . . . Of the Spanish armies we need only say that they had been repeatedly routed with invariable certainty and more or less disgrace, though Cuesta still held a nominal force together in the valley of the Tagus. There were, therefore, two courses open to the British commander: —either to repel the menaced advance of Soult by marching on Oporto, or to effect a junction with Cuesta, and try the result of a demonstration against Madrid. The latter of these plans was wisely postponed for the moment, and, preference having been decisively given to the former, the troops at once commenced their march upon the Douro. The British force under Sir Arthur Wellesley's command amounted at this time to about 20,000 men, to which about 15,000 Portuguese, in a respectable state of organisation, were added by the exertions of Beresford. Of these about 24,000 were now led against Soult, who, though not inferior in strength, no sooner ascertained the advance of the English commander, than he arranged for a retreat by detaching Loison with 6,000 men to dislodge a Portuguese post from his left rear. Sir Arthur's intention was to envelope, if possible, the French corps by pushing forward a strong force upon its left, and thus intercepting its retreat toward Ney's position, while the main body assaulted Soult in his quarters at Oporto. The former of these operations he intrusted to Beresford, the latter he directed in person. On the 12th of May the troops reached the southern bank of the Douro; the waters of which, 300 yards in width, rolled between them and their adversaries. . . . Availing himself of a point where the river by a bend in its course was not easily visible from the town, Sir Arthur determined on transporting, if possible, a few troops to the northern bank, and occupying an unfinished stone building, which he perceived was capable of affording temporary cover. The means were soon supplied by the activity of Colonel Waters—an officer whose habitual audacity rendered him one of the heroes of this memorable war. Crossing in a skiff to the opposite bank, he returned with two or three boats, and in a few minutes a company of the Buffs was established in the building. Reinforcements quickly followed, but not without discovery. The alarm was given, and presently the edifice was enveloped by the eager battalions of the French. The British, however, held their ground; a passage was effected at other points during the struggle; the French, after an ineffectual resistance, were fain to abandon the city in precipitation, and Sir Arthur, after his unexampled feat of arms, sat down that evening to the dinner which had been prepared for Soult. . . . This brilliant operation being effected, Sir Arthur was now at liberty to turn to the main project of the campaign — that to which, in fact, the attack upon Soult had been subsidiary — the defeat of Victor in Estremadura. . . . Cuesta would take no advice, and insisted on the adoption of his own schemes with such obstinacy, that Sir Arthur was compelled to frame his plans accordingly. Instead, therefore, of circumventing Victor as he had intended, he advanced into Spain at the beginning of July, to effect a junction with Cuesta and feel his way towards Madrid. The armies, when united, formed a mass of 78,000 combatants; but of these 56,000 were Spanish, and for the brunt of war Sir Arthur could only reckon on his 22,000 British troops, Beresford's Portuguese having been despatched to the north of Portugal. On the other side, Victor's force had been strengthened by the succours which Joseph Bonaparte, alarmed for the safety of Madrid, had hastily concentrated at Toledo; and when the two armies at length confronted each other at Talavera, it was found that 55,000 excellent French troops were arrayed against Sir Arthur and his ally, while nearly as many more were descending from the north on the line of the British com-

munications along the valley of the Tagus. On the 28th of July the British commander, after making the best dispositions in his power, received the attack of the French, directed by Joseph Bonaparte in person, with Victor and Jourdan at his side, and after an engagement of great severity, in which the Spaniards were virtually inactive, he remained master of the field against double his numbers, having repulsed the enemy at all points with heavy loss, and having captured several hundred prisoners and 17 pieces of cannon in this the first great pitched battle between the French and English in the Peninsula. In this well fought field of Talavera, the French had thrown, for the first time, their whole disposable force upon the British army without success; and Sir Arthur Wellesley inferred, with a justifiable confidence, that the relative superiority of his troops to those of the Emperor was practically decided. Jomini, the French military historian, confesses almost as much; and the opinions of Napoleon himself, as visible in his correspondence, underwent from that moment a serious change."—*Memoir of Wellington, from "The Times" of Sept.* 15-16, 1852.

Also in: R. Southey, *Hist. of the Peninsular War, ch.* 22-24 (*v.* 3-4).—Sir A. Alison, *Hist. of Europe*, 1789-1815, *ch.* 62 (*v.* 13).

A. D. 1809 (August—November).—Battles of Almonacid, Puerto de Baños, Ocana, and Alba de Tormes.—Soon after Wellington's unfruitful victory at Talavera, "Venegas had advanced as far as Aranjuez, and was besieging Toledo; but the retreat of the British having set the French armies at liberty, he was attacked and defeated after a sharp action at Almonacid (Aug. 11) by Dessoles and Sebastiani; and Sir Robert Wilson, who had approached Madrid with 6,000 Spaniards and Portuguese, was encountered and driven back by Ney (Aug. 8) at Puerto de Baños. The British at length, after lying a month at Deleitosa, were compelled, by the scandalous failure of the Spanish authorities to furnish them with supplies or provisions, to cross the mountains and fix their headquarters at Badajos, after an angry correspondence between Wellesley and Cuesta, who soon after was removed from his command. A gleam of success at Tamanes, where Marchand was routed with loss (Oct. 24) by Romana's army under the Duke del Parque, encouraged the Spaniards to make another effort for the recovery of Madrid; and an army of 50,000 men, including 7,000 horse and 60 pieces of cannon, advanced for this purpose from the Sierra Morena, under General Areizaga. The battle was fought (Nov. 12) at Ocana, near Aranjuez; but though the Spaniards behaved with considerable spirit, the miserable incapacity of their commander counterbalanced all their efforts, and an unparalleled rout was the result. Pursued over the wide plains of Castile by the French cavalry, 20,000 prisoners were taken, with all the guns and stores: the wreck was complete and irretrievable; and the defeat of the Duke del Parque (Nov. 25) at Alba de Tormes, dispersed the last force which could be called a Spanish army. It was evident from these events that Portugal was the only basis from which the deliverance of the Peninsula could be effected." —*Epitome of Alison's Hist. of Europe, sect.* 576 (*ch.* 62, *v.* 13 *of complete work*).

A. D. 1809 (August—December).—Wellington's difficulties.—His retreat into Portugal.—"In the course of the 29th, the army was reinforced by the arrival of a troop of horse-artillery, and a brigade of light troops from Lisbon, under General Crawford. Under the circumstances of his situation, however, it was impossible for Sir Arthur Wellesley to follow up his victory. The position he occupied was still one of extreme peril. A powerful enemy was advancing on his rear; and no reliance could be placed for the supply of his army, either on the promises of the Spanish General, or of the Junta. The army of Vanegas, which, in obedience to the orders of the Supreme Junta, had advanced from Madrilejos, was engaged, during the 28th and 29th, in endeavouring to dislodge the French garrison from Toledo. His advance pushed on during the night to the neighbourhood of Madrid, and took prisoners some patroles of the enemy. Vanegas, however no sooner learned from the prisoners that Joseph and Sebastiani were approaching, than he . . . desisted from any further offensive operations. The intelligence that Vanegas had failed in executing the part allotted to him, was speedily followed by information that Soult had with facility driven the Spaniards from the passes leading from Salamanca to Placentia. It was in consequence arranged between the Generals, that the British army should immediately march to attack Soult, and that Cuesta should remain in the position of Talavera, to protect this movement from any operation of Victor. The wounded likewise were to be left in charge of Cuesta. . . . On the morning of the 3rd of August, the British accordingly commenced their march on Oropesa. On his arrival there, Sir Arthur Wellesley received intelligence that Soult was already at Naval Moral. . . . Shortly after, a courier arrived from Cuesta, announcing, that, as the enemy were stated to be advancing on his flank, and as it was ascertained that the corps of Ney and Mortier had been united under Soult, he had determined on quitting his position, and joining the British army at Oropesa. This movement was executed the same night; and nearly the whole of the British wounded were left unprotected in the town of Talavera. The conduct of Cuesta, in this precipitate retreat, is altogether indefensible. . . . In quitting the position of Talavera, Cuesta had abandoned the only situation in which the advance of Victor on the British rear could be resisted with any prospect of success. . . . The whole calculations of Sir Arthur Wellesley were at once overthrown. . . . Sir Arthur determined to throw his army across the Tagus by the bridge of Arzobisbo. . . . Cuesta . . . followed the British in their retreat to the bridge of Arzobisbo, and leaving the Duke del Albuquerque with two divisions of infantry and one of cavalry to defend it, he withdrew the remainder of his army to Paraleda de Garben. The French, however, having taken post on the opposite side of the river, soon succeeded in discovering a ford by which they crossed, and surprising the Spaniards, drove them at once from the works, with the loss of 30 pieces of cannon. After this, Cuesta with his whole force fell back on Deleytosa, while the British moved to Xaraicejo. . . . Vanegas . . . remained with his army in the neighbourhood of Aranjuez. On the 5th of August, he succeeded in gaining a decided advantage over an advanced division of the enemy. . . . Harassed by inconsistent orders,

Vanegas was unfortunately induced again to advance, and give battle to the corps of Sebastiani at Almonacid. This engagement, though many of the Spanish troops behaved with great gallantry, terminated in the complete defeat of the army of Vanegas. It was driven to the Sierra Morena, with the loss of all its baggage and artillery. With this action terminated the campaign which had been undertaken for the relief of Madrid, and the expulsion of the enemy from the central provinces of Spain. The British army at Xaraicejo, still served as a shield to the southern provinces, and Sir Arthur Wellesley, (whom the gratitude of his country had now ennobled,) [raising him to the peerage as Baron Duke of Wellesley and Viscount Wellington of Talavera] considered it of importance to maintain the position he then occupied. But the total failure of supplies rendered this impossible, and about the 20th of August he fell back through Merida on Badajos, in the neighbourhood of which he established his army. At this period all operations in concert ceased between the English and Spanish armies. The Supreme Junta complained bitterly of the retreat of the former, which left the road to Seville and Cadiz open to the enemy, while the Marquis Wellesley, then ambassador in Spain, made strong representations of the privations to which the British army had been exposed, by the inattention and neglect of the authorities. In the correspondence which ensued, it appeared that the measure of retreat had been forced on Lord Wellington, by the absolute impossibility of supporting his army in the ground he occupied. . . . The year had closed in Spain triumphantly for the French arms, as it had commenced. The Spanish armies had sustained a series of unparalleled defeats. The British had retired into Portugal; and the efforts of Lord Wellington, were for the present, limited to the defence of that kingdom."—T. Hamilton, *Annals of the Peninsular Campaigns, ch. 7 and 9.*

Also in: R. Waite, *Life of the Duke of Wellington, ch. 6.*—Sir W. F. P. Napier, *Hist. of the War in the Peninsula, bk. 8, ch. 7–9, bk. 9 (v. 2).*

A. D. 1809-1810 (October — September).—The Lines of Torres Vedras.—"Since Austria had laid down arms by signing the peace of Vienna, and had thus proved the inefficiency of England's last allies—since among the sovereigns of the Continent Napoleon boasted none but courtiers or subjects, Wellington saw that all the resources and all the efforts of his gigantic power would be turned against the only country which still struggled for the liberty of Europe. What could Spain achieve with her bands of insurgents and her defeated armies, albeit so persevering? or the small English army effect against so formidable an adversary, aided by the combined forces of so many nations? But during the very time when the world looked upon all as lost, and Napoleon's proudest enemies were growing weak, Wellington never despaired of the cause he had embraced. Far from allowing himself to be cast down by the magnitude or the imminence of the danger, he derived from that very circumstance, not only the resolution of fighting to the last extremity, but also the energy to conceive and to execute a project which will continue to be the admiration of the world, and an everlasting lesson to nations oppressed by foreign rule. He had always thought that some day, sooner or later, the whole of Europe would rise against Napoleon's tyranny, provided that an opportunity for such a rising were afforded to it by a prolonged resistance in certain points. The end to aim at therefore was, in his opinion, not so much to drive the French out of the Peninsula, as the tacticians of the central junta wildly fancied, but rather to keep the contest there alive at any cost, until the moment should arrive for so inevitable and universal a revolt. In view of the new invasion pouring into Spain, he could not dream of undertaking any offensive operations against the French. Even if conducted with genius, they would have rapidly exhausted his very limited forces. His small army . . . could not have lasted a month amidst the large masses of French troops then in Spain. He therefore resolved to entrench it in strong positions, rendered still more formidable by every resource of defensive warfare, where he might defy superiority in numbers and the risk of surprise, where he could also obtain supplies by sea, and whence if necessary he might embark in case of disaster; where, also, he might take advantage of the distances and the difficulties of communication which were so rapidly exhausting our troops, by creating around us a desert in which we should find it impossible to live. To stand out under these restricted but vigorously conceived conditions, and to resist with indomitable obstinacy until Europe, ashamed to let him succumb, should come to his succour, was the only course which afforded Wellington some chance of success in view of the feeble means at his disposal; and such, with equal firmness and decision, was the one he now adopted. The necessity which suggested it to him in no wise diminishes the merit or originality of an operation which was, one may say, without precedent in military history. The position he was seeking for he found in the environs of Lisbon, in the peninsula formed by the Tagus at its entrance to the sea. Protected on almost every side either by the ocean or the river, which at this point is nearly as wide as an inland sea, this peninsula was accessible only on the north where it joined the mainland. There, however, the prolongation of the Sierra d'Estrella presented a series of rugged heights, craggy precipices and deep ravines filled with torrents, forming a true natural barrier, the strength of which had already struck more than one military observer. . . . Wellington was the first who conceived and executed the project of transforming the whole peninsula into a colossal fortress, of more than a hundred miles in circumference. He desired that this fortress should be composed of three concentric enclosures, defended by cannon, and large enough to contain not only his army and the Portuguese allies—comprising the regular troops, the militia and Ordenanzas—but the whole available population of the Southern provinces of Portugal, with their harvests, their cattle and their provisions, so that the country surrounding Lisbon should offer no resource whatever to the invaders. He at the same time secured his retreat by means of a spacious and fortified port, in which, should any untoward accident occur, the English army and even the Portuguese troops might embark in safety. This immense citadel extended to the north from Zizembre and the heights of Torres Vedras, which protected its front, as far as

Alemquer; thence to the east by Sobral and Alvera it followed the counterforts of the Estrella which overhang the Tagus, and extended to Lisbon, where it was covered alike by the mouth of the river and by the ocean. . . . From the beginning of the month of October, 1809, with the aid of Colonel Fletcher of the Engineers, he had employed thousands of workmen and peasants, without intermission, in throwing up intrenchments, constructing redoubts, and forming sluices for inundating the plain."—P. Lanfrey, *Life of Napoleon I., v.* 4, *ch.* 4.

Also in: W. H. Maxwell, *Life of Wellington, v.* 2, *ch.* 9–12.—Gen. Sir W. F. P. Napier, *Hist. of the War in the Peninsula, bk.* 11, *ch.* 8 (*v.* 2).

A. D. 1810.—Revolt of the Argentine provinces. See Argentine Republic: A. D. 1806–1820.

A. D. 1810-1812.—The French advance into Portugal.—Their recoil from the Lines of Torres Vedras.—"By the spring of 1810, the French armies in Spain numbered fully 350,000 men, and Napoleon had intended to cross the Pyrenees, at the head of this enormous force. His marriage, however, or more probably the innumerable toils and cares of Empire prevented him from carrying out his purpose; and this was one of the capital mistakes of his life, for his presence was necessary on the scene of events. He still despised the insurrection of Spain; he held Wellington cheap as a 'Sepoy general'; strange as it may appear, he was wholly ignorant of the existence of the Lines of Torres Vedras, and he persisted in maintaining that the only real enemy in the Peninsula was the British army, which he estimated at 25,000 men. He gave Masséna 70,000, with orders 'to drive the English into the sea'; and at the same time, he sent a great army to subdue Andalusia and the South, false to his art in thus dividing his forces. A contest followed renowned in history, and big with memorable results for Europe. Masséna took the fortresses on the northeast of Portugal, and by the close of September had entered Beira; he met a bloody reverse at Busaco [September 27], but he succeeded in turning Wellington's flank, and he advanced, in high heart, from Coimbra, on Lisbon. To his amazement, however, the impregnable lines, a gigantic obstacle utterly unforeseen, rose before him, and brought the invaders to a stand, and the 'spoiled child of victory,' daring as he was, after vain efforts to find a vulnerable point, recoiled from before the invincible rampart, baffled and indignant, but as yet hopeful. Masséna, with admirable skill, now chose a formidable position near the Tagus, and held the British commander in check. . . . But Wellington, with wise, if stern, forethought, had wasted the adjoining region with fire and sword; Napoleon, meditating a new war, was unable to despatch a regiment from France; Soult, ordered to move from Andalusia to the aid of his colleague, paused and hung back; and Masséna, his army literally starved out, and strengthened by a small detachment only, was at last reluctantly forced to retreat. The movement began in March, 1811; it was conducted with no ordinary skill; but Wellington had attained his object and the French general re-entered Spain with the wreck only of a once noble force. Masséna, however, would not confess defeat; having restored and largely increased his army, he attacked Wellington at Fuentes de Onoro, and possibly only missed a victory, owing to the jealousies of inferior men. This, nevertheless, was his last effort; he was superseded in his command by Napoleon, unjust in this instance to his best lieutenant, and Wellington's conduct of the war had been completely justified. Torres Vedras permanently arrested Napoleon's march of conquest; the French never entered Portugal again. . . . Meantime the never-ceasing insurrection of Spain continued to waste the Imperial forces, and surrounded them, as it were, with a circle of fire. It was all in vain that another great army was struck down in the field at Ocana; that Suchet invaded and held Valencia; that Soult ravaged Andalusia; that Victor besieged Cadiz. The resistance of the nation became more intense than ever; Saguntum, which had defied Hannibal, Girona, Tortosa, and, above all, Tarragona, defended their walls to the last; and not a village from Asturias to Granada acknowledged Joseph at Madrid, as its lawful king. . . . After Fuentes de Onoro the contest in Spain had languished in 1811, though Marmont and Soult missed a great chance of assailing Wellington, with very superior numbers. In the following year the British commander pounced on Ciudad Rodrigo, and Badajoz, the keys of Spain from the Portuguese frontier, completely deceiving the distant Emperor, who would direct operations from Paris; and he defeated Marmont in a great battle, at Salamanca, beside the Tormes, which threw open to him the gates of Madrid. Yet, in an effort made against the communications of the French, the object he steadily kept in view, he was baffled by the resistance of Burgos, and before long he was in retreat on Portugal, having just escaped from a great French army, so various were the fortunes of this most instructive war."—W. O'C. Morris, *Napoleon, ch.* 10–11.

Also in: G. Hooper, *Wellington, ch.* 7.—J. H. Stocqueler, *Life of Wellington, v.* 1, *ch.* 4–10.—Gen. Sir W. F. P. Napier, *Hist. of the War in the Peninsula, v.* 2–3.—R. Southey, *Hist. of the Peninsular War, v.* 4–5.—A. Thiers, *Hist. of the Consulate and Empire, bk.* 42 (*v.* 4).—Gen. Sir J. T. Jones, *Journal of the Sieges in Spain, v.* 1.

A. D. 1810-1821.—Revolt and achievement of independence in Venezuela and New Granada. See Colombian States: A. D. 1810–1819.

A. D. 1810-1825.—Revolt and independence of Mexico. See Mexico: A. D. 1810–1819; and 1820–1826.

A. D. 1812 (June—August).—Wellington's victory at Salamanca.—Abandonment of Madrid by King Joseph.—"In the month of May, 1812, that rupture took place [between Napoleon and Alexander I. of Russia] which was to determine, by its issue, whether Europe should acknowledge one master; and Napoleon, too confident in his own fortunes, put himself at the head of his armies and marched on Moscow. The war in Spain, which had hitherto occupied the first place in public attention, became from that hour, as far as France was concerned, a matter of minor consideration. Whatever effective battalions were at the disposal of the war-minister, were forwarded to the Vistula; while to recruit the regiments in Spain, depôts were formed in the south, out of which, from time to time, a body of conscripts were equipped and dispatched

to reinforce the French armies. Lord Wellington's army consisted of 60,000 men, Portuguese and Spaniards included. Of these, 10,000 infantry, with about 1,200 cavalry, were cantoned on the Tagus at Almarez; while the commander-in-chief, with the remainder, prepared to operate, on the north of that river, against Marmont. The capture of the redoubts at Almarez had, in some degree, isolated the French marshal; and, although he was at the head of 50,000 veterans, Lord Wellington felt himself in a condition to cope with him. At the same time Lord Wellington had to observe Soult, who, commanding the army of the south, was around Seville and Cordova with 58,000 men — while Suchet held the eastern provinces with 50,000 excellent troops — Souham was in the north with 10,000 — and the army of the centre, probably 15,000 more, was disposed around the capital, and kept open the communications between the detached corps. On the other hand, there were on foot no Spanish armies deserving of the name. Bands of guerrillas moved, indeed, hither and thither, rendering the communications between the French armies and their depôts exceedingly insecure; but throughout the north, and west, and centre of Spain, there was no single corps in arms of any military respectability. In the east, Generals Lacy and Sarsfield were at the head of corps which did good service, and occupied Suchet pretty well; while D'Eroles, more bold than prudent, committed himself at Rhonda with General Rourke, in a combat which ended in his total defeat and the dispersion of his troops. Yet were the French far from being masters of the country. Few fortified towns, Cadiz and Alicante excepted, continued to display the standard of independence, but every Sierra and mountain range swarmed with the enemies of oppression, out of whom an army, formidable from its numbers, if not for its discipline, might at any moment be formed. But it had never entered into the counsels of the allies to furnish a nucleus round which such an army might be gathered. . . . Meanwhile, the commander-in-chief, after having given his army a few weeks' repose, . . . broke up from his cantonments, and advanced in the direction of Salamanca. On the 17th of June his divisions crossed the Tormes, by the fords above and below the town, and, finding no force in the field competent to resist them, marched direct upon the capital of the province." Salamanca was taken on the 27th of June, after a siege of ten days, and a series of manœuvres — a great game of tactics between the opposing commanders — ensued, which occupied their armies without any serious collision, until the 22d of July, when the decisive battle of Salamanca was fought. "The dispositions of the French, though masterly against one less self-collected, had been, throughout the day, in Wellington's opinion, full of hazard. They aimed at too much — and, manœuvring to throw themselves in force upon the English right, risked, as the event proved fatally, the weakening of their own right and centre. Lord Wellington saw that filing constantly in one direction disconnected the divisions of Marmont's army, and left an interval where he might strike to advantage. . . . It was the first mistake that Marmont had made, and Wellington never permitted him to retrieve it. Lord Wellington had dined amid the ranks of the third division, and Packenham, its frank and chivalrous leader, was one of those who shared his simple and soldier-like meal. To him the commander-in-chief gave his orders, somewhat in the following words: 'Do you see those fellows on the hill, Packenham? Throw your division into columns of battalions — at them directly — and drive them to the devil.' Instantly the division was formed — and the order executed admirably. . . . By this magnificent operation, the whole of the enemy's left was destroyed. Upward of 3,000 prisoners remained in the hands of the victors, while the rest, broken and dispirited, fell back in utter confusion upon the reserves, whom they swept away with them in their flight. Meanwhile, in the centre, a fiercer contest was going on. . . . Marmont, . . . struck down by the explosion of a shell, was carried off the field early in the battle, with a broken arm and two severe wounds in the side. The command then devolved upon Clausel, who did all that man in his situation could do to retrieve the fortune of the day. . . . But Lord Wellington was not to be arrested in his success, nor could his troops be restrained in their career of victory. . . . Seven thousand prisoners, two eagles, with a number of cannon and other trophies, remained in the hands of the English: 10,000 men, in addition, either died on the field or were disabled by wounds; whereas the loss on the part of the allies amounted to scarcely 5,000 men. . . . After this disaster, Clausel continued his retreat by forced marches. . . . Meanwhile, Joseph, ignorant of the result of the late battle, was on his way, with 20,000 men, to join Marmont, and had arrived at the neighbourhood of Arevolo before the intelligence of that officer's defeat was communicated to him. He directed his columns instantly toward Segovia. . . . On the 7th of August the British army moved; . . . while Joseph, retreating with precipitation, left the passes of the Guadarama open, and returned to Madrid, where the confusion was now extreme. . . . Lord Wellington's march was conducted with all the celerity and good order which distinguished every movement of his now magnificent army. On the 7th, he entered Segovia. . . . On the 12th [he] entered Madrid in triumph. . . . The city exhibited the appearance of a carnival, and the festivities were kept up till the dawn of the 13th came in. . . . Immediately the new constitution was proclaimed; Don Carlos D'Espana was appointed governor of the city, and the people, still rejoicing, yet restrained from excesses of every sort, returned to their usual employments."—Gen. Vane (Marquess of Londonderry), *Story of the Peninsular War, ch.* 30.

Also in: Gen. Sir W. F. P. Napier, *Hist. of the War in the Peninsula, bk.* 18 (*v.* 4).—Lt. Col. Williams, *Life and Times of Wellington, v.* 1, *pp.* 275-290.

A. D. 1812-1814.—Final campaigns of the Peninsular War.—Expulsion of the French.— "The south and centre of Spain . . . seemed clear of enemies, but the hold of the French was as yet shaken only, not broken; for in fact though Wellington's march had forced his enemies in two directions (Clausel, with the remainder of Marmont's army, having retired north, while the king withdrew south-east), such were their numbers that each division became the centre of an army as powerful as his own. . . . Of the two armies against which Wellington had to contend by far the largest was the army of Soult

and the king, on the south-east. On the other hand, Clausel's forces were beaten and retreating, so that it appeared to the general better to leave a detachment under Hill to cover Madrid, while he himself repaired with the bulk of his army to strike a final blow at Clausel by the capture of Burgos, intending to return at once and with his whole combined forces fight a great battle with Soult and the king before the capital. . . . The resistance offered by Burgos and the deficiency of proper artillery proved greater obstacles than had been expected. The delay thus caused allowed the French to recover. . . . As Soult began to draw towards Madrid from Valencia, thus threatening the safety of Hill, there was no course left but to summon that general northward, and to make a combined retreat towards Salamanca and Portugal. . . . This was the last of Wellington's retreats. Events in Europe lessened the power of his enemies; while fighting for his very existence on the main continent of Europe, Napoleon could not but regard the war in Spain as a very secondary concern, and a great many old and valuable soldiers were withdrawn. The jealousy which existed between Joseph and the generals, and the dislike of the great generals to take upon themselves the Spanish war, threw it into inferior hands for some little while, and there is little more to chronicle than a succession of hard-won victories. . . . A vigorous insurrection had arisen all along the northern provinces; and it was this more than anything else which decided Wellington's course of action. While leaving troops to occupy the attention of the French in the valley of the Tagus, he intended to march northwards, . . . connect himself with the northern insurgents, and directly threaten the communications with France. . . . As he had expected, the French had to fall back before him; he compelled them to evacuate Burgos and attempt to defend the Ebro. Their position there was turned, and they had again to fall back into the basin of Vittoria. This is the plain of the river Zadora, which forms in its course almost a right angle at the south-west corner of the plain, which it thus surrounds on two sides. Across the plain and through Vittoria runs the high road to France, the only one in the neighbourhood sufficiently large to allow of the retreat of the French army, encumbered with all its stores and baggage, and the accumulated wealth of some years of occupation of Spain. While Wellington forced the passage of the river in front south of the great bend, and drove the enemy back to the town of Vittoria, Graham beyond the town closed this road. The beaten enemy had to retreat as best he could towards Salvatierra, leaving behind all the artillery, stores, baggage, and equipments [June 21, 1813]. The offensive armies of France had now to assume the defensive and to guard their own frontier. Before advancing to attack them in the mountains, Wellington undertook the blockade of Pampeluna and the siege of St. Sebastian. It was impossible for the French any longer to regard diplomatic or dynastic niceties. Joseph was superseded, and the defence of France intrusted to Soult, with whom the king had hopelessly quarrelled. He proved himself worthy of the charge. A series of terrible battles was fought in the Pyrenees, but one by one his positions were forced. With fearful bloodshed, St. Sebastian was taken, the Bidasoa was crossed (Oct. 7), the battle of the Nivelle fought and won (Nov. 10), and at length, in February, the lower Adour was passed, Bayonne invested, and Soult obliged to withdraw towards the east. But by this time events on the other side of France had changed the appearance of the war. . . . Napoleon was being constantly driven backward upon the east. The effect could not but be felt by the southern army, and Soult deserves great credit for the skill with which he still held at bay the victorious English. He was however defeated at Orthes (Feb. 27), lost Bordeaux (March 8), and was finally driven eastward towards Toulouse, intending to act in union with Suchet, whose army in Catalonia was as yet unbeaten. On the heights upon the east of Toulouse, for Wellington had brought his army across the Garonne, was fought, with somewhat doubtful result, the great battle of Toulouse [April 10]. The victory has been claimed by both parties; the aim of the English general was however won, the Garonne was passed, the French position taken, Toulouse evacuated and occupied by the victors. The triumph such as it was had cost the victors 7,000 or 8,000 men, a loss of life which might have been spared, for Napoleon had already abdicated, and the battle was entirely useless."—J. F. Bright, *Hist. of Eng., period* 3, *pp.* 1317–1321.

Also in: Sir A. Alison, *Hist. of Europe*, 1789–1815, *ch.* 76–77 (*v.* 16).—Count Miot de Melito, *Memoirs, ch.* 33–34.—Gen. Sir W. F. P. Napier, *Hist. of the War in the Peninsula, v.* 4–5.

A. D. 1813.—Possession of West Florida taken by the United States. See Florida: A. D. 1810–1813.

A. D. 1813-1814 (December—May).—Restoration of Ferdinand and despotic government.—Abolition of the Cortes.—Re-establishment of the Inquisition.—Hostility of the people to freedom.—"The troops of the allies in Catalonia were paralyzed, when just about to take their last measures against Suchet, and, as they hoped, drive out the last of the French from Spain. An envoy arrived from the captive Ferdinand, with the news that Ferdinand and Napoleon had made a treaty, and that the Spaniards might not fight the French any more, nor permit the English to do so on their soil. Ferdinand had been a prisoner at Valençay for five years and a half; and during that time he had, by his own account, known nothing of what was doing in Spain, but from the French newspapers. The notion uppermost in his little mind at this time appears to have been that the Cortes and the liberal party in Spain were 'Jacobins and infidels,' and that it was all-important that he should return, to restore absolutism and the Inquisition. In sending to Spain the treaty he had made with Napoleon, he took no notice whatever of the Cortes, but addressed himself solely to the Regency: and with them, his business was to consult whether he should adhere to the treaty or break through it;—which he might easily do on the plea that it was an extorted act, agreed to under deficient knowledge of the state of Spain. Thus crooked was the policy, even at the moment of restoration, of the foolish prince who seems to have had no ability for any thing but mean and petty intrigue. The terms of the treaty might easily be anticipated from the circumstances under which it was made. Napoleon wanted to shake out the British from his southwestern quarter; he was

in great need of the veteran French troops who were prisoners in Spain: and he had no longer any hope of restoring his brother Joseph. The treaty of December, 1813, therefore provided that Ferdinand and his successors should be recognised as monarchs of Spain and of the Indies: that the territory of Spain should be what it had been before the war — the French giving up any hold they had there: that Ferdinand should maintain the integrity of this territory, clearing it completely of the British: that France and Spain should ally themselves to maintain their maritime rights against England: that all the Spaniards who had adhered to King Joseph should be reinstated in whatever they had enjoyed under him: that all prisoners on both sides should immediately be sent home: and that Joseph and his wife should receive large annuities from Spain. The General of the Spanish forces in Catalonia, Copons, was in so much haste to conclude a separate armistice for himself, with Suchet, without any regard to his British comrades, that the Cortes had to act with the utmost rapidity to prevent it. Since the Cortes had invested themselves with executive, as well as legislative power, the Regency had become a mere show: and now, when the Cortes instantly quashed the treaty, the Regency followed the example. On the 8th of January, the Regency let his Majesty know how much he was beloved and desired; but also, how impossible it was to ratify any act done by him while in a state of captivity. As Napoleon could not get back his troops from Spain in this way, he tried another. He released some of Ferdinand's chief officers, and sent them to him, with advocates of his own, to arrange about an end to the war, and exchanging prisoners; and General Palafox, one of the late captives, went to Madrid, where, however, he met with no better success than his predecessor. By that time (the end of January) it was settled that the Spanish treaty, whatever it might be, was to be framed under the sanction of the Allies, at the Congress of Chatillon. With the hope of paralyzing the Spanish forces by division, Napoleon sent Ferdinand back to Spain. He went through Catalonia, and arrived in his own dominions on the 24th of March. . . . These intrigues and negotiations caused extreme vexation to Wellington. They suddenly stopped every attempt to expel the French from Catalonia, and threatened to bring into the field against him all the prisoners he had left behind him in Spain: and there was no saying how the winding-up of the war might be delayed or injured by the political quarrels which were sure to break out whenever Ferdinand and the Cortes came into collision. . . . He therefore lost no time: and the war was over before Ferdinand entered Madrid. It was on the 14th of May that he entered Madrid, his carriage drawn by the populace. As he went through the city on foot, to show his confidence, the people cheered him. They were aware of some suspicious arrests, but were willing to hope that they were merely precautionary. Then followed the complete restoration of the religious orders to the predominance which had been found intolerable before; the abolition of the Cortes; and the re-establishment of the Inquisition. The Constitution had been rejected by the King before his entry into Madrid. In a few weeks, the whole country was distracted with discontent and fear; and, in a few months, the prisons of Madrid were so overflowing with state prisoners — ninety being arrested on one September night — that convents were made into prisons for the safe-keeping of the King's enemies. Patriots were driven into the mountains, and became banditti, while Ferdinand was making arrests right and left, coercing the press, and ceremoniously conveying to the great square, to be there burned in ignominy, the registers of the proceedings of the late Cortes." —H. Martineau, *Hist. of England*, 1800–1815, *bk.* 2, *ch.* 6.—"Ferdinand was a person of narrow mind, and his heart seems to have been incapable of generous feeling; but he was not a wicked man, nor would he have been a bad King if he had met with wise ministers, and had ruled over an enlightened people. On the two important subjects of civil and religious freedom he and the great body of the nation were in perfect sympathy, — both, upon both subjects, imbued with error to the core; and the popular feeling in both cases outran his. The word Liberty ('Libertad') appeared in large bronze letters over the entrance of the Hall of the Cortes in Madrid. The people of their own impulse hurried thither to remove it. . . . The Stone of the Constitution, as it was called, was everywhere removed. . . . The people at Seville deposed all the existing authorities, elected others in their stead to all the offices which had existed under the old system, and then required those authorities to re-establish the Inquisition. In re-establishing that accursed tribunal by a formal act of government, in suppressing the freedom of the press, which had been abused to its own destruction, and in continuing to govern not merely as an absolute monarch, but as a despotic one, Ferdinand undoubtedly complied with the wishes of the Spanish nation. . . . But, in his treatment of the more conspicuous persons among the 'Liberales,' whom he condemned to strict and long imprisonment, many of them for life, he brought upon himself an indelible reproach." —R. Southey, *Hist. of the Peninsular War, ch.* 46 (*v.* 6).

A. D. 1814-1827.—The Constitution of 1812. —Abrogated by Ferdinand.— Restored by the Revolution of 1820.— Intervention of the Holy Alliance.—Absolutism and bigotry reinstated by the arms of France.—"During the war and the captivity of Ferdinand, the Cortès had, in March 1812 established a new Constitution, by which the royal authority was reduced to little more than a name. . . . Ferdinand VII., after his return, immediately applied himself to restore the ancient régime in all its unmitigated bigotry and exclusiveness. He issued decrees, in May, 1814, by which all Liberals and Freemasons, and all adherents of the Cortès, and of the officers appointed by them, were either compelled to fly, or subjected to imprisonment, or at least deposed. All national property was wrested from the purchasers of it, not only without compensation, but fines were even imposed upon the holders. All dissolved convents were re-established. The Inquisition was restored, and Mir Capillo, Bishop of Almeria, appointed Grand Inquisitor, who acted with fanatical severity, and is said to have incarcerated 50,000 persons for their opinions, many of whom were subjected to torture. . . . Ten thousand persons are computed to have fled into France. The kingdom was governed by a Camarilla, consisting of the

King's favourites, selected from the lowest and most worthless of the courtiers. . . . The French invasion of Spain had occasioned a revolution in Spanish America [see ARGENTINE REPUBLIC: A. D. 1806–1820; COLOMBIAN STATES: A. D. 1810–1819; MEXICO: A. D. 1810–1819, and 1820–1826; CHILE: A. D. 1810–1818; PERU: A. D. 1820–1826]. The loss of the American colonies, and a bad system of rural economy, by which agriculture was neglected in favour of sheep-breeding, had reduced Spain to great poverty. This state of things naturally affected the finances; the troops were left unpaid, and broke out into constant mutinies. A successful insurrection of this kind, led by Colonels Quiroga and Riego, occurred in 1820. Mina, who had distinguished himself as a guerilla leader, but, having compromised himself in a previous mutiny, had been compelled to fly into France, now recrossed the Pyrenees to aid the movement. The Constitution of 1812 was proclaimed at Saragossa; and the cowardly Ferdinand . . . was also obliged to proclaim it at Madrid, March 8th 1820. The Cortès was convened in July, when Ferdinand opened the Assembly with an hypocritical speech, remarkable for its exaggeration of Liberal sentiments. The Cortès immediately proceeded again to dissolve the convents, and even to seize the tithes of the secular clergy, on the pretext that the money was required for the necessities of the State. The Inquisition was once more abolished, the freedom of the press ordained, the right of meeting and forming clubs restored. . . . The Spanish revolutionists were divided into three parties: the Decamisados, answering to the French 'Sans-culottes'; the Communeros, who were for a moderate constitutional system; and the Anilleros, known by the symbol of a ring; who, dreading the interference of the Holy Alliance, endeavoured to conciliate the people with the crown. On the whole, the insurgents used their victory with moderation, and, with the exception of some few victims of revenge, contented themselves with depriving their opponents, the Serviles, of their places and emoluments. . . . The revolution, though originated by the soldiery, was adopted by the more educated class of citizens. On the other hand, the clergy and the peasantry were bitterly opposed to it. In the summer of 1821, guerilla bands were organised in the provinces in the cause of Church and King, and obtained the name of 'Armies of the Faith.' . . . In these civil disturbances dreadful atrocities were committed on both sides. . . . The French Government, with the ulterior design of interfering in Spanish affairs, seized the pretext of this disorder to place a cordon of troops on the Pyrenees; to which the Spaniards opposed an army of observation. Ferdinand, relying on the Army of the Faith, and on his Foreign Minister, Martinez de la Rosa, a Moderado, thought he might venture on a coup d'état before the appearance of the French; but his guards were worsted in a street fight, July 7th 1822. . . . Ferdinand was now base enough to applaud and thank the victors, to dismiss the Moderados from the Ministry, and to replace them by Exaltados, or Radicals. This state of things had attracted the attention of the Holy Alliance. In October 1822, the three northern monarchs assembled in congress at Verona, to adopt some resolution respecting Spain [see VERONA: THE CONGRESS OF]. . . . They addressed a note to the Spaniards requiring the restoration of absolutism. . . . In the spring, the French army of observation, which had been increased to 100,000 men, was placed under the command of the Duke of Angoulême." The Spanish troops "were few and ill disciplined; while in Old Castile stood guerilla bands, under the priest Merino, ready to aid the French invasion. An attempt on the part of Ferdinand to dismiss his Liberal ministry induced the ministers and the Cortès to remove him to Seville (March 20th 1823), whither the Cortès were to follow. The Duke of Angoulême addressed a proclamation to the Spaniards from Bayonne, April 2nd, in which he told them that he did not enter Spain as an enemy, but to liberate the captive King, and, in conjunction with the friends of order, to re-establish the altar and the throne. The French crossed the Bidassoa, April 7th. The only serious resistance which they experienced was from Mina [in Catalonia]. Ballasteros [in Navarre] was not strong enough to oppose them, while the traitor O'Donnell [commanding a reserve in New Castile] entered into negociations with the enemy, and opened to them the road to the capital. Ballasteros was compelled to retire into Valencia, and the French entered Madrid, May 23rd. A Regency . . . was now instituted till the King should be rescued. . . . A French corps was despatched . . . against Seville, where the Cortès had reopened their sittings; but on the advance of the French they retired to Cadiz, June 12th, taking with them the King, whom they declared of unsound mind, and a provisional Regency was appointed." The French advanced and laid siege to Cadiz, which capitulated October 1st, after a bombardment, the Cortès escaping by sea. Mina, in Catalonia, gave up resistance in November. "The Duke of Angoulême returned to Paris before the end of the year, but Spain continued to be occupied by an army of 40,000 French. The first act of Ferdinand after his release was to publish a proclamation, October 1st, revoking all that had been done since March 7th 1820. The Inquisition, indeed, was not restored; but the vengeance exercised by the secular tribunals was so atrocious that the Duke of Angoulême issued an order prohibiting arrests not sanctioned by the French commander: an act, however, which on the principle of non-interference was disavowed by the French Government. . . . It is computed that 40,000 Constitutionalists, chiefly of the educated classes, were thrown into prison. The French remained in Spain till 1827. M. Zea Bermudez, the new Minister, endeavoured to rule with moderation. But he was opposed on all sides. . . . His most dangerous enemy was the Apostolic Junta, erected in 1824 for the purpose of carrying out to its full extent, and independently of the Ministry, the victory of bigotry and absolutism." In 1825, Bermudez was driven to resign. "The Junta . . . in the spring of 1827 excited in Catalonia an insurrection of the Serviles. The insurgents styled themselves Aggraviados (aggrieved persons), because the King did not restore the Inquisition, and because he sometimes listened to his half Liberal ministers, or to the French and English ambassadors, instead of suffering the Junta to rule uncontrolled. The history of the revolt is obscure. . . . The object seems to have been to dethrone Ferdinand in favour of his brother Carlos." The insurrection

was suppressed, "the province disarmed, and many persons executed."—T. H. Dyer, *Hist. of Modern Europe, bk.* 8 (*v.* 4).

ALSO IN: E. Blaquiere, *Historical Review of the Spanish Revolution.*—F. A. de Châteaubriand, *Memoirs: Congress of Verona, v.* 1.—S. Walpole, *Hist. of Eng., ch.* 9 (*v.* 2).—Sir A. Alison, *Hist. of Europe,* 1815–1852, *ch.* 7, *and* 11–12.

A. D. 1815.—The Allies in France. See FRANCE: A. D. 1815 (JULY—NOVEMBER).

A. D. 1815.—Accession to the Holy Alliance. See HOLY ALLIANCE.

A. D. 1818.—Chile lost to the Spanish crown. See CHILE: A. D. 1810–1818.

A. D. 1821.—Mexican independence practically gained.—Iturbide's empire. See MEXICO: A. D. 1820–1826.

A. D. 1822-1823.—The Congress of Verona.—French intervention approved. See VERONA, THE CONGRESS OF.

A. D. 1824.—Peruvian independence won at Ayacucho. See PERU: A. D. 1820–1826.

A. D. 1833.—Accession of Isabella II.

A. D. 1833-1846.—The civil war of Carlists and Christinos.—Abdication of Christina.—Regency of Espartero.—Revolution of 1843.—Accession of Queen Isabella.—Louis Philippe and his Spanish marriages.—"The eyes of King Ferdinand VII. were scarcely closed, September 29th, 1833, when the Apostolic party—whose strength lay in the north of Spain, and especially in Navarre and the Basque provinces—proclaimed his brother, Don Carlos, king under the title of Charles V. In order to offer a successful resistance to the Carlists, who were fighting for absolutism and priestcraft, there was no other course for the regent, Maria Christina, than to throw herself into the arms of the liberal party. So the seven years' war between Carlists and Christinos, from a war of succession, became a strife of principles and a war of citizens. At the outset, owing to the skill of General Zumalacarreguy, to whom the Christinos could oppose no leader of equal ability, the Carlists had the advantage in the field. Don Carlos threatened the Spanish frontiers from Portugal, where he had been living in exile with his dear nephew, Don Miguel. In this strait, Christina applied to England and France, and between those two states and Spain and Portugal was concluded the quadruple alliance of April 22d, 1834, the aim of which was to uphold the constitutional thrones of Isabella and Maria da Gloria, and to drive out the two pretenders, Carlos and Miguel. In that year both pretenders, who enjoyed to a high degree the favor of the Pope and the Eastern powers, had to leave Portugal. Carlos reached England on an English ship in June, but fled again in July, and, after an adventurous journey through France, appeared suddenly in Navarre, to inspire his followers with courage by the royal presence. The war was conducted with passion and cruelty on both sides. After the death of Zumalacarreguy at the siege of Bilbao, June 14th, 1835, the Christinos, who were superior in point of numbers, seemed to have the advantage. . . . The turning-point was reached when the command of the Christino army was committed to Espartero. In 1836 he defeated the Carlists in the murderous battle of Luchana. In 1837, when Carlos advanced into the neighborhood of Madrid, he hastened to the succor of the capital, and compelled him to retreat. To these losses were added disunion in the Carlist camp. The utterly incapable, dependent pretender was the tool of his Camarilla, which made excellence in the catechism a more important requisite for the chief command than military science, and which deposed the most capable generals to put its own creatures in command. The new commander-in-chief, Guergué, said, bluntly, to Carlos, 'We, the blockheads and ignoramuses, have yet to conduct your Majesty to Madrid; and whoever does not belong in that category is a traitor.' This Apostolic hero was defeated several times by Espartero in 1838, and the enthusiasm of the northern provinces gradually cooled down. He was deposed, and the chief command intrusted to the cunning Maroto. . . . As he [Maroto] did not succeed in winning victories over Espartero, who overmatched him, he concluded, instead, August 31st, 1839, the treaty of Vergara, in accordance with which he went over to the Christinos, with his army, and by that means obtained full amnesty, and the confirmation of the privileges of Navarre and the Basque provinces. After this, Don Carlos's cause was hopelessly lost. He fled, in September, to France, with many of his followers, and was compelled to pass six years in Bourges under police supervision. In 1845, after he had resigned his claims in favor of his eldest son, the Duke of Montemolin, he received permission to depart, and went to Italy. He died in Trieste, March 10th, 1855. His followers, under Cabrera, carried on the war for some time longer in Catalonia. But they, too, were overcome by Espartero, and in July, 1840, they fled, about 8,000 strong, to France, where they were put under surveillance. The civil war was at an end, but the strife of principles continued. Espartero, who had been made Duke of Victory (Vittoria), was the most important and popular personage in Spain, with whom the regent, as well as everybody else, had to reckon. In the mean time Christina had contrived to alienate the respect and affection of the Spaniards, both by her private life and her political conduct. Her liberal paroxysms were not serious, and gave way, as soon as the momentary need was past, to the most opposite tendency. . . . In 1836 the Progressists apprehended a reaction, and sought to anticipate it. Insurrections were organized in the larger cities, and the constitution of 1812 was made the programme of the revolt. . . . Soldiers of the guard forced their way into the palace, and compelled [Christina] to accept the constitution of 1812. A constitutional assembly undertook a revision of this, and therefrom resulted the new constitution of 1837. Christina swore to it, but hoped, by controlling the elections, to bring the Moderados into the Cortes and the ministry. When she succeeded in this, in 1840, she issued a municipal ordinance placing the appointment of the municipal authorities in the hands of the administration. This occasioned riots in Madrid and other cities; and when Christina commissioned Espartero, who was just returning victorious, to suppress the revolt in Madrid, he refused to constitute himself the tool of an unpopular policy. But he was the only man who could hold in check the revolution which threatened to break out on all sides; and so, September 16th, 1840, he had to be named minister president. . . . Under such circumstances the regency had but little charm for Christina, and there were, more-

over, other causes working with these to the same result. Soon after the death of her husband, she had bestowed her favor on a young lifeguardsman named Munoz, made him her chamberlain, and been secretly married to him. This union soon published itself in a rich blessing of offspring, but it was not until the year 1844 that her public marriage with Munoz, and his elevation to the rank of duke (of Rianzares) and grandee of Spain took place. Having by this course of life forfeited the fame of an honest woman, and exposed herself to all sorts of attacks, she preferred to leave the country. October 12th, she abdicated the regency, and journeyed to France. May 8th, 1841, the newly elected Cortes named Espartero regent of Spain, and guardian of Queen Isabella and her sister, the Infanta Luisa Fernanda. . . . Since he knew how actively Christina, supported by Louis Philippe, was working against him with gold and influence, he entered into closer relations with England, whereupon his envious foes and rivals accused him of the sale of Spanish commercial interests to England. Because he quieted rebellious Barcelona by a bombardment in 1842, he was accused of tyranny. In 1843 new insurrections broke out in the south; Colonel Prim hastened to Catalonia, and set himself at the head of the soldiers whom Christina's agents had won over by a liberal use of money; Espartero's deadliest foe, General Narvaez, landed in Valencia, and marched into Madrid at the head of the troops. Espartero, against whom Progressists and Moderados had conspired together, found himself forsaken, and embarked at Cadiz, July 26th 1843, for England, whence he did not dare to return to his own country until 1848. In November, 1843, the thirteen-year-old Isabella was declared of age. She assumed the government, made Narvaez, now Duke of Valencia, minister president, and recalled her mother. Thereby gate and doors were opened to the French influence, and the game of intrigue and reaction recommenced. In 1845 the constitution of 1837 was altered in the interests of absolutism. . . . In order to secure to his house a lasting influence in Spain, and acquire for it the reversion of the Spanish throne, Louis Philippe, in concert with Christina, effected, October 16th, 1846, the marriage of Isabella with her kinsman Francis of Assis, and of the Infanta Luisa with the Duke of Montpensier, his own youngest son. (At first his plan was to marry Isabella also to one of his sons, the Duke of Aumale, but he abandoned it on account of the energetic protest of the Palmerston cabinet, and, instead, chose for Isabella, in Francis of Assis, the person who, by reason of his mental and physical weakness, would be least likely to stand in the way of his son Montpensier.) This secretly negotiated marriage cost Louis Philippe the friendship of the English cabinet."—W. Müller, *Political Hist. of Modern Times, sect.* 9.

Also in: W. Bollaert, *The Wars of Succession in Portugal and Spain*, 1826 *to* 1840, *v.* 2.—C. F. Henningsen, *A Twelve Months' Campaign with Zumalacarregui.*—Sir H. L. Bulwer (Lord Dalling), *Life of Palmerston, v.* 3, *ch.* 7.—C. A. Fyffe, *Hist. of Modern Europe, v.* 2, *ch.* 6.

A. D. 1845-1860.—Cuba in danger from the United States.—Filibustering movements.—The Ostend Manifesto. See Cuba: A. D. 1845-1860.

A. D. 1861.—Allied intervention in Mexico. See Mexico: A. D. 1861-1867.

A. D. 1866.—War with Peru.—Repulse from Callao. See Peru: A. D. 1826-1876.

A. D. 1866-1873.—Vices and misgovernment of Isabella.—Revolution of 1868.—Flight of the Queen.—Constitution of 1869.—Religious toleration.—Candidates for the vacant throne.—Election of Amadeo of Italy.—Unfriendliness of the nation to him.—His abdication.—"In January, 1866, occurred an insurrection headed by General Prim, a leading officer of the army, which, failing, caused his temporary exile. In June there originated in the barrack of San Gil, a few hundred yards from the palace, a more serious revolt, which extended over a great part of Madrid. In October of the same year the Ministry, in a public proclamation, alleged as a justification for an autocratic exercise of power, that 'revolutionary tendencies constituted an imposing organism with dangerous pretensions; that a rebellion adverse to the fundamental institutions of the country and the dynasty of Isabella, such as had never been seen in Spain, had obtained possession of important municipalities, and triumphed in the deputations from all the provinces,' and that it was necessary to dissolve the municipalities and renew the provisional deputations. . . . By this arbitrary assumption Spain was under as complete a despotism as existed in the neighboring empire of Morocco. The dissatisfaction at such maladministration, such abuses in the government, and the thinly disguised immoralities of the Queen, soon found expression in audible murmurs and severe criticism. These verbal protests were followed by machinations for the overthrow or control of a sovereign subject to ambitious priests and a venal coterie. Two exiles, Marshal Serrano and Marshal Prim, united with Admiral Topete at Cadiz, and began a revolution which soon had the sympathy and co-operation of a large part of the army and the navy. A provisional revolutionary junta of forty-one persons—a few others, notably Sagasta and Martos, were afterwards added—was appointed, which signed decrees and orders having the force and effect of laws. In less than a month Francisco Serrano was authorized by the junta to form a temporary ministry to rule the country until the Cortes should meet. The defeat of the royal troops near Alcolea prevented the return of Isabella to Madrid, and on September 30, 1868, she fled across the border into France. . . . With the flight of the Queen vanished for a time the parliamentary monarchy, and, despite her impotent proclamations from France, and offers of amnesty, a provisional government was at once established. A decree of the Government to take inventories of all the libraries, collections of manuscripts, works of art, or objects of historical value—a measure necessary to make useful and available these treasures, and to prevent spoliation and transfer—was peacefully executed except at Burgos. Here, under instigation of the priests and aided by them, a mob assembled, broke down the doors of the cathedral, assassinated the Governor, wounded the chief of police, and expelled those engaged in making the required examination and inventory. This outbreak, attributed to a clerical and Carlist conspiracy, awakened opposition and horror. A strong pressure was created for the immediate establishment of freedom of

worship. The atrocious butchery at Burgos aroused the inhabitants of the capital. The Nuncio was so imperilled by the excited populace that the diplomatic corps interposed for the safety and protection of their colleague. Marshal Serrano quieted the angry multitude gathered at his residence by saying that the Government had prepared the project of a constitution to be submitted to the Constitutional Assembly, one of whose first articles was liberty of worship. On February 12, 1869, the Constitutional Cortes convoked by the Provisional Government, assembled with unusual pomp and ceremony and with striking demonstrations of popular enthusiasm. . . . The Republicans, among whom the eloquent Castelar was influential, were a compact phalanx, and to them the independent Progresistas, led by General Prim, made overtures which were accepted. On Sunday June 5, 1869, the Constitution was promulgated. . . . While recognizing the provinces and endowing them with important functions, the Cortes rejected the plan of a federal republic, and adhered to the monarchical form of government as corresponding with and a concession to Spanish traditions, and as most likely to secure a larger measure of the liberal principles of the revolution. The Constitution, the legitimate outgrowth of that popular uprising, recognized the natural and inherent rights of man, and established an elective monarchy. . . . Congress was chosen by universal suffrage. The provincial assemblies and the municipal authorities were elected by the people of their respective localities. The ancient privileges of the aristocracy were annulled, and the equality of all men before the law was recognized. . . . The Clerical party claimed the continued maintenance of the Roman Catholic Church and the exclusion of all other worship, but the country had outgrown such intolerance. . . . The Catholic form of faith was retained in the organic law as the religion of the State, but a larger liberty of worship was secured to the people. In Article XXI. the Catholic Apostolic Roman religion was declared the State religion, and the obligation to maintain its worship and ministers was imposed. Foreigners were granted toleration for public and private worship under the limitations of the universal rules of morals and right, and Spaniards, even, professing another than the Catholic religion were to have the like toleration. . . . Spain quietly passed from the anomalous condition of a provisional into a regular constitutional government, the title of Provisional Government having been changed to that of Executive Power. In June a regency was established, and Serrano was chosen by a vote of 193 to 45. From June 16, 1869, the date of Prim's first cabinet, until December 27, 1870, when he was shot [as he rode through the street, by assassins, who escaped], he had four separate ministries besides several changes of individual ministers; and this instability is characteristic of Spanish politics. . . . For the vacant throne some Spaniards turned to the Duke of Montpensier; some to the Court of Portugal, and in default thereof to the house of Savoy. . . . At the moment of greatest embarrassment, the candidature of Leopold, Prince of Hohenzollern, was proposed [— a proposal which led to the Franco-German war: see FRANCE: A. D. 1870 (JUNE — JULY)]. . . . Leopold's declension was a welcome relief. His candidacy being removed, the strife for the throne became fiercer. On November 3, 1870, General Prim announced to the Cortes the Duke of Aosta, son of Victor Emmanuel, as the Ministerial candidate for the crown. Castelar impetuously denounced the attempt to put a foreigner over Spaniards. On the 15th, Amadeo was elected king, receiving on a vote by ballot a majority of seventy-one of those present and a majority of eighteen in a full house. . . . The choice excited no enthusiasm, elicited no applause, nor was a viva given by the multitude outside the building where the Cortes had made a sovereign. Thirty thousand troops, discreetly posted in principal thoroughfares, prevented any hostile demonstration, and the leading Republicans, Figueras, Castelar, and Piyy Margall, advised against any acts of violence. Many journals condemned the Cortes. Grandees protested, placards caricatured and ridiculed. . . . Nevertheless, Zorrilla went to Italy to make the formal tender of the crown, and on January 2, 1871, the prince reached Madrid and took the prescribed oaths of office in the presence of the regent, the Cortes, and the diplomatic corps. The ceremony was brief and simple. The reception by the populace was respectful and cold. The Provisional Government resigned, and a new ministry was appointed, embracing such men as Serrano, Martos, Moret, Sagasta, and Zorrilla. . . . Amadeo never had the friendship of the Carlists nor of the simon-pure Monarchists. The dynasty was offensive to the adherents of Don Carlos and of Alfonso, and to the Republicans, who were opposed to any king. . . . Becoming [after two years] convinced that the Opposition was irreconcilable, that factions were inevitable, that a stable ministry was impossible, Amadeo resolved on the singular course of abdicating the royal authority, and returning to the nation the powers with which he had been intrusted;" and this abdication he performed on the 11th of February, 1873.—J. L. M. Curry, *Constitutional Government in Spain, ch.* 3–4.

ALSO IN: J. A. Harrison, *Spain, ch.* 27–28.

A. D. 1873-1885.—Reign of Alphonso XII., son of Queen Isabella.—On the abdication of King Amadeo, "a republic was declared by the Cortes, and the gifted and eminent statesman, Castelar, strove to give it a constitutional and conservative character. But during the disorders of the last few years the Basque provinces of Navarre and Biscay had been in a ferment excited by the Carlists. The grandson of the Don Carlos who had troubled Spain from 1833 to 1839 appeared in those provinces which were still favourable to his cause, and this ardent young champion of divine right of course received the support of French legitimists. On the other hand, the doctrines of the Paris Commune had found in the south of Spain many adherents, who desired that their country should form a federation of provincial republics. Malaga, Seville, Cadiz, Cartagena, and Valencia revolted, and were reduced only after sharp fighting. A group of generals then determined to offer the crown to Alphonso, the young son of Isabella II, in whose favour she had abdicated in 1868. Castelar, the moderate republican statesman, reluctantly consented, and young Alphonso XII, on landing in Spain, 1874, received the support of most republicans and Carlists, disgusted by the excesses of their extreme partisans. His generals gradually hemmed

in the Carlists along the north coast by battles near Bilbao and Irun; and when the rebels shot a German subject Prince Bismarck sent German ships to aid the Alphonsists. These in the spring of 1876 forced Don Carlos and most of his supporters to cross the French frontier. The Madrid Government now determined to put an end to the fueros or local privileges of the Basque provinces, which they had misused in openly preparing this revolt. So Biscay and Navarre henceforth contributed to the general war expenses of Spain, and their conscripts were incorporated with the regular army of Spain. Thus the last municipal and provincial privileges of the old Kingdom of Navarre vanished, and national unity became more complete in Spain, as in every other country of Europe except Austria and Turkey. The Basque provinces resisted the change which placed them on a level with the rest of Spain, and have not yet become reconciled to the Madrid Government. The young King, Alphonso XII, had many other difficulties to meet. The government was disorganised, the treasury empty, and the country nearly ruined; but he had a trusty adviser in Canovas del Castillo, a man of great prudence and talent, who, whether prime minister or out of office, has really held power in his hands. He succeeded in unifying the public debt, and by lowering its rate of interest he averted State bankruptcy. He also strove to free the administration from the habits of bribe-taking which had long enfeebled and disgraced it; but in this he met with less success, as also in striving for purity of parliamentary election. . . . The Senate is composed of (1) nobles, (2) deputies elected by the corporations and wealthy classes, and (3) of life senators appointed by the crown. The Chamber of Deputies is elected by universal suffrage, one deputy for every 50,000 inhabitants. The king or either House of Parliament has the right of proposing laws. In 1883 King Alphonso paid a visit to Berlin, and was made honorary colonel of a Uhlan regiment. For this he was hooted and threatened by the Parisians on his visit to the French capital; and this reception increased the coldness of Spain toward the French, who had aggrieved their southern neighbour by designs on Morocco. The good understanding between Spain and Germany was overclouded by a dispute about the Caroline Islands in the Pacific, which Spain rightly regarded as her own. This aggravated an illness of Alphonso, who died suddenly (November 25, 1885). His young widow, as queen-regent for her infant child, has hitherto [1889] succeeded with marvellous tact."—J. H. Rose, *A Century of Continental History, ch.* 43.

A. D. 1885-1894.—Alphonso XIII.—At the time of this writing (November, 1894), the queen-regent, Maria Christina, is still reigning in the name of her young son, Alphonso XIII.

SPALATO. See SALONA, ANCIENT.

SPANISH AMERICA: A. D. 1492-1517.—Discoveries and early settlements. See AMERICA: A. D. 1492, to 1513–1517.

A. D. 1517-1524.—Discovery and conquest of Mexico. See AMERICA: A. D. 1517–1518; and MEXICO: 1519, to 1521–1524.

A. D. 1527-1533.—Discovery and conquest of Peru. See AMERICA: A. D. 1524–1528; and PERU: A. D. 1528–1531, and 1531–1533.

A. D. 1533.—Conquest of the kingdom of Quito. See ECUADOR.

A. D. 1535-1550. — Spanish conquests in Chile. See CHILE: A. D. 1450–1724.

A. D. 1536-1538. — Conquest of New Granada. See COLOMBIAN STATES: A. D. 1536–1731.

A. D. 1542-1568. — Establishment of the audiencias of Quito, Charcas, New Granada, and Chile, under the viceroyalty of Peru. See AUDIENCIAS.

A. D. 1546-1724. — The Araucanian War. See CHILE: A. D. 1450–1724.

A. D. 1580.—Final founding of the city of Buenos Ayres. See ARGENTINE REPUBLIC: A. D. 1580–1777.

A. D. 1608-1767.—The Jesuits in Paraguay. See PARAGUAY: A. D. 1608–1873.

A. D. 1620.—Formation of the government of Rio de La Plata. See ARGENTINE REPUBLIC: A. D. 1580–1777.

A. D. 1767.—Expulsion of the Jesuits. See PARAGUAY: A. D. 1608–1873.

A. D. 1776.—Creation of the viceroyalty of Buenos Ayres. See ARGENTINE REPUBLIC: A. D. 1580–1777; and PERU: A. D. 1550–1816.

A. D. 1810-1816.—Revolt, independence and confederation of the Argentine Provinces. See ARGENTINE REPUBLIC: A. D. 1806–1820.

A. D. 1810-1818. — Chilean independence achieved. See CHILE: A. D. 1810–1818.

A. D. 1810-1821.—The War of Independence in Venezuela and New Granada. See COLOMBIAN STATES: A. D. 1810–1819.

A. D. 1811.—Paraguayan independence accomplished. See PARAGUAY: A. D. 1608–1873.

A. D. 1820-1826. — The independence of Mexico. — Brief Empire of Iturbide. — The Federal Republic established. See MEXICO: A. D. 1820–1826.

A. D. 1821.—Independence acquired in the Central American States. See CENTRAL AMERICA: A. D. 1821–1871.

A. D. 1824.—Peruvian independence won at Ayacucho. See PERU: A. D. 1820–1826.

A. D. 1826.—The Congress of Panama. See COLOMBIAN STATES: A. D. 1826.

A. D. 1828.—The Banda Oriental becomes the Republic of Uruguay. See ARGENTINE REPUBLIC: A. D. 1819–1874.

SPANISH ARMADA, The. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1588.

SPANISH COINS.—"The early chroniclers make their reckonings of values under different names at different times. Thus during the discoveries of Columbus we hear of little else but 'maravedis'; then the 'peso de oro' takes the lead, together with the 'castellano'; all along 'marco' and 'ducado' being occasionally used. At the beginning of the 16th century, and before and after, Spanish values were reckoned from a mark of silver, which was the standard. A mark was half a pound either of gold or silver. The gold mark was divided into 50 castellanos; the silver mark into eight ounces. In the reign of Ferdinand and Isabella the mark was divided by law into 65 'reales de vellon' of 34 maravedis each, making 2,210 maravedis in a mark. . . . In the reign of Alfonso XI., 1312–1350, there were 125 maravedis to the mark, while in the reign of Ferdinand VII., 1808–1833, a mark was

divided into 5,440 maravedis. In Spanish America a 'real' is one-eighth of a 'peso,' and equal to 2¼ reales de vellon. The peso contains one ounce of silver; it was formerly called 'peso de ocho reales de plata,' whence came the term 'pieces of eight,' a vulgarism at one time in vogue among the merchants and buccaneers in the West Indies. . . . The castellano, the one fiftieth of the golden mark, in the reign of Ferdinand and Isabella, was equivalent to 490 maravedis of that day. The 'peso de oro,' according to Oviedo, was exactly equivalent to the castellano, and either was one third greater than the ducado or ducat. The 'doblon'. . . was first struck by Ferdinand and Isabella as a gold coin of the weight of two castellanos. The modern doubloon is an ounce of coined gold, and is worth 16 pesos fuertes. Reduced to United States currency, the peso fuerte, as slightly alloyed bullion, is in weight nearly enough equivalent to one dollar. Therefore a mark of silver is equal to 8 dollars; a piece of eight, equal to one peso, which equals one dollar; a real de vellon, 5 cents; a Spanish-American real, 12½ cents; a maravedi, $\frac{100}{1776}$ of a cent; a castellano, or peso de oro $2.56; a doubloon $5.14; a ducat, $1.92; a mark of gold $128, assuming the United States alloy. The fact that a castellano was equivalent to only 490 maravedis shows the exceedingly high value of silver as compared with gold at the period in question."—H. H. Bancroft, *Hist. of the Pacific States, v.* 1, *pp.* 192–193, *foot-note.*

SPANISH CONSPIRACY, The. See LOUISIANA: A. D. 1785–1800.

SPANISH ERA, The. See ERA, SPANISH.

SPANISH FURY, The. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1575–1577.

SPANISH INQUISITION, The. See INQUISITION: A. D. 1203–1525.

SPANISH MAIN, The.—"The Spanish main was simply the mainland, terra firma, of Spanish America, as opposed to the islands: but the term 'terra firma' was specially applied to the northern part of South America, extending 'all along the North Sea from the Pacific Ocean to the mouth of the river of Amazons upon the Atlantic' (Burke, European Settlements in America, Pt. III., chap. xvi.), and comprising the towns of Panama, Carthagena, and Porto Bello [see TIERRA FIRME]. Longfellow blunders in the 'Wreck of the Hesperus' when he speaks of the old sailor who 'had sailed the Spanish main.'"—C. P. Lucas, *Hist. Geog. of the British Colonies, v.* 2, *p.* 35, *foot-note.*

SPANISH MARCH, The. See SPAIN: A. D. 778.

SPANISH MARRIAGES, The question of the. See FRANCE: A. D. 1841–1848.

SPANISH SUCCESSION, The War of the. See SPAIN: A. D. 1698–1700, and after; NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1702–1704, and after; GERMANY: A. D. 1702, and after; ITALY: A. D. 1701–1713; NEW ENGLAND: A. D. 1702–1710; and UTRECHT: A. D. 1712–1714.

SPARTA: The City.—Its situation, origin and growth.—Laconia.—"Hollow Lacedæmon."—"Laconia is formed by two mountain-chains running immediately from Arcadia [from the center to the southeastern extremity of Peloponnesus], and enclosing the river Eurotas, whose source is separated from that of an Arcadian stream by a very trifling elevation. The Eurotas is, for some way below the city of Sparta, a rapid mountain-stream; then, after forming a cascade, it stagnates into a morass; but lower down it passes over a firm soil in a gentle and direct course. Near the town of Sparta rocks and hills approach the banks on both sides, and almost entirely shut in the river both above and below the town: this enclosed plain is without doubt the 'hollow Lacedæmon' of Homer."—C. O. Müller, *Hist. and Antiq. of the Doric Race, bk.* 1, *ch.* 4.—Upon the Dorian invasion and occupation of Peloponnesus (see DORIANS AND IONIANS) the city and neighborhood of Sparta in Laconia,—i. e. Sparta and 'hollow Lacedæmon,'—became the seat of the dominant state which they founded in the peninsula. The conquerors, themselves, and their descendants, were the only full citizens of this Spartan state and were called Spartiatæ or Spartans. The prior inhabitants of the country were reduced to political dependence, in a class called the Periœci, or else to actual serfdom in the more degraded class known as Helots. "Sparta was not, like other towns of the Greeks, composed of a solid body of houses, but, originally in a rural and open situation on the river and its canals, it gradually stretched out into the open country, and Dorians lived far beyond Sparta along the entire valley, without the inhabitants of remoter points being on that account in any less degree citizens of Sparta than those dwelling by the ford of the Eurotas. They were all Spartans, as by a stricter term they were called, as distinguished from the Lacedæmonians. . . . Strictly apart from this exclusive community of Spartiatæ there remained, with its ancient conditions of life intact, the older population of the land, which dwelt scattered on the mountains surrounding the land of the Spartiatæ on all sides (hence called the dwellers-around, or Periœci). More than trebling the Spartiatæ in number, they cultivated the incomparably less remunerative arable land of the mountains, the precipitous declivities of which they made available by means of terraced walls for cornfields and vineyards. . . . Free proprietors on their own holdings, they, according to primitive custom, offered their tribute to the kings. The country people, on the other hand, residing on the fields of the Spartiatæ, met with a harder fate. Part of them probably consisted of peasants on the domains; others had been conquered in the course of internal feuds. They were left on the fields which had been once their own, on the condition of handing over to the Spartiatæ quartered upon them an important portion of their produce. This oppression provoked several risings; and we must assume that the ancient sea-town of Helos was for a time the centre of one of these outbreaks. For this is the only admissible explanation of the opinion universally prevailing among the ancients, that from that town is derived the name of the Helots."—E. Curtius, *Hist. of Greece, v.* 1, *bk.* 2, *ch.* 1.

ALSO IN: G. F. Schömann, *Antiq. of Greece: The State, pt.* 3, *ch.* 1.

The Constitution ascribed to Lycurgus.—"Sparta was the city from which the Dorians slowly extended their dominion over a considerable portion of Peloponnesus. Of the progress of her power we have only the most meagre information. . . . The internal condition of Sparta at this early period is uniformly

described as one of strife and bad government, a condition of affairs which was certainly unfavourable to external development and conquest. Herodotus attributes these dissensions, at least in part, to the mutual animosity of the two royal families; the twin sons of Aristodemus quarrelled all their lives, and their descendants after them did the same. Plutarch, on the other hand, speaks of quarrels between the kings and the people. . . . Whatever the cause, it is more certain than any other fact in early Spartan history that the condition of the country was for a long time one of internal strife and dissension. It was the great merit of Lycurgus to have put an end to this disastrous state of affairs. Lycurgus is the foremost name in Spartan history. Tradition is nearly unanimous in describing this lawgiver as the author of the prosperity of Sparta, and the founder of her peculiar institutions, but about the date and the events of his life the greatest uncertainty prevailed. . . . Thucydides, though he does not mention Lycurgus, asserts that the form of the government had continued the same in Sparta for more than four hundred years before the end of the Peloponnesian war. In his opinion, therefore, the reforms of Lycurgus were introduced shortly before 804 B. C. This date is considerably later than that usually given to Lycurgus, on the authority of the ancient chronologers. . . . Herodotus tells us that Lycurgus, when visiting the Delphic shrine, was hailed by the priestess as a being more than human, and some authorities asserted that the Spartan institutions were revealed to him there. The Lacedaemonians, however, regarded Crete as the source of their peculiar arrangements [see CRETE]. They were thus enabled to connect them with the great name of Minos, and derive their authority from Zeus himself. . . . Plutarch has fortunately transcribed the text of the Rhetrae, or ordinances, which were given to Lycurgus at Delphi. There does not seem to be any reason to doubt that these were the oldest ordinances known at Sparta, or that they formed the basis of their 'good government.' They were therefore the oldest political ordinances known in Hellas, and, indeed, in the world. 'Found a temple to Zeus Hellanius, and Athena Hellania, arrange the tribes, and the Obes, thirty in number, establish the Gerousia with the Archagetae. Summon the people for meeting from time to time between Babyca and the Cnacion, there bring forward and decide (reject). The people are to have the supreme power.' Thus the first duty of the lawgiver was to found a public sanctuary which should be as it were the centre of the community. Then the people were to be arranged in tribes and Obes. The division into tribes was not a new one; from the first the Dorians at Sparta, as elsewhere, when free from the admixture of external elements, were divided into three tribes, Hylleis, Dymanes, Pamphyli, but it is possible that some changes were now introduced, regulating the internal arrangement of the tribe. In each tribe were ten Obes, of which we know nothing beyond the name. They appear to have been local divisions. As the Gerousia [see GERUSIA], including the kings, contained thirty members, we may conjecture that each Obe was represented in the Senate, and therefore that the two kings were the representatives of two distinct Obes. The Archagetae are the kings, or leaders of the people. From time to time the community were to be summoned to a meeting. . . . Before the assembled people measures were to be introduced that they might decide upon them, for no measure was valid which had not received the sanction of the whole people. The elements with which these ordinances deal — the Kings, the Council and the Assembly — appear in the Homeric poems, and grew naturally out of the patriarchal government of the tribe. The work of Lycurgus did not consist in creating new elements, but in consolidating those which already existed into a harmonious whole. . . . Three other ordinances which are ascribed to Lycurgus forbade (1) the use of written laws; (2) the use of any tools but the axe and saw in building a house; (3) frequent wars upon the same enemies. He is also said to have forbidden the use of coined money in Sparta. Neither gold nor silver was to be used for purposes of exchange, but bars of iron, which by their small value and great bulk rendered money dealings on any large scale impossible. The iron of these bars was also made unusually brittle in order that it might be useless for ordinary purposes. Such precepts were doubtless observed at Sparta, though they may not have been derived from Lycurgus. The training which every Spartan underwent was intended to diminish the sphere of positive law as much as possible, and to encourage the utmost simplicity and even rudeness of life. . . . About a century after Lycurgus, in the reign of Theopompus, two changes of great importance were made in the Spartan constitution. The veto which the earlier rhetra had allowed to the assembled people was cancelled, and a new law was introduced, which gave the ultimate control to the Gerontes and Kings. 'If the people decide crookedly, the elders and chiefs shall put it back,' i. e. shall reverse the popular decision. Under what circumstances this ordinance, which is said to have been obtained from Delphi, was passed, we do not know, nor is it quite clear how it consists with what we find recorded of the constitutional history of Sparta in later times. . . . The second innovation was even more important. Though Herodotus ascribes the institution of the Ephoralty [see EPHORS] to Lycurgus, it seems more correct to follow Aristotle and others in ascribing it to Theopompus. The Ephors, who were five in number, appear in the first instance to have been of no great importance. But as they were intimately connected with the commons, elected from and by them as their representatives, we must assume that the ephoralty was a concession to the people, and it may have been a compensation for the loss of the right of voting in the assembly. In time the ephors grew to be the most important officers in the state, both in war and in peace. They were associated with the council, they presided in the assembly, and even the kings were not exempt from their power. To this result the growing dread of 'a tyrannis,' like that at Corinth or Sicyon, and the increasing importance of the Spartan training, which the ephors superintended, in a great measure contributed. . . . The kings were the leaders of the army. For a time they always took the field together, but owing to the dissensions of Cleomenes and Demaratus, a law was passed that one king only should go out with the army, and it was henceforth the custom for one king only to be absent from Sparta, at a

time. The kings had the right of making war on whom they would, and no one could prevent them, on pain of being under a curse, but as they were liable to be brought to trial on their return for failure in an expedition, they usually obtained the consent of the ephors or the assembly before going. . . . The origin of the dual monarchy, which from the first was so distinctive a feature of the Spartan government, is very obscure, and many attempts have been made to explain it. It may have arisen by a fusion of the native and immigrant races, each of which was allowed to retain its own prince in the new community. . . . It is perhaps more reasonable to assume that the two kings represent two leading families, each of which had a claim to give a chief to the community. That two families holding equal rights should be regarded as descended from the twin sons of the Dorian founder of Sparta is merely one of the fictions which of necessity arose in the period when all political unions and arrangements were expressed in the terms of genealogical connection. . . . The Apella was an assembly of all the Spartan citizens who had reached the age of thirty years. . . . In historical times it was presided over by the ephors. No speaking was allowed except by officers of State and persons duly invited, and perhaps the Senators. The votes were given by acclamation. The assembly decided on war and peace, treaties, and foreign politics generally; it elected the ephors and gerontes. . . . More important for the development of Sparta than her political constitution was the education and training which her citizens received. . . . The Spartan did not exist for himself but for his city; for her service he was trained from birth, and the most intimate relations of his life were brought under her control. In the secluded valley of the Eurotas, where till the time of Epaminondas no invader ever set foot, amid profound peace, he nevertheless led the life of a warrior in the field. His strength and endurance were tested to the utmost; he was not permitted to surrender himself to the charm of family life and domestic affections. Even when allowed to marry, he spent but little time at home; his children, if thought worthy of life, were taken from him at an early age to go through the same training in which he himself had been brought up. Only when he reached the age of sixty years, at which he could no longer serve his country in the field, was he permitted to enjoy the feeling of personal freedom."—E. Abbott, *Hist. of Greece, pt.* 1, *ch.* 6.

Also in: G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece, pt.* 2, *ch.* 6.—G. W. Cox, *Hist. of Greece, bk.* 1, *ch.* 5.—C. O. Müller, *Hist. and Antiquities of the Doric Race, bk.* 3 (*v.* 2).

B. C. 743-510.—The First and Second Messenian Wars.—Military supremacy in Peloponnesus established.—"The effect of the Lycurgean institutions was to weld the people of Sparta into what Grote well denominates a 'military brotherhood'—the most potent military machine which at that time, and for long after, existed in Greece or in the world. Had their political ambition and ability been proportionate, it is difficult to doubt that the Lacedæmonians might have anticipated the career of the Romans; but their inability to produce really great statesmen, and the iron rigidity of their political system, placed in their path effectual barriers to the attainment of such grandeur. . . . The first object of their attacks was the neighbouring Dorian kingdom of Messenia. The kinship between the two peoples and their rulers had previously kept them on friendly terms. It was symbolized and expressed by joint sacrifices, annually celebrated at a temple in honour of Artemis which stood on the borders between the two countries, near the source of the river Neda. It was a quarrel that broke out at these annual rites which led to the outbreak of the first Messenian war, about 743 B. C. The circumstances of the quarrel were differently related by the two parties; but it resulted in the death of Teleclus, one of the Spartan kings. His subjects invaded Messenia to obtain redress. At first the struggle was of an indecisive character, but ultimately the Messenians were obliged to take refuge on the fortified mountain of Ithome, and all the rest of their country was overrun and conquered by their persistent enemies. After the war had lasted twenty years, the Messenian garrison was compelled to abandon Ithome, the fortifications of which were razed by the Spartans, and Messenia became part of the Lacedæmonian territory, —all its inhabitants who refused to submit being driven into exile. Pausanius and other ancient writers give long details of the events of this twenty years' struggle, the great hero of which was the Messenian king Aristomenes; but these details are as legendary as the exploits of the Homeric heroes, and all that is certainly known about the war is that it ended in the subjugation of Messenia. The severity and oppression with which the conquered people were ruled led them, about forty years later, to rise up in revolt, and another struggle of seventeen years' duration followed. In this, again, Aristomenes is represented as the Messenian leader, although he had put an end to his own life at the unsuccessful close of the former contest; and the later Hellenic writers tried to get over this impossibility by declaring that the Aristomenes of the second war must have been a descendant of the earlier hero bearing the same name. In the course of the war the Spartans suffered severely, as the Messenians had the support of other Peloponnesian communities — especially the Arcadians — who had begun to dread the strength and arrogance of the Lacedæmonians. Ultimately, however, the revolt was crushed, and from that time till the days of Epaminondas, Messenia remained a part of the Laconian territory [see Messenian Wars, First and Second]. To Sparta it was an important acquisition, for the plain of the Pamisus was the most fertile district in Peloponnesus. The Spartans next became aggressive on the eastern and northern frontiers of their territory. Among the numerous independent communities of Arcadia, the two most important were Tegea and Mantinea, in the extreme east of the Arcadian territory. With these cities, especially the former, the Spartans had some severe struggles, but were not able to conquer them, though they established a dominant influence, and reduced them to the position of dependent allies. From Argos . . . the Lacedæmonians wrested, in the course of two centuries, the strip of territory between the Parnon range and the sea from Thyrea down to the Malean promontory. By the beginning of the 6th century B. C. they were masters of two-fifths of the whole area of Peloponnesus — a

territory of something more than 3,000 square miles. To modern notions, such a territory, which is smaller in extent than more than one Scottish county, seems utterly insignificant; but it sufficed to make Sparta the largest and strongest state in Hellas, and even at the pinnacle of her power she never made any further addition to her possessions in Peloponnesus. Protected from invasion by impregnable natural defences, and possessing a military discipline, a social and political unity, such as no other Grecian community could boast, the Lacedæmonians possessed peculiar advantages in the competition for the Hellenic leadership. . . . It was about the close of the 6th century B. C. that Sparta, having asserted her supremacy in Peloponnesus, began to take an active part in the affairs of the Hellenic communities outside the peninsula. . . . In 510 B. C. her king, Cleomenes, went to Athens at the head of a large force to obey the mandate of the Delphic oracle and 'liberate the city' by the expulsion of the Pisistratids."—C. H. Hanson, *The Land of Greece, ch.* 11.

ALSO IN: C. Thirlwall, *Hist. of Greece, ch.* 9.—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece, pt.* 2, *ch.* 7–8.

B. C. 509-506.— Persistent undertakings of Cleomenes to restore tyranny at Athens, opposed by the Corinthians and other allies. See ATHENS: B. C. 509–506.

B. C. 508.—Interference of King Cleomenes at Athens, and its failure. See ATHENS: B. C. 510–507.

B. C. 501.—Refusal of aid to the Ionian revolt. See PERSIA: B. C. 521–493.

B. C. 496.—War with Argos.—Prostration of the Argive state. See ARGOS: B. C. 496–421.

B. C. 492-491.—Headship in Greece recognized.—Defiance of the Persian king.—Enforced unity of Greece for war. See GREECE: B. C. 492–491.

B. C. 481-479.—Congress at Corinth.—Organized Hellenic Union against Persia.—The Spartan headship. See GREECE: B. C. 481–479.

B. C. 480.—The Persian War.—Leonidas and his Three Hundred at Thermopylæ. See GREECE: B. C. 480 THERMOPYLÆ.

B. C. 478.—Interference to forbid the rebuilding of the walls of Athens, foiled by Themistocles. See ATHENS: B. C. 479–478.

B. C. 478-477.—Mad conduct of Pausanias at Byzantium.— Alienation of the Asiatic Greeks.—Loss of the leadership of the Greek world.—Formation of the Confederacy of Delos, with Athens at its head. See GREECE: B. C. 478–477.

B. C. 464-455.— The great Earthquake.— The Third Messenian War.—Offensive rebuff to Athenian friendliness. See MESSENIAN WARS: THE THIRD.

B. C. 462-458. — Embittered enmity at Athens.—Rise of Pericles and the democratic Anti-Spartan party.—Athenian alliance with Argos, Thessaly, and Megara. See ATHENS: B. C. 466–454.

B. C. 457.—Interference in Phocis.—Collision with the Athenians and victory at Tanagra. See GREECE: B. C. 458–456.

B. C. 453.—Five years truce with Athens. See ATHENS: B. C. 460–449.

B. C. 449-445.—Aid to revolts in Bœotia, Eubœa and Megara against Athenian rule or influence.— The Thirty Years Truce. See GREECE: B. C. 449–445.

B. C. 440. — Interference with Athens in Samos opposed by Corinth. See ATHENS: B. C. 440–437.

B. C. 432-431.—Hearing of charges against Athens.— Congress of Allies.— Decision for war.—Theban attack on Platæa.—Opening of the Peloponnesian War. See GREECE: B. C. 432–431.

B. C. 431-429.—First and second years of the Peloponnesian War: Invasions of Attica. —Plague at Athens.—Death of Pericles. See GREECE: B. C. 431–429.

B. C. 429-427.— The Peloponnesian War: Siege of Platæa. See GREECE: B. C. 429–427 SIEGE OF PLATÆA.

B. C. 428-427.—The Peloponnesian War: Aid to the insurgent Mityleneans.—Its failure. See GREECE: B. C. 429–427 PHORMIO'S SEA-FIGHTS.

B. C. 425.—The Peloponnesian War: Catastrophe at Sphacteria.—Peace pleaded for and refused by Athens. See GREECE: B. C. 425.

B. C. 424-421.—Peloponnesian War: Successes of Brasidas in Chalcidice.—Athenian defeat at Delium.—Death of Brasidas.—Peace of Nikias. See GREECE: B. C. 424–421.

B. C. 421-418.—The Peloponnesian War: New hostile combinations.—The Argive confederacy.—War in Argos and Arcadia.—Victory at Mantinea. See GREECE: B. C. 421–418.

B. C. 415-413.—The Peloponnesian War: Help to Syracuse against the Athenians.— Comfort to the fugitive Alcibiades. See SYRACUSE: B. C. 415–413.

B. C. 413-412.—The Peloponnesian War: Aid to the revolting cities in Asia and the Ægean.— Intrigues of Alcibiades. See GREECE: B. C. 413–412.

B. C. 413.— Negotiations with Persian satraps.— Subsidies for war against Athens.— Invasion of Attica.—The Decelian War. See GREECE: B. C. 413.

B. C. 411-407.—Athenian victories at Cynossema and Abydos.— Exploits of Alcibiades.— His return to Athens.— His second deposition and exile. See GREECE: B. C. 411–407.

B. C. 406.—The Peloponnesian War: Defeat at Arginusæ. See GREECE: B. C. 406.

B. C. 405.—The Peloponnesian War: Decisive victory at Ægospotami. See GREECE: B. C. 405.

B. C. 404.— End of the Peloponnesian War: Surrender of Athens. See ATHENS: B. C. 404.

B. C. 404-403.— The organizing of Spartan supremacy.—The Harmosts in power.— The overthrow of Athenian power in the Greek world, made final by the battle of Ægospotami, B. C. 405, rendered Sparta supreme, and established her in a sovereignty of affairs which is often alluded to as the Spartan, or Lacedæmonian Empire. The cities which had been either allied or subject to Athens were now submissive to the Spartan conqueror, Lysander. "He availed himself of his strength to dissolve the popular system of government in all the towns which had belonged to the Attic confederation, and to commit the government to a fixed body of men enjoying his confidence. As at Athens the Thirty

[see ATHENS: B. C. 404–403], so elsewhere Commissions of Ten [called Dekarchies] were established; and in order to give security and strength to those governing bodies, detachments of Spartan troops were placed by their side, under the command of a Harmost. This measure, again, was, by no means a novel invention. From an early period the Lacedæmonians had been in the habit of despatching Harmostæ (i. e. military governors) into the rural districts, to hold sway over the Perioeci, and to keep the latter in strict subjection to the capital. Such Harmosts were subsequently also sent abroad; and this, of itself, showed how the Spartans had no intention of recognizing various kinds of subjection, and how they at bottom designed to make no essential difference between subject rural communities in Laconia and the foreign towns which had of their own accord, or otherwise, submitted to the power of Sparta. The duration of the Harmosts' tenure of office was not defined."—E. Curtius, *Hist. of Greece, bk.* 5, *ch.* 1 (*v.* 4).

ALSO IN: G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece, pt.* 2, *ch.* 72.—G. F. Schömann, *Antiq. of Greece: The State, pt.* 3, *ch.* 1.—C. Sankey, *The Spartan and Theban Supremacies, ch.* 1.

B. C. 399-387.—War with Persia and with a hostile league in Greece.—Struggle for the Corinthian isthmus.—Restored independence of Athens.—The Peace of Antalcidas. See GREECE: B. C. 399–387.

B. C. 385.—Destruction of Mantinea. See GREECE: B. C. 385.

B. C. 383.—Treacherous seizure of the Kadmeia of Thebes. See GREECE: B. C. 383.

B. C. 383-379.—Overthrow of the Olynthian Confederacy. See GREECE: B. C. 383–379.

B. C. 379-371.—Liberation and triumph of Thebes.—Spartan supremacy broken at Leuctra. See GREECE: B. C. 379–371.

B. C. 371-362.—The conflict with Thebes.—Two attempts of Epaminondas against the city.—The battle of Mantinea. See GREECE: B. C. 371–362.

B. C. 353-337.—Independent attitude towards Philip of Macedon. See GREECE: B. C. 357–336.

B. C. 317.—Building of Walls.—It was not until about the year 317 B. C., during the distractions which followed the death of Alexander the Great, that walls were built around the city of Sparta. "The maintenance of Sparta as an unwalled city was one of the deepest and most cherished of the Lykurgean traditions; a standing proof of the fearless bearing and self-confidence of the Spartans against dangers from without. The erection of the walls showed their own conviction, but too well borne out by the real circumstances around them, that the pressure of the foreigner had become so overwhelming as not to leave them even safety at home."—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece, pt.* 2, *ch.* 96.

B. C. 272.—Siege by Pyrrhus.—Not many years after the walls of Sparta were first built the city was subjected to a siege by Pyrrhus, the ambitious Epirotic king. There were two claimants to the Spartan crown, and Pyrrhus, espousing the cause of the unsuccessful one, marched into Peloponnesus with a powerful army, (B. C. 272) and assailed the Lacedæmonian capital. He was repulsed and repulsed again, and gave up the attempt at last, marching away to Argos, where his interference in local quarrels had been solicited. He perished there, ignominiously, in another abortive enterprise, being killed by a tile flung down by a woman's hand, from a housetop overlooking the street in which he was attempting to manage the retreat of his discomfited forces.—C. Thirlwall, *Hist. of Greece, ch.* 60.—See MACEDONIA, &c.: B. C. 277–244.

B. C. 227-221.—Downfall in the Cleomenic War. See GREECE: B. C. 280–146.

A. D. 267.—Ravaged by the Goths. See GOTHS: A. D. 258–267.

A. D. 395.—Plundered by the Goths. See GOTHS: A. D. 395.

SPARTACUS, The Rising of.—Schools for the training of gladiators, to supply the barbarous amusement which the Romans delighted in, were numerous at Rome and throughout Italy. The men placed in these schools were slaves, criminal prisoners, or unfortunates whose parents abandoned them in infancy. As a rule, they were forced into the brutal profession and the schools which trained them for it were places of confinement and restraint. From one of these schools, at Capua, some seventy or more gladiators escaped, in the year 73 B. C., and fled to the mountains. They had for their leader a Thracian, named Spartacus, who proved to be a soldier of remarkable ability and energy. Stationing himself at first on Mount Vesuvius, Spartacus was joined by other slaves and fugitives, until he had a large force under his command. Again and again the Roman armies sent against him were defeated and the insurgents equipped themselves with captured arms. Nola, Nuceria, and other towns in Southern Italy fell into their hands. In the year 72 they moved toward North Italy, routing two consular armies on their way, and were thought to be intending to escape beyond the Alps; but, after another great victory at Mutina (Modena) over the proconsul of Gallia Cisalpina, Spartacus turned southward again, for some unexplained reason, and allowed himself to be blockaded in the extremity of Lucania, by M. Licinius Crassus. In this situation he sought to make terms, but his proposals were rejected. He then succeeded in breaking through the Roman lines, but was pursued by Crassus and overwhelmingly defeated at Mount Calamatius, where 35,000 of the insurgents are said to have been slain. The flying remnant was again brought to bay near Petilia, in Bruttium, and there Spartacus ended his life. A few thousand of the insurgents who escaped from the field were intercepted by Pompey and cut to pieces, while 6,000 captives were crucified, with Roman brutality, along the road between Capua and Rome.—G. Long, *Decline of the Roman Republic, v.* 3, *ch.* 2.—See, also, ROME: B. C. 78–68.

SPARTAN EMPIRE. See SPARTA: B. C. 404–403.

SPARTAN TRAINING. See EDUCATION, ANCIENT: GREECE; also, SPARTA, THE CONSTITUTION, &c.

SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.—"The splendor of the position of Speaker of the British House of Commons is perhaps not generally realized. The appointment, nominally for the duration of but one Parliament, generally extends over several. . . . Chosen from among the members, subject to the approval of the Crown, the Speaker can be re-

moved only upon an address to the Crown. Besides a palatial residence occupying one wing of the Houses of Parliament, and a large patronage, he receives a salary of £5,000 a year. At the end of his labors he is rewarded with a peerage and a pension of £4,000 per annum for two lives. He is a member of the Privy Council, and the first gentleman in the United Kingdom, taking rank after barons. . . . The wig and gown which he wears, the state and ceremony with which he is surrounded, doubtless contribute to the isolation and impressiveness of his position. . . . When, at the opening of proceedings, he makes his way in state from his residence to the Chamber, through the corridors used by members for passing to the committee, library, and refreshment rooms, it is against etiquette for any one to be found therein. When on summer evenings he and his family take the air upon the portion of the terrace which is outside his residence, there is no more thought of approaching them than there would be if he were a Grand Lama. When in the chair, he can be approached only upon strictly business matters. His levees, held twice a year and open to all members, can be attended only in court costume, sword by the side."—*The Nation, Aug.* 17, 1893 (*p.* 117).

SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES. See Congress of the United States.

SPECIE CIRCULAR, The. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1835–1837.

SPENCEAN PHILANTHROPISTS.—SPENCEANS. See England: A. D. 1816–1820.

SPEUSINII. See Scythians, or Scythæ, of Athens.

SPHACTERIA, Capture of. See Greece: B. C. 425.

SPHINX, The.—"About six hundred yards to the S. E. of the Great Pyramid is the Sphinx. The Sphinx is a natural rock, to which has been given, more or less accurately, the external appearance of that mystic animal. The head alone has been sculptured. The body is formed of the rock itself, supplemented, where defective, by a somewhat clumsy masonry of limestone. The total height of the monument is 19 metres 80 centimetres, equal to 65 English feet. The ear measures 6 feet 5 inches; the nose 5 feet 10 inches; and the mouth 7 feet 8 inches. The face, in its widest part, across the cheek, is 4 metres 15 centimetres, that is, 13 feet 7 inches. Its origin is still a matter of doubt. At one time it was supposed to be a monument of the reign of Thothmes IV. (XVIIIth dynasty). But we know now, thanks to a stone in the Boulak Museum, that the Sphinx was already in existence when Cheops (who preceded Chephren) gave orders for the repairs which this stone commemorates. It must also be remembered that the Sphinx is the colossal image of an Egyptian god called Armachis."—A. Mariette, *Monuments of Upper Egypt, p.* 70.

SPICHERN, OR FORBACH, Battle of. See France: A. D. 1870 (July—August).

SPINNING-JENNY, Invention of the. See Cotton Manufacture.

SPIRES: A. D. 1526-1529.—The imperial Diets.—Legal recognition of the Reformed religion, and its withdrawal.—Protest of Lutheran princes. See Papacy: A. D. 1525–1529.

A. D. 1689.—Destruction by the French. See France: A. D. 1689–1690.

A. D. 1713.—Taken by the French. See Utrecht: A. D. 1712–1714.

SPOILS SYSTEM, The. See Civil-Service Reform in the United States.

SPOLETO: A. D. 1155.—Burned by Frederick Barbarossa. See Italy: A. D. 1154–1162.

SPOLIA OPIMA.—"The proudest of all military trophies were Spolia Opima, which could be gained only when the commander-in-chief of a Roman army engaged and overthrew in single combat the commander-in-chief of the enemy. . . . Roman history afforded but three examples of legitimate Spolia Opima. The first were won by Romulus from Acro, King of the Ceninenses; the second by Aulus Cornelius Cossus from Lar Tolumnius, King of the Veientes; the third by M. Claudius Marcellus from Virodomarus, a Gaulish chief (B. C. 222). In all cases they were dedicated to Jupiter Feretrius and preserved in his temple."—W. Ramsay, *Manual of Roman Antiq., ch.* 12.

SPOLIATION CLAIMS, French. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1800.

SPORADES, The. See Cyclades.

SPOTTSYLVANIA, Battle of. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1864 (May: Virginia) Grant's Movement, &c.: Spottsylvania.

SPRING HILL, Engagement at. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1864 (November: Tennessee).

SPRINGFIELD, Mass.: A. D. 1637.—The first settlement. See Connecticut: A. D. 1634–1637.

SPURS, The Battle of the (1513). See France: A. D. 1513–1515.

SPURS, The Day of the. See Courtrai, The Battle of.

SQUATTER SOVEREIGNTY. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1854.

SQUIRE. See Chivalry.

STAATEN-BUND. See Germany: A. D. 1814–1820.

STADACONA. See Quebec: A. D. 1535.

STADION, OR STADIUM, The. See Hippodrome.

STADIUM, OR STADE, The Greek.—"Throughout the present work I shall uniformly assume that the Greeks employed but one measure under that designation [the stadium] which was . . . a hundred fathoms, or 600 Greek feet. This has been proved, in my opinion, beyond a doubt, by Col. Leake in his paper 'On the Stade as a Linear Measure' . . . republished in his treatise 'On some disputed Questions of Ancient Geography.' . . . At the present day the controversy may be considered as settled. . . . A stade of 600 Greek feet was in reality very nearly the 600th part of a degree [of the circumference of the earth]; ten stades are consequently just about equal to a nautical or geographical mile of 60 to a degree."—E. H. Bunbury, *Hist. of Ancient Geog., ch.* 6, *note c.*

STADTHOLDER. See Netherlands: A. D. 1584–1585.

STADTLOHN, Battle of (1623). See Germany: A. D. 1621–1623.

STAFFARDA, Battle of (1690). See France: A. D. 1689–1691.

STAHL, George E.: Influence upon Medical Science. See MEDICAL SCIENCE: 17TH CENTURY.—CLOSING PERIOD, &c.

STALLER AND HORDERE, The.—"In the time of Ælfred [Alfred the Great] the great officers of the court were the four heads of the royal household, the Hordere, the Staller, the Dish-thegn, and the Cup-thegn. . . . The Hordere was the officer of the court in its stationery aspect, as the Staller or Constable was of the court on progress. . . . Of the four officers one only retained under the later West-Saxon monarchy any real power. The dish-thegn and cup-thegn lost importance as the court became stationary and no longer maintained a vast body of royal followers. The staller retained only the functions of leading in war as the feudal constable, which in turn passed away with later changes in the military system. The hordere alone held a position of growing importance. . . . No doubt the 'Hoard' contained not only money and coin, but the costly ornaments and robes of the crown."—J. R. Green, *Conquest of Eng., ch.* 10, *note.*—"The names by which the Chamberlain was designated are Hrægel thegn, literally thane or servant of the wardrobe, Cubicularius, Camerarius, Búrthegn, perhaps sometimes Dispensator, and Thesaurarius or Hordere. . . . We may presume that he had the general management of the royal property, as well as the immediate regulation of the household. . . . The Marshal (among the Franks Marescalcus and Comes stabuli) was properly speaking the Master of the Horse. . . . The Anglosaxon titles are Steallere [Staller] and Horsthegn, Stabulator and Strator regis."—J. M. Kemble, *The Saxons in Eng., bk.* 2, *ch.* 3.—See, also, CONSTABLE.

STALWARTS AND HALF-BREEDS.—During the administration of President Grant, certain leaders of the Republican party in the United States—conspicuous among them Senator Conkling of New York—acquired a control of the distribution of appointed offices under the Federal Government which gave them a more despotic control of the organization of their party than had been known before in the history of the country. It was the culminating development of the "spoils system" in American politics. It produced a state of things in which the organization of the party—its elaborated structure of committees and conventions—state, county, city, town and district,—became what was accurately described as a "political machine." The managers and workers of the machine were brought under a discipline which allowed no room for personal opinions of any kind; the passive adherents of the party were expected to accept what was offered to them, whether in the way of candidates or declarations of principle. The faction which controlled and supported this powerful machine in politics acquired the name of Stalwarts and contemptuously gave the name of Half-breeds to their dissatisfied Republican opponents. During the term of President Hayes, who favored Civil Service Reform, the Stalwarts were considerably checked. They had desired to nominate General Grant in 1876 for a third term, but found it unwise to press the proposition. In 1880, however, they rallied all their strength to accomplish the nomination of Grant at Chicago and were bitterly enraged when their opponents in the convention carried the nomination of Garfield. They joined in electing him, but Conkling, the Stalwart leader, speedily quarreled with the new President when denied the control of the Federal "patronage" (that is, official appointments) in New York State, resigned from the Senate, appealed to the New York Legislature for re-election, and was beaten. Then followed the tragedy of the assassination of President Garfield, which had a very sobering effect on the angry politics of the time. Conkling disappeared from public life, and Stalwartism subsided with him.—J. C. Ridpath, *Life and Work of James A. Garfield, ch.* 10–12.

ALSO IN: E. Stanwood, *Hist. of Presidential Elections, ch.* 24–25.—J. Bryce, *The American Commonwealth, ch.* 60–65 (*v.* 2).

STAMBOUL.—"It must be remembered that the Constantinople of 1200 was only that portion which is now called Stamboul or Istamboul, a word which is probably the Turkish abbreviation of Constantinople, just as Skenderoun is the abbreviation of Alexandretta, Skender bey for Alexander bey, Isnik for Nicæa, Ismidt for Nicomedia, &c. . . . The 'Itinerario' of Clavigo states that before the Moslem occupation the inhabitants themselves called the city Escomboli. The Turks allow a few foreigners to have their warehouses in Stamboul, but will not permit them to reside there. All the embassies and legations are in Pera, that is, across the water; . . . or at Galata, which is a part of what was originally called Pera."—E. Pears, *The Fall of Constantinople, ch.* 7, *foot-note.*

STAMFORD, Battle of. See LOSE-COAT FIELD.

STAMFORD BRIDGE, Battle of. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1066 (SEPTEMBER).

STAMP ACT, The. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1765; and 1766.

STANDARD, The Battle of the (1138).—In the civil war which arose in England, on the death of Henry I., over the disputed succession to the throne, Matilda's claims, as the daughter of Henry, were supported against Stephen of Blois by her mother's brother David, king of Scotland. David, as the nephew of Edgar Ætheling, heir of the dethroned Saxon royal house, had some claims of his own to the English crown; but these he declared that he waived in favor of his niece. "Though he himself declared that he had no desire for the English throne, there is mentioned by one chronicler a general conspiracy of the native English with their exiled country-men, of whom the south of Scotland was full, for the purpose of taking advantage of the condition of the country to put to death the Normans, and to place the crown upon David's head. The plot was discovered, . . . and many of the conspirators were hanged, but many others found a refuge in Scotland. At length, in 1138, David entered England with a large army, and pushed forward as far as Northallerton in Yorkshire. He was there met by the forces of the Northern bishops and barons. . . . They gathered round a tall mast borne upon a carriage, on which, above the standards of the three Northern Saints, St. Peter of York, St. John of Beverley, and St. Wilfred of Ripon, was displayed a silver pyx bearing the consecrated wafer. The motley army of the Scots, some armed as the English, some in the wild dress of the Picts of Galloway, after a well-fought battle [August 22, 1138]

broke against the full-clad Norman soldiers, and were killed by the arrows, which had now become the national weapon of the English; 11,000 are said to have fallen on the field." From the great standard above described, which probably resembled the "Carroccio" of the mediæval Italian cities, the fight at Northallerton was called the Battle of the Standard.—J. F. Bright, *Hist. of Eng., period* 1, *p.* 79.—See ENGLAND: A. D. 1135–1154.

STÄNDERATH, The. See SWITZERLAND: A. D. 1848–1890.

STANDING ARMY: The first in modern Europe. See FRANCE: A. D. 1453–1461.

STANDISH, Miles, and the Plymouth Colony. See MASSACHUSETTS: A. D. 1623–1629.

STANISLAUS AUGUSTUS PONIATOWSKI, King of Poland, A. D. 1764–1795.

STANISLAUS LESZCZYNSKI, King of Poland, A. D. 1704–1709.

STANWIX, Fort.—The early name of the fort afterwards called Fort Schuyler, near the head of the Mohawk River, in New York.

A. D. 1768.—Boundary Treaty with the Six Nations. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1765–1768.

STANZ, Battle of (1798). See SWITZERLAND: A. D. 1792–1798.

STANZ, Convention of. See SWITZERLAND: A. D. 1481–1501.

STAOUELI, Battles of. See BARBARY STATES: A. D. 1830.

STAPLE.—STAPLERS, The.—"A term which makes a great figure in the commercial regulations of this period [13th and 14th centuries] is that of the Staple. The word, in its primary acceptation, appears to have meant a particular port or other place to which certain commodities were obliged to be brought to be weighed or measured for the payment of the customs, before they could be sold, or in some cases exported or imported. Here the king's staple was said to be established. The articles of English produce upon which customs were anciently paid were wool, sheep-skins (or woolfels), and leather; and these were accordingly denominated the staples or staple goods of the kingdom. The persons who exported these goods were called the Merchants of the Staple: they were incorporated, or at least recognized as forming a society with certain privileges." By a charter granted by Edward II., in 1313, to the merchants of the staple, Antwerp was made the staple for wool and woolfels, and they could be carried for sale to no other port in Brabant, Flanders or Artois. In 1326 the staple was removed altogether from the continent and fixed at certain places within the English kingdom. In 1341 it was established at Bruges; in 1348 at Calais (which the English had captured); in 1353 it was again removed entirely from the continent;—and thus the changes were frequent. During some intervals all staples were abolished and trade was set free from their restriction; but these were of brief duration.—G. L. Craik, *Hist. of British Commerce, ch.* 4 (*v.* 1).—"The staplers were merchants who had the monopoly of exporting the principal raw commodities of the realm, especially wool, woolfels, leather, tin, and lead; wool figuring most prominently among these 'staple' wares. The merchants of the staple used to claim that their privileges dated from the time of Henry III, but existing records do not refer to the staple before the time of Edward I. . . . The staples were the towns to which the above-mentioned wares had to be brought for sale or exportation. Sometimes there was only one such mart, and this was situated abroad, generally at Bruges or Calais, occasionally at Antwerp, St. Omer, or Middleburg. From the reign of Richard II until 1558 the foreign staple was at Calais. The list of home staples was also frequently changed."—C. Gross, *The Gild Merchant, pp.* 140–141.

ALSO IN: A. Anderson, *Hist. of Commerce, v.* 1, *p.* 216, *and after.*

STAR, Knights of the.—"On the 8th September, 1351, king John [of France] revived the almost obsolete order of the Star, in imitation of the Garter, and the first chapter of it was held at his palace of St. Ouen. At first there were but eighteen knights; the rest were added at different chapters. They wore a bright star on the crest of their helmets, and one pendant at their necks, and the same was embroidered on their mantles."—T. Johnes, *Note to Froissart's Chronicles, bk.* 1, *ch.* 152.

STAR CHAMBER, The Court of.—"In the reign of Edward III, the king's Continual Council was in the habit of sitting in what was called the Starred Chamber (la Chambre des Etoiles). After the establishment of the Court of Chancery as a separate and independent jurisdiction taking cognizance of the greater portion of the civil business of the Council, the latter body appears to have usually sat in the Star Chamber while exercising jurisdiction over such cases as were not sent to the Chancery. . . . Henry VII. . . . created, in the 3rd year of his reign, a new court, sometimes inaccurately called the Court of Star Chamber. . . . It continued to exist as a distinct tribunal from the Privy Council till towards the close of the reign of Henry VIII.; but in the meantime, probably during the chancellorship of Wolsey, the jurisdiction of the ancient Star Chamber (i. e. the Council sitting for judicial business) was revived, and in it the limited court erected by Henry VII. became gradually merged. . . . Under the Stewart Kings the court was practically identical with the Privy Council, thus combining in the same body of men the administrative and judicial functions. . . . Under the Stewart Kings the pillory, whipping, and cruel mutilations were inflicted upon political offenders by the sentence of this court; and at length the tyrannical exercise and illegal extension of its powers became so odious to the people that it was abolished by the Long Parliament in 1641."—T. P. Taswell-Langmead, *Eng. Const. Hist., pp.* 181–183.—"The Star Chamber was no temporary court. During 150 years its power penetrated into every branch of English life. No rank was exalted enough to defy its attacks, no insignificance sufficiently obscure to escape its notice. It terrified the men who had worsted the Armada; it overshadowed the dignity of the judicial bench; it summoned before its tribunal the Prynnes and the Cromwells, who at last proved its destroyers. It fell at length, but great was the fall thereof, and in its ruin was involved the downfall of the monarchy. It is with something of astonishment that the inquirer discovers that this august tribunal was merely the Council under another name; and that

the court, whose overgrown power the patriots of 1640 cast to the ground, was the same body whose early encroachments had alarmed the parliamentary leaders under Edward III and Richard II. The process by which the judicial authority of the Council passed into the form of the Court of Star Chamber admits of some dispute, and is involved in no little obscurity. . . . The Council's manner of proceeding was unlike that of other courts. Its punishments were as arbitrary as they were severe; it also exercised a power peculiar to itself of extorting confession by torture. Some, however, may imagine that powers so great were only occasionally exercised, that exceptional exertions of authority were employed to meet exceptional crimes, and that gigantic force was put forth to crush gigantic evils. Some circumstances have given currency to such a notion. . . . Yet no conception of the Star Chamber is more false than that which makes it a 'deus ex machina' which intervened only when the lower courts of justice stood confronted by some criminal attempt with which they were too weak to deal. The sphere of the Council's jurisdiction was unlimited. It is now no question of what it had a right to do, but of what it did. And any one who examines the most certain facts of history will be convinced that from the accession of Henry VII till the meeting of the Long Parliament the Council interfered in all matters, small as well as great. It is, indeed, perhaps not generally known, that crimes of a very ordinary nature, such as would now come before a police magistrate, occupied the attention of the Star Chamber."—A. V. Dicey, *The Privy Council, pt.* 3, *ch.* 4.

ALSO IN: H. Hallam, *Const. Hist. of Eng., v.* 1, *ch.* 1.—R. Gneist, *Hist. of the Eng. Const., ch.* 35 *and* 38 (*v.* 2).

STAR OF INDIA, The Order of the.—An Order of Knighthood instituted by Queen Victoria, in 1861, to commemorate the assumption of the Government of India by the British Crown. —*Annual Register*, 1861.

STAR SPANGLED BANNER: The circumstances of the writing of the song. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1814 (AUGUST—SEPTEMBER).

STARK, General John: Victory at Bennington. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1777 (JULY—OCTOBER).

STARO-OBRIADTSI, The. See RUSSIA: A. D. 1655–1659.

STAROSTS.—"Elders," in Poland, who administered justice in the towns.—Count Moltke, *Poland, p.* 8.—See, also, MIR, THE RUSSIAN.

STARRY CROSS, Order of the.—An Austrian order, founded in 1668, for ladies of noble birth, by the dowager Empress Eleanora.

STATE SOVEREIGNTY, The doctrine of. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1787.

STATES-GENERAL OF FRANCE: In the 14th Century.—"I lately attempted to explain the manner in which the identity or union of the Royal Council and of the Parliament of Paris was virtually, though not formally dissolved [see PARLIAMENT OF PARIS], so that each of them thenceforward existed as a substantive and distinct body in the state. This tacit revolution had been nearly completed when Philip le Bel for the first time convened the States-General of France" (A. D. 1301). The circumstances under which this occurred were as follows: Philip had imposed a tax from which the clergy were not excepted. Pope Boniface issued a bull forbidding them to make the required payment. "Philip retaliated by an order forbidding them to pay the customary papal dues to Boniface himself. The Pope then summoned a synod, to advise him how he might most effectually resist this invasion of his pontifical rights; and Philip, in his turn, summoned the barons, clergy, and commons of his realm to elect deputies who should meet him at Paris, there to deliberate on the methods to be pursued for the successful conduct of his controversy with Rome. To Philip himself, the importance of this great innovation was probably not perceptible. He, as we may well believe, regarded it only as a temporary device to meet a passing exigency." Once more, before the end of his reign, in 1314, Philip assembled the States-General and procured their apparent assent to a tax, which proved to be exceedingly unpopular and which provoked a very turbulent resistance. The next meeting of the States-General,—called by King John—was in 1355, on the outbreak of the war with Edward III. of England. Under the lead of the celebrated Étienne (Stephen) Marcel, the States took matters on that occasion quite into their own hands. They created a commission to superintend the collecting of funds raised for the war, and they provided for an adjourned session in the following year to receive an accounting of the Expenditure. When the adjourned session took place, in 1356, King John was a prisoner in the hands of the English and his son Charles reigned as regent in his stead. This Charles, who became king in 1364, and who acquired the name of Charles the Wise, contrived to make the meeting of 1356 an abortive one and then endeavored to raise moneys and to rule without the help of the three estates. The result was an insurrection at Paris, led by Marcel, which forced the regent to convene the States-General once more. They met in 1357 under circumstances which gave them full power to check and control the royal authority, even to the extent of instituting a permanent commission, from their own membership, charged with a general superintendence of the administration of the government during the intervals between sessions of the States-General themselves. At that moment there would have seemed to be more promise of free government in France than across the channel. But the advantage which the national representatives acquired was brief. The taxes they imposed produced disappointment and discontent. They lost public favor; they fell into quarrels among themselves; the nobles and the clergy deserted the deputies of the people. The young regent gained influence, as the States-General lost it, and he was strengthened in the end by the violence of Marcel, who caused two offending ministers of the crown to be slain in the presence of the king. Then ensued a short period of civil war; Paris was besieged by the Dauphin-regent; Marcel perished by assassination; royalty recovered its ascendancy in France, with more firmness of footing than before. "It was the commencement of a long series of similar conflicts and of similar successes—conflicts and successes which terminated at length in the transfer of the power of the purse from the representatives of

the people to the ministers of the crown."—Sir J. Stephen, *Lect's on the Hist. of France, lect.* 10.—"The year 1357 was the period when the States-General had greatest power during the Middle Ages; from that time they rapidly declined; they lost, as did also the Third Estate, all political influence, and for some centuries were only empty shadows of national assemblies."—E. de Bonnechose, *Hist. of France, period* 4, *bk.* 2, *ch.* 3.—"One single result of importance was won for France by the states-general of the 14th century, namely, the principle of the nation's right to intervene in their own affairs, and to set the government straight when it had gone wrong or was incapable of performing that duty itself. . . . Starting from King John, the states-general became one of the principles of national right; a principle which did not disappear even when it remained without application, and the prestige of which survived even its reverses."—F. P. Guizot, *Popular Hist. of France, ch.* 21.

ALSO IN: A. Thierry, *Formation and Progress of the Tiers État in France, v.* 1, *ch.* 2–3.—See, also, FRANCE: A. D. 1356–1358.

The last States General before the Revolution. See FRANCE: A. D. 1610–1619.

The States-General of 1789. See FRANCE: A. D. 1789 (MAY) and (JUNE).

STATES-GENERAL, OR ESTATES, OF THE NETHERLANDS. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1494–1519, and 1584–1585 LIMITS OF THE UNITED PROVINCES.

STATES OF THE CHURCH: Origin. See PAPACY: A. D. 755–774; and 1077–1102.

A. D. 1198-1216.—The establishing of Papal Sovereignty. See PAPACY: A. D. 1198–1216.

A. D. 1275.—The Papal Sovereignty confirmed by Rodolph of Hapsburg. See GERMANY: A. D. 1273–1308.

A. D. 1352-1378.—Subjugation by Cardinal Albornoz.—Revolt, supported by Florence, and war with the Pope. See PAPACY: A. D. 1352–1378; and FLORENCE: A. D. 1375–1378.

A. D. 1380.—Proposed formation of the kingdom of Adria. See ITALY (SOUTHERN): A. D. 1343–1389.

A. D. 1409.—Sale to Ladislas, king of Naples, by Pope Gregory XII. See ITALY (SOUTHERN): A. D. 1386–1414.

A. D. 1503-1513.—Conquests and consolidation of Papal Sovereignty under Julius II. See PAPACY: A. D. 1471–1513; and ITALY: A. D. 1510–1513.

A. D. 1545-1556.—Alienation of Parma and Placentia. See PARMA: A. D. 1545–1592.

A. D. 1597.—Annexation of Ferrara. See PAPACY: A. D. 1597.

A. D. 1631.—Annexation of Urbino. See PAPACY: A. D. 1605–1700.

A. D. 1796-1797.—Territories taken by Bonaparte to add to the Cispadine and Cisalpine Republics. See FRANCE: A. D. 1796 (APRIL—OCTOBER); 1796–1797 (OCTOBER—APRIL).

A. D. 1808-1809.—Seizure by Napoleon.—Partial annexation to the kingdom of Italy.—Final incorporation with the French Empire. See PAPACY: A. D. 1808–1814.

A. D. 1815.—Papal Sovereignty restored. See VIENNA, THE CONGRESS OF.

A. D. 1831-1832.—Revolt suppressed by Austrian troops. See ITALY: A. D. 1830–1832.

A. D. 1860-1861.—Absorption in the new kingdom of Italy. See ITALY: A. D. 1859–1861.

STATUTES. See LAW.

STAURACIUS, Emperor in the East (Byzantine, or Greek), A. D. 811.

STAVOUTCHANI, Battle of (1739). See RUSSIA: A. D. 1725–1739.

STEAM ENGINE: The beginning of its invention, before Watt.—"It is probable that the first contriver of a working steam-engine was Edward, second Marquis of Worcester [A.D. 1601–1667]. . . . He was born at London in 1601. His early years [when his title was Lord Herbert] were principally spent at Raglan Castle, his father's country seat, where his education was carefully attended to. . . . From an early period of his life Lord Herbert took especial pleasure in mechanical studies, and in the course of his foreign tours he visited and examined the famous works of construction abroad. On settling down at Raglan he proceeded to set up a laboratory, or workshop, wherein to indulge his mechanical tastes. . . . Among the works executed by Lord Herbert and his assistant at Raglan, was the hydraulic apparatus by means of which the castle was supplied with water. . . . It is probable that the planning and construction of these works induced Lord Herbert to prosecute the study of hydraulics, and to enter upon that series of experiments as to the power of steam which eventually led to the contrivance of his 'Water-commanding Engine.'" No description of the Marquis's engine remains which enables modern engineers to understand with certainty its principle and mode of working, and various writers "have represented it in widely different forms . . . . But though the Marquis did not leave the steam-engine in such a state as to be taken up and adopted as a practicable working power, he at least advanced it several important steps. . . . Even during the Marquis's lifetime other minds besides his were diligently pursuing the same subject. . . . One of the most distinguished of these was Sir Samuel Morland, appointed Master of Mechanics to Charles II. immediately after the Restoration. . . . Morland's inventions proved of no greater advantage to him than those of the Marquis of Worcester had done. . . . The next prominent experimenter on the powers of steam was Dr. Dionysius Papin." Being a Protestant, he was driven to England in 1681, four years before the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, and received, through the friendship of Dr. Boyle, the appointment of Curator of the Royal Society. It was during this connection that he constructed his well-known "Digester," which was an apparatus for the cooking of meats under a high pressure and consequent high temperature of steam. For the safe employment of so high a pressure he invented the safety-valve. His success with the Digester led him to experiments with steam as a motive force. Having been invited to Germany, he made the attempt there to pump water by atmospheric pressure, on a large scale, producing the vacuum by a condensation of steam; but his undertakings were not successful. He next tried steam navigation, converting the alternate motion of a piston in a steam cylinder into rotary motion, turning paddle-wheels on the sides of a boat, by arming the piston-rods with

teeth, geared into wheels on the paddle axis. "His first experiments were doubtless failures;" but he finally succeeded to his satisfaction, and was conveying his model to London for exhibition, in 1707, when some barbarous boatmen in Germany destroyed it. Papin could raise no means for the construction of another, and three years later he died. "The attempts hitherto made to invent a working steam-engine, it will be observed, had not been attended with much success." But, "although the progress made seemed but slow, the amount of net result was by no means inconsiderable. Men were becoming better acquainted with the elastic force of steam. . . . Many separate and minor inventions, which afterwards proved of great value, had been made, such as the four-way cock, the safety-valve, and the piston moving in a cylinder. The principle of a true steam-engine had not only been demonstrated, but most of the separate parts of such an engine had been contrived by various inventors. It seemed as if all that was now wanting was a genius of more than ordinary power to combine them in a complete and effective whole. To Thomas Savery is usually accorded the merit of having constructed the first actual working steam-engine. . . . Thomas Savery was born at Shilston, . . . in Devon, about the year 1650. Nothing is known of his early life, beyond that he was educated to the profession of a military engineer. . . . He occupied much of his spare time in mechanical experiments, and in projecting and executing contrivances of various sorts." One of the earliest of these was a boat propelled by paddle-wheels, worked by man-power, turning a capstan, and this he exhibited on the Thames. "It is curious that it should not have occurred to Savery, who invented both a paddle-wheel boat and a steam-engine, to combine the two in one machine; but he was probably sick of the former invention . . . and gave it up in disgust, leaving it to Papin, who saw both his inventions at work, to hit upon the grand idea of combining the two in a steam-vessel. . . . It is probable that Savery was led to enter upon his next and most important invention by the circumstance of his having been brought up in the neighbourhood of the mining districts," and being well aware of the great difficulty experienced by the miners in keeping their pits clear of water." He devised what he called a "Fire Engine" for the raising of water. In this he made a double use of steam, in tight cylinders, first to create a vacuum, by condensing it, and then to force the water, so lifted, to a greater height, by pressure of fresh steam. "The great pressure of steam required to force up a high column of water was such as to strain to the utmost the imperfect boilers and receivers of those early days; and the frequent explosions which attended its use eventually led to its discontinuance in favour of the superior engine of Newcomen, which was shortly after invented. . . . This engine [of which the first working model was completed in 1705] . . . worked entirely by the pressure of the atmosphere, steam being only used as the most expeditious method of producing a vacuum," in a steam cylinder, under the piston which worked the rod of a pump. "The engine was, however, found to be very imperfect," until it was improved by a device for throwing a jet of cold water into the cylinder, to produce a more rapid condensation of steam. "Step by step, Newcomen's engine grew in power and efficiency, and became more and more complete as a self-acting machine."—S. Smiles, *Lives of Boulton and Watt, ch.* 1–4.—"We have . . . certain evidence that the Marquis of Worcester's Engine was in full operation for at least seven years, and that one of the conditions of the Act of Parliament obliged him to deposit a model in the Exchequer. His own estimate of its value may be judged by his gladly giving up for the promised tithe of it to the King, his claim on Charles I equal to £40,000, in lieu thereof. His Lordship's invention was never offered by him as a merely amusing trifle."—H. Dircks, *Life and Times of the Second Marquis of Worcester, p.* 337.

A. D. 1765-1785.—The improvements of James Watt.—After Newcomen, "no improvement of essential consequence . . . was effected in the steam engine until it came into the hands of Watt." James Watt, born at Greenock, Scotland, in 1736, educated to the profession of a mathematical instrument maker, and settled as such at Glasgow in 1757, began a few years later to give his thoughts to this subject. "Directing his attention first, with all his profound physical and mathematical knowledge, to the various theoretical points involved in the working of the machine, 'he determined,' says M. Arago, 'the extent to which the water dilated in passing from its liquid state into that of steam. He calculated the quantity of water which a given weight of coal could vaporise—the quantity of steam, in weight, which each stroke of one of Newcomen's machines of known dimensions expended—the quantity of cold water which required to be injected into the cylinder, to give the descending stroke of the piston a certain force—and finally, the elasticity of steam at different temperatures. All these investigations would have occupied the lifetime of a laborious philosopher; whilst Watt brought all his numerous and difficult researches to a conclusion, without allowing them to interfere with the labours of his workshop.' . . . Newcomen's machine laboured under very great defects. In the first place, the jet of cold water into the cylinder was a very imperfect means of condensing the steam. The cylinder, heated before, not being thoroughly cooled by it, a quantity of steam remained uncondensed, and, by its elasticity, impeded the descent of the piston, lessening the power of the stroke. Again, when the steam rushed into the cylinder from the boiler, it found the cylinder cold, in consequence of the water which had recently been thrown in; and thus a considerable quantity of steam was immediately condensed and wasted while the rest did not attain its full elasticity till the cylinder became again heated up to 212 degrees. These two defects . . . were sources of great expense. . . . Watt remedied the evil by a simple but beautiful contrivance—his separate condenser. The whole efficacy of this contrivance consisted in his making the condensation of the steam take place, not in the cylinder, but in a separate vessel communicating with the cylinder by a tube provided with a stop-cock. . . . So far the invention was all that could be desired; an additional contrivance was necessary, however, to render it complete. The steam in the act of being condensed in the separate vessel would give out its latent heat;

this would raise the temperature of the condensing water; from the heated water vapour would rise; and this vapour, in addition to the atmospheric air which would be disengaged from the injected water by the heat, would accumulate in the condenser, and spoil its efficiency. In order to overcome this defect, Watt attached to the bottom of the condenser a common air-pump, called the condenser pump, worked by a piston attached to the beam. and which, at every stroke of the engine, withdrew the accumulated water, air, and vapour. This was a slight tax upon the power of the machine, but the total gain was enormous—equivalent to making one pound of coal do as much work as had been done by five pounds in Newcomen's engine. This, certainly, was a triumph; but Watt's improvements did not stop here. In the old engine, the cylinder was open at the top, and the descent of the piston was caused solely by the pressure of the atmosphere on its upper surface. Hence the name of Atmospheric Engine, which was always applied to Newcomen's machine." Watt constructed his engine with the cylinder, closed at both ends; sliding the rod of the piston through a tightly packed hole in the metallic cover, introducing steam both above and below the piston,—but still using its expansive power only in the upper chamber, while in the lower it was employed as before to create a vacuum. "The engine with this improvement Watt named the Modified Engine; it was, however, properly, the first real steam engine; for in it, for the first time, steam, besides serving to produce the vacuum, acted as the moving force. . . . Another improvement less striking in appearance, but of value in economising the consumption of fuel, was the enclosing of the cylinder in a jacket or external drum of wood, leaving a space between which could be filled with steam. By this means the air was prevented from acting on the outside of the cylinder so as to cool it. A slight modification was also necessary in the mode of keeping the piston air-tight. . . . The purpose was . . . effected by the use of a preparation of wax, tallow, and oil, smeared on the piston-rod and round the piston-rim. The improvements which we have described had all been thoroughly matured by Mr. Watt before the end of 1765, two years after his attention had been called to the subject." Another two years had passed before he found the means to introduce his invention into practice. He formed a partnership at length with Dr. Roebuck, who had lately founded the Carron iron-works, near Glasgow. "A patent was taken out by the partners in 1769, and an engine of the new construction, with an eighteen-inch cylinder, was erected at the Kinneil coal-works [leased by Dr. Roebuck], with every prospect of complete success; when, unfortunately, Dr. Roebuck was obliged by pecuniary embarrassments to dissolve the partnership, leaving Watt with the whole patent, but without the means of rendering it available." For five years after this failure the steam-engine was practically put aside, while Watt devoted himself to civil engineering, which he had worked into as a profession. "At length, in 1774, Mr. Watt entered into a partnership most fortunate for himself and for the world. This was with Mr. Matthew Boulton, of the Soho Foundry, near Birmingham—a gentleman of remarkable scientific abilities, of liberal disposition and of unbounded enterprise." A prolongation of Watt's patent, which had nearly expired, was procured with great difficulty from Parliament, where a powerful opposition to the extension was led by Edmund Burke. The new engine, now fairly introduced, speedily supplanted Newcomen's, and Watt and his partner were made wealthy by stipulating with mine owners for one third part of the value of the coal which each engine saved. "The first consequence of the introduction of Watt's improved steam-engine into practice was to give an impulse to mining speculations. New mines were opened; and old mines . . . now yielded a return. This was the only obvious consequence at first. Only in mines, and generally for the purpose of pumping water was the steam-engine yet used; and before it could be rendered applicable to other purposes in the arts . . . the genius of Watt required once again to stoop over it, and bestow on it new creative touches." He produced the beautiful device known as the "parallel motion," for connecting the piston-rod of the engine with the beam through which its motion is transmitted to other pieces of machinery. "Another improvement, which, in point of the additional power gained, was more important than the parallel motion, and which indeed preceded it in point of time, was the 'Double-acting Engine,'" in which steam was introduced to act expansively on each side of the piston in the engine. He also invented the governor, to regulate the quantity of steam admitted from the boiler into the cylinder, and thus regulate the motion of the engine. "To describe all the other inventions of a minor kind connected with the steam-engine which came from the prolific genius of Watt, would occupy too much space." —*Life of James Watt* (*Chambers's Miscellany, v.* 17).—"The Watt engine had, by the construction of the improvements described in the patents of 1782–'85, been given its distinctive form, and the great inventor subsequently did little more than improve it by altering the forms and proportions of its details. As thus practically completed, it embodied nearly all the essential features of the modern engine. . . . The growth of the steam-engine has here ceased to be rapid, and the changes which followed the completion of the work of James Watt have been minor improvements, and rarely, if ever, real developments."—R. H. Thurston, *Hist. of the Growth of the Steam Engine, ch.* 3.

Also in: S. Smiles, *Lives of Boulton and Watt, ch.* 5–17.—J. P. Muirhead, *Life of James Watt.* —The same, *Origin and Progress of the Mechanical Inventions of James Watt.*

STEAM LOCOMOTION ON LAND.—The beginning of Railroads.—"The application of the steam engine to locomotion on land was, according to Watt, suggested by Robison, in 1759. In 1784, Watt patented a locomotive engine, which, however, he never executed. About the same time Murdoch, assistant to Watt, made a very efficient working model of a locomotive engine. In 1802, Trevithick and Vivian patented a locomotive engine, which was constructed and set to work in 1804 or 1805. It travelled at about five miles an hour, with a net load of ten tons. The use of fixed steam engines to drag trains on railways by ropes, was introduced by Cook in 1808. After various in-

ventors had long exerted their ingenuity in vain to give the locomotive engine a firm hold of the track by means of rackwork-rails and toothed driving wheels, legs, and feet, and other contrivances, Blackett and Hedley, in 1813, made the important discovery that no such aids are required, the adhesion between smooth wheels and smooth rails being sufficient. To adapt the locomotive engine to the great and widely varied speeds at which it now has to travel, and the varied loads which it now has to draw, two things are essential — that the rate of combustion of the fuel, the original source of the power of the engine, shall adjust itself to the work which the engine has to perform, and shall, when required, be capable of being increased to many times the rate at which fuel is burned in the furnace of a stationary engine of the same size; and that the surface through which heat is communicated from the burning fuel to the water shall be very large compared with the bulk of the boiler. The first of these objects is attained by the 'blast-pipe,' invented and used by George Stephenson before 1825; the second, by the tubular boiler, invented about 1829, simultaneously by Séguin in France and Booth in England, and by the latter suggested to Stephenson. On the 6th October, 1829, occurred that famous trial of locomotive engines, when the prize offered by the directors of the Liverpool and Manchester Railway was gained by Stephenson's engine, the 'Rocket,' the parent of the swift and powerful locomotives of the present day, in which the blast-pipe and tubular boiler are combined."— W. J. M. Rankine, *Manual of the Steam Engine, pp. xxv–xxvii.*— George Stephenson, the son of a common workingman, and self-educated as a mechanic and engineer, was appointed engine-wright of Killingworth Colliery in 1812. In the following year he urged the lessees of the colliery to undertake the construction of a "travelling engine," as he called it. "Lord Ravensworth, the principal partner, had already formed a very favourable opinion of Stephenson, from the important improvements which he had effected in the colliery engines, both above and below ground; and, after considering the matter, and hearing Stephenson's statements, he authorized him to proceed with the construction of a locomotive. . . . The engine was built in the workshops at the West Moor, the leading mechanic being John Thirlwall, the colliery blacksmith, an excellent workman in his way, though quite new to the work now entrusted to him. . . . The wheels of the new locomotive were all smooth,— and it was the first engine that had been so constructed. From the first, Mr. Stephenson was convinced that the adhesion between a smooth wheel and an edgerail would be as efficient as Mr. Blackett had proved it to be between the wheel and the tramroad. . . . The engine was, after much labour and anxiety, and frequent alterations of parts, at length brought to completion, having been about ten months in hand. It was first placed upon the Killingworth Railway on the 25th of July, 1814; and its powers were tried on the same day. On an ascending gradient of 1 in 450, the engine succeeded in drawing after it eight loaded carriages of 30 tons' weight at about four miles an hour; and for some time after, it continued regularly at work. It was indeed the most successful working engine that had yet been constructed. . . . The working of the engine was at first barely economical; and at the end of the year the steam power and the horse power were ascertained to be as nearly as possible upon a par in point of cost. The fate of the locomotive in a great measure depended on this very engine. Its speed was not beyond that of a horse's walk, and the heating surface presented to the fire being comparatively small, sufficient steam could not be raised to enable it to accomplish more on an average than about three miles an hour. The result was anything but decisive; and the locomotive might have been condemned as useless had not Mr. Stephenson at this juncture applied the steam blast [carrying the escape of steam from the cylinders of the engine into the chimney or smoke-stack of the furnace], and at once more than doubled the power of the engine." A second engine, embodying this and other improvements, was constructed in 1815, with funds provided by Mr. Ralph Dodds. "It is perhaps not too much to say that this engine, as a mechanical contrivance, contained the germ of all that has since been effected. . . . It is somewhat remarkable that, although George Stephenson's locomotive engines were in daily use for many years on the Killingworth railway, they excited comparatively little interest." But in 1821, Mr. Stephenson was employed to construct a line of railway from Witton Colliery, near Darlington, to Stockton, and to build three locomotives for use upon it. The Stockton and Darlington line was opened for traffic on the 27th of September, 1825, with great success. In 1826 the building of the Liverpool and Manchester Railway was begun, with George Stephenson as the chief engineer of the work, and the public opening of the line took place on the 15th of September, 1830. The directors had offered, in the previous year, a prize of £500 for the best locomotive engine to be designed for use on their road, and the prize was won by Stephenson's famous "Rocket," which attained a speed of 35 miles an hour. It was at the ceremonial of the opening of the Liverpool and Manchester Railway that Mr. Huskisson, then Prime Minister of England, was struck down by the "Rocket" and fatally injured, expiring the same night.— S. Smiles, *Life of George Stephenson, ch.* 9-24.— "Whatever credit is due to the construction of the first railroad ever built in America is usually claimed for the State of Massachusetts. Every one who has ever looked into a school history of the United States knows something of the Quincy railway of 1826. Properly speaking, however, this was never — or at least, never until the year 1871,— a railroad at all. It was nothing but a specimen of what had been almost from time immemorial in common use in England, under the name of 'tram-ways.' . . . This road, known as the Granite railway, built by those interested in erecting the Bunker Hill Monument, for the purpose of getting the stone down from the Quincy quarries to a wharf on Neponset River, from which it was shipped to its destination. The whole distance was three miles, and the cost of the road was about $34,000. . . . Apart, however, from the construction of the Granite railway, Massachusetts was neither particularly early nor particularly energetic in its railroad development. At a later day many of her sister States were in advance of her, and especially was this true of South Carolina. There is, indeed, some reason for believing that the

South Carolina Railroad was the first ever constructed in any country with a definite plan of operating it exclusively by locomotive steam power. . . . On the 15th of January 1831,—exactly four months after the formal opening of the Manchester & Liverpool road,—the first anniversary of the South Carolina Railroad was celebrated with due honor. A queer looking machine, the outline of which was sufficient in itself to prove that the inventor owed nothing to Stephenson, had been constructed at the West Point Foundry Works in New York during the summer of 1830—a first attempt to supply that locomotive which the Board had, with a sublime confidence in possibilities, unanimously voted on the 14th of the preceding January should alone be used on the road. The name of Best Friend was given to this very simple product of native genius. . . . In June, 1831, a second locomotive, called the West Point, had arrived in Charleston; and this at last was constructed on the principle of Stephenson's Rocket. In its general aspect, indeed, it greatly resembled that already famous prototype. There is a very characteristic and suggestive cut representing a trial trip made with this locomotive on March 5th, 1831. . . . About six months before . . . there had actually been a trial of speed between a horse and one of the pioneer locomotives, which had not resulted in favor of the locomotive. It took place on the present Baltimore & Ohio road upon the 28th of August, 1830. The engine in this case was contrived by no other than Mr. Peter Cooper. . . . The Cooper engine, however, was scarcely more than a working model. Its active-minded inventor hardly seems to have aimed at anything more than a demonstration of possibilities. The whole thing weighed only a ton, and was of one-horse power. . . . Poor and crude as the country was, however, America showed itself far more ready to take in the far reaching consequences of the initiative which Great Britain gave in 1830 than any other country in the world. . . . It might almost be said that there was a railroad mania. Massachusetts led off in 1826; Pennsylvania followed in 1827, and in 1828 Maryland and South Carolina. Of the great trunk lines of the country, a portion of the New York Central was chartered in 1825; the construction of the Baltimore & Ohio was begun on July 4th, 1828. The country, therefore, was not only ripe to accept the results of the Rainhill contest, but it was anticipating them with eager hope. . . . Accordingly, after 1830 trial trips with new locomotives followed hard upon each other. To-day it was the sensation in Charleston; to-morrow in Baltimore; the next day at Albany. Reference has already been made to a cut representing the excursion train of March 5th, 1831, on the South Carolina Railroad. There is, however, a much more familiar picture of a similar trip made on the 9th of August of the same year from Albany to Schenectady, over the Mohawk Valley road. This sketch, moreover, was made at the time and on the spot by Mr. W. H. Brown."—C. F. Adams, Jr., *Railroads: Their Origin and Problems, ch.* 1.

STEAM NAVIGATION, The beginnings.—"The earliest attempt to propel a vessel by steam is claimed by Spanish authorities . . . to have been made by Blasco de Garay, in the harbor of Barcelona, Spain, in 1543. . . . The account seems somewhat apochryphal, and it certainly led to no useful results. . . . In 1690, Papin proposed to use his piston-engine to drive paddle-wheels to propel vessels; and in 1707 he applied the steam-engine, which he had proposed as a pumping-engine, to driving a model boat on the Fulda at Cassel [see above—STEAM ENGINE THE BEGINNINGS, &C.]. . . . In the year 1736, Jonathan Hulls took out an English patent for the use of a steam-engine for ship-propulsion, proposing to employ his steamboat in towing. . . . There is no positive evidence that Hulls ever put his scheme to the test of experiment, although tradition does say that he made a model, which he tried with such ill-success as to prevent his prosecution of the experiment further. . . . A prize was awarded by the French Academy of Science, in 1752, for the best essay on the manner of impelling vessels without wind. It was given to Bernouilli, who, in his paper, proposed a set of vanes like those of a windmill—a screw in fact—one to be placed on each side the vessel and two more behind. . . . But a more remarkable essay is quoted by Figuier—the paper of l' Abbé Gauthier, published in the 'Memoires de la Société Royale des Sciences et Lettres de Nancy.'. . . A little later (1760), a Swiss clergyman, J. A. Genevois, published in London a paper relating to the improvement of navigation, in which his plan was proposed of compressing springs by steam or other power, and applying their effort while recovering their form to ship propulsion. It was at this time that the first attempts were made in the United States to solve this problem. . . . William Henry was a prominent citizen of the then little village of Lancaster, Pa., and was noted as an ingenious and successful mechanic. . . . In the year 1760 he went to England on business, where his attention was attracted to the invention—then new, and the subject of discussion in every circle—of James Watt. He saw the possibility of its application to navigation and to driving carriages, and, on his return home, commenced the construction of a steam-engine, and finished it in 1763. Placing it in a boat fitted with paddle-wheels, he made a trial of the new machine on the Conestoga River, near Lancaster, where the craft, by some accident, sank, and was lost. He was not discouraged by this failure, but made a second model, adding some improvements. Among the records of the Pennsylvania Philosophical Society is, or was, a design, presented by Henry in 1782, of one of his steamboats. . . . John Fitch, whose experiments will presently be referred to, was an acquaintance and frequent visitor to the house of Mr. Henry, and may probably have there received the earliest suggestions of the importance of this application of steam. About 1777 . . . Robert Fulton, then twelve years old, visited him, to study the paintings of Benjamin West, who had long been a friend and protégé of Henry. He, too, not improbably, received there the first suggestion which afterward . . . made the young portrait-painter a successful inventor and engineer. . . . In France, the Marquis de Jouffroy was one of the earliest to perceive that the improvements of Watt, rendering the engine more compact, more powerful, and, at the same time, more regular and positive in its action, had made it, at last, readily applicable to the propulsion of vessels. . . . Comte d'Auxiron and Chevalier Charles

Mounin, of Follenai, friends and companions of Jouffroy, were similarly interested, and the three are said to have . . . united in devising methods of applying the new motor. In the year 1770, D'Auxiron determined to attempt the realization of the plans which he had conceived. He resigned his position in the army," obtained from the King a patent of monopoly for fifteen years, and formed a company for the undertaking. "The first vessel was commenced in December, 1772. When nearly completed, in September, 1774, the boat sprung a leak, and, one night, foundered at the wharf." Quarrels and litigation ensued, D'Auxiron died, and the company dissolved. "The heirs of D'Auxiron turned the papers of the deceased inventor over to Jouffroy, and the King transferred to him the monopoly held by the former. . . . M. Jacques Périer, the then distinguished mechanic, was consulted, and prepared plans, which were adopted in place of those of Jouffroy. The boat was built by Périer, and a trial took place in 1774 [1775] on the Seine. The result was unsatisfactory." Jouffroy was still undiscouraged, and pursued experiments for several years, at his country home and at Lyons, until he had impoverished himself and was forced to abandon the field. "About 1785, John Fitch and James Rumsey were engaged in experiments having in view the application of steam to navigation. Rumsey's experiments began in 1774, and in 1786 he succeeded in driving a boat at the rate of four miles an hour against the current of the Potomac at Shepherdstown, W. Va., in presence of General Washington. His method of propulsion has often been reinvented since. . . . Rumsey employed his engine to drive a great pump which forced a stream of water aft, thus propelling the boat forward, as proposed earlier by Bernouilli. . . . Rumsey died of apoplexy, while explaining some of his schemes before a London society a short time later, December 23, 1793, at the age of 50 years. A boat, then in process of construction from his plans, was afterward tried on the Thames, in 1793, and steamed at the rate of four miles an hour. . . . John Fitch was an unfortunate and eccentric, but very ingenious, Connecticut mechanic. After roaming about until 40 years of age, he finally settled on the banks of the Delaware, where he built his first steamboat. . . . The machinery [of Fitch's first model] was made of brass, and the boat was impelled by paddle-wheels. . . . In September, 1785, Fitch presented to the American Philosophical Society, at Philadelphia, a model in which he had substituted an endless chain and floats for the paddle-wheels." His first actual steamboat, however, which he tried at Philadelphia in August, 1787, before the members of the Federal Constitutional Convention, was fitted with neither paddle-wheels nor floats, but with a set of oars or paddles on each side, worked by the engine. His second boat, finished in 1788, was similarly worked, but the oars were placed at the stern. This boat made a trip to Burlington, 20 miles from Philadelphia. "Subsequently the boat made a number of excursions on the Delaware River, making three or four miles an hour. Another of Fitch's boats, in April, 1790, made seven miles an hour. . . . In June of that year it was placed as a passenger-boat on a line from Philadelphia to Burlington, Bristol, Bordentown, and Trenton. . . . During this period, the boat probably ran between 2,000 and 3,000 miles, and with no serious accident. During the winter of 1790–'91, Fitch commenced another steamboat, the 'Perseverance,'" which was never finished. Although he obtained a patent from the United States, he despaired of success in this country, and went, in 1793, to France, where he fared no better. "In the year 1796, Fitch was again in New York City, experimenting with a little screw steamboat on the 'Collect' Pond, which then covered that part of the city now occupied by the 'Tombs,' the city prison. This little boat was a ship's yawl fitted with a screw, like that adopted later by Woodcroft, and driven by a rudely made engine. Fitch, while in the city of Philadelphia at about this time, met Oliver Evans, and discussed with him the probable future of steam-navigation, and proposed to form a company in the West." Soon afterwards, he settled on a land-grant in Kentucky, where he died in 1798. "During this period, an interest which had never diminished in Great Britain had led to the introduction of experimental steamboats in that country. Patrick Miller, of Dalswinton, had commenced experimenting, in 1786–'87, with boats having double or triple hulls, and propelled by paddle-wheels placed between the parts of the compound vessel." On the suggestion of James Taylor, he placed a steam-engine in a boat constructed upon this plan, in 1788, and attained a speed of five miles an hour. The next year, with a larger vessel, he made seven miles an hour. But for some reason, he pursued his undertaking no further. "In the United States, several mechanics were now at work besides Fitch. Samuel Morey and Nathan Read were among these. Nicholas Roosevelt was another. . . . In Great Britain, Lord Dundas and William Symington, the former as the purveyor of funds and the latter as engineer, followed by Henry Bell, were the first to make the introduction of the steam-engine for the propulsion of ships so completely successful that no interruption subsequently took place in the growth of the new system of water-transportation. . . . Symington commenced work in 1801. The first boat built for Lord Dundas, which has been claimed to have been the 'first practical steamboat,' was finished ready for trial early in 1802. The vessel was called the 'Charlotte Dundas,' in honor of a daughter of Lord Dundas. . . . Among those who saw the Charlotte Dundas, and who appreciated the importance of the success achieved by Symington, was Henry Bell, who, 10 years afterward, constructed the Comet, the first passenger-vessel built in Europe. This vessel was built in 1811, and completed January 18, 1812. . . . Bell constructed several other boats in 1815, and with his success steam-navigation in Great Britain was fairly inaugurated." Meantime this practical success had been anticipated by a few years in the United States, through the labors and exertions of Stevens, Livingston, Fulton, and Roosevelt. Fulton's and Livingston's first experiments were made in France (1803), where the latter was Ambassador from the United States. Three years later they renewed them in America, using an engine ordered for the purpose from Boulton & Watt. "In the spring of 1807 the 'Clermont,' as the new boat was christened, was launched from the ship-yard of Charles Brown, on the East River, New York. In August the machinery was on board and in successful operation.

The hull of this boat was 133 feet long, 18 feet wide, and 9 deep. The boat soon made a trip to Albany, running the distance of 150 miles in 32 hours running time, and returning in 30 hours. . . . This was the first voyage of considerable length ever made by a steam vessel; and Fulton, though not to be classed with James Watt as an inventor, is entitled to the great honor of having been the first to make steam-navigation an every-day commercial success. . . . The success of the Clermont on the trial-trip was such that Fulton soon after advertised the vessel as a regular passenger-boat between New York and Albany. During the next winter the Clermont was repaired and enlarged, and in the summer of 1808 was again on the route to Albany; and, meantime, two new steamboats — the Raritan and the Car of Neptune — had been built by Fulton. In the year 1811 he built the Paragon. . . . A steam ferry-boat was built to ply between New York and Jersey City in 1812, and the next year two others, to connect the metropolis with Brooklyn. . . . Fulton had some active and enterprising rivals." The prize gained by him "was most closely contested by Colonel John Stevens, of Hoboken," who built his first steamboat in 1804, propelling it by a screw with four blades, and his second in 1807, with two screws. He was shut out from New York waters by a monopoly which Fulton and Livingston had procured, and sent his little ship by sea to Philadelphia. "After Fulton and Stevens had thus led the way, steam-navigation was introduced very rapidly on both sides of the ocean." Nicholas J. Roosevelt, at Pittsburgh, in 1811, built, from Fulton's plans, the first steamer on the western rivers, and took her to New Orleans. "The first steamer on the Great Lakes was the Ontario, built in 1816, at Sackett's Harbor."—R. H. Thurston, *Hist. of the Growth of the Steam Engine, ch.* 5.

Also in: The same, *Robert Fulton.*—C. D. Colden, *Life of Robert Fulton.*—T. Westcott, *Life of John Fitch.*

On the Ocean.—"In 1819 the Atlantic was first crossed by a ship using steam. This was the Savannah, of 380 tons, launched at Corlear's Hook, New York, August 22, 1818. She was built to ply between New York and Savannah as a sailing packet. She was however, purchased by Savannah merchants [by a Mr. Scarborough] and fitted with steam machinery, the paddle-wheels being constructed to fold up and be laid upon the deck when not in use, her shaft also having a joint for that purpose. She left Savannah on the 26th of May, and reached Liverpool in 25 days, using steam 18 days. The log book, still preserved, notes several times taking the wheels in on deck in thirty minutes. In August she left Liverpool for Cronstadt. An effort was made to sell her to Russia, which failed. She sailed for Savannah, touching at Copenhagen and Arendal, and arrived in 53 days. Her machinery later was taken out, and she resumed her original character as a sailing packet, and ended her days by being wrecked on the south coast of Long Island. But steam-power had by 1830 grown large enough to strike out more boldly. The Savannah's effort was an attempt in which steam was only an auxiliary, and one, too, of a not very powerful kind. Our coastwise steamers, as well as those employed in Great Britain, as also the voyage of the Enterprise to Calcutta in 1825 (though she took 113 days in doing it), had settled the possibility of the use of steam at sea, and the question had now become whether a ship could be built to cross the Atlantic depending entirely on her steam power. It had become wholly a question of fuel consumption. The Savannah, it may be said, used pitch-pine on her outward voyage, and wood was for a very long time the chief fuel for steaming purposes in America. . . . In 1836, under the influence of Brunel's bold genius, the Great Western Steamship Company was founded as, an off-shoot of the Great Western Railway, whose terminus was then Bristol." The Company's first ship was the Great Western. She was of unprecedented size—236 feet length and 35 feet 4 inches breadth—"determined on by Brunel as being necessary for the requisite power and coal carrying capacity. . . . The Great Western was launched on July 19, 1837, and was towed from Bristol to the Thames to receive her machinery, where she was the wonder of London. She left for Bristol on March 31, 1838; and arrived, after having had a serious fire on board, on April 2d. In the meantime others had been struck with the possibility of steaming to New York; and a company, of which the moving spirit was Mr. J. Laird, of Birkenhead, purchased the Sirius, of 700 tons, employed between London and Cork, and prepared her for a voyage to New York. The completion of the Great Western was consequently hastened; and she left Bristol on Sunday, April 8, 1838, at 10 A. M. with 7 passengers on board, and reached New York on Monday, the 23d, the afternoon of the same day with the Sirius, which had left Cork Harbor (where she had touched en route from London) four days before the Great Western had left Bristol. The latter still had nearly 200 tons of coal, of the total of 800, on board on arrival; the Sirius had consumed her whole supply, and was barely able to make harbor. It is needless to speak of the reception of these two ships at New York. It was an event which stirred the whole country, and with reason; it had practically, at one stroke, reduced the breadth of the Atlantic by half. . . . The Great Western started on her return voyage, May 7th, with 66 passengers. This was made in 14 days, though one was lost by a stoppage at sea." Within a few years following several steamers were placed in the transatlantic trade, among them the Royal William, the British Queen, the President, the Liverpool, and the Great Britain, the latter a screw steamer, built of iron and put afloat by the Great Western Company. In 1840 the long famous Cunard line was founded by Mr. Samuel Cunard, of Halifax, Nova Scotia, in company with Mr. George Burns of Glasgow and Mr. David McIver of Liverpool. The screw propeller (taking the place of the paddle-wheel), which made its first appearance in ocean navigation with the Great Britain, obtained its practical introduction through the labors of the great Swedish engineer, John Ericsson, though an idea of it had been in the minds of many inventors for a century and a half. Ericsson, induced by Francis B. Ogden and Captain Robert F. Stockton, U. S. N., came to the United States in 1839, and the introduction of the screw-propeller occurred rapidly after that date, the paddle-wheel disappearing from ocean steamships first, and more slowly from the steamers

engaged in lake and river navigation.—F. E. Chadwick, *The Development of the Steamship* (*"Ocean Steamships," ch.* 1).

ALSO IN: A. J. Maginnis, *The Atlantic Ferry, ch.* 1–2.—R. H. Thurston, *Hist. of the Growth of the Steam Engine, ch.* 5.—W. C. Church, *Life of Ericsson, ch.* 6–10 (*v.* 1).

STEDMAN, FORT, The capture of. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1865 (MARCH—APRIL: VIRGINIA).

STEEL BOYS. See IRELAND: A. D. 1760–1798.

STEEL YARD, The Association of the. See HANSA TOWNS.

STEENWYK: Siege and relief (1581). See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1577–1581.

STEIN, Prussian reform measures of. See GERMANY: A. D. 1806 (JANUARY — AUGUST); 1807–1808; and 1808.

STEINKIRK, OR STEENKERKE, Battle of. See FRANCE: A. D. 1692.

STELA, OR STELE.—"This is one of the words most frequently used in Egyptian archæology, because it designates a monument which is found in hundreds. The stela is a rectangular flat stone generally rounded at the summit, and it was made use of by the Egyptians for all sorts of inscriptions. These stelæ were, generally speaking, used for epitaphs; they also served, however, to transcribe texts which were to be preserved or exhibited to the public, and in this latter case the stela became a sort of monumental placard."—A. Mariette, *Monuments of Upper Egypt, p.* 29, *foot-note.*

STENAY: A. D. 1654.—Siege and capture by the French. See FRANCE: A. D. 1653–1656.

A. D. 1659.—Ceded to France. See FRANCE: A. D. 1659–1661.

STEPHANUS, OR ESTIENNE, Robert and Henry, The Press of. See PRINTING &C.: A. D. 1496–1598.

STEPHEN (of Blois), King of England, A. D. 1135–1154.....Stephen I., Pope, A. D. 752, March.....Stephen I. (called Saint), King of Hungary, 997–1038.....Stephen II., Pope, 752–757.....Stephen II., King of Hungary, 1114–1131.....Stephen III., Pope, 768–772.....Stephen III. and IV. (in rivalry), Kings of Hungary, 1161–1173.....Stephen IV., Pope, 816–817.....Stephen V., Pope, 885–891.....Stephen V., King of Hungary, 1270–1272.....Stephen VI., Pope, 896–897.....Stephen VII., Pope, 929–931.....Stephen VIII., Pope, 939–942.....Stephen IX., Pope, 1057–1058.....Stephen Batory, King of Poland, 1575–1586.....Stephen Dushan, The Empire of. See BALKAN AND DANUBIAN STATES: A. D. 1341–1356.

STEPHENS, Alexander H.—Opposition to Secession. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1861 (JANUARY — FEBRUARY).....**Election to the Vice-Presidency of the rebellious "Confederate States."** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1861 (FEBRUARY).....**The Hampton Roads Peace Conference.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1865 (FEBRUARY).

STEPHENSON, George, and the beginning of railroads. See STEAM LOCOMOTION.

STETTIN: A. D. 1630.—Occupied by Gustavus Adolphus and his Swedes. See GERMANY: A. D. 1630–1631.

A. D. 1648.—Cession to Sweden in the Peace of Westphalia. See GERMANY: A. D. 1648.

A. D. 1677.—Siege and capture by the Elector of Brandenburg. See SCANDINAVIAN STATES (SWEDEN): A. D. 1644–1697.

A. D. 1720.—Cession by Sweden to Prussia. See SCANDINAVIAN STATES (SWEDEN): A. D. 1719–1721.

STEUBEN, Baron, in the Virginia campaign of the American Revolution. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1780–1781; 1781 (JANUARY—MAY).

STEVENS, Thaddeus, and the Reconstruction Committee. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1865–1866 (DECEMBER—APRIL), to 1868–1870.

STEWART, Captain Charles, and the frigate Constitution. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1814.

STEWART DYNASTY, The. See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1370; and ENGLAND: A. D. 1603, to 1688.

STILICHO, Ministry of. See ROME: A. D. 394–395, to 404–408.

STILLWATER, Battle of. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1777 (JULY—OCTOBER).

STIRLING, Earl of, The American grant to. See NEW ENGLAND: A. D. 1621–1631.

STIRLING, General Lord, and the American Revolution. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1776 (AUGUST).

STIRLING, Wallace's victory at (1297). See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1290–1305.

STIRLING CASTLE, Sieges of.—Stirling Castle was taken in 1303 by Edward I. of England, after a three months' siege, which he conducted in person and which he looked upon as his proudest military achievement. Eleven years later, in 1314, it was besieged and recaptured by the Scots, under Edward Bruce, and it was in a desperate attempt of the English to relieve the castle at that time that the battle of Bannockburn was fought.—J. H. Burton, *Hist. of Scotland, ch.* 22–23 (*v.* 2).—See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1314.

STOA, The.—"We have repeatedly mentioned the stoa or colonnade in connection with other buildings; we now have to consider it as a separate artistic erection [in ancient Greek cities]. . . . The stoa, as an independent building, occurs both as an ornament of streets and squares, and as a convenient locality for walks and public meetings. Its simplest form is that of a colonnade bounded by a wall. This back wall offers a splendid surface for decorations, and is frequently adorned with pictures. A stoa in the market-place of Athens contained illustrations of the battle of Œnoë, of the fight of the Athenians against the Amazons, of the destruction of Troy and of the battle of Marathon. . . . The progress from this simple form to a further extension is on a principle somewhat analogous to what we have observed in the temple; that is, a row of columns was added on the other side of the wall. The result was a double colonnade, . . . as a specimen of which, Pausanias mentions the Korkyraic stoa near the market place of Elis. As important we notice Pausanias's remark that this stoa 'contained in the middle, not columns, but a wall'; which shows that most of the double

colonnades contained columns in the centre as props of the roof."—E. Guhl and W. Koner, *Life of the Greeks and Romans, pt.* 1, *sect.* 27.

STOCKACH, Battle of (1799). See FRANCE: A. D. 1798–1799 (AUGUST—APRIL).

STOCKBRIDGE INDIANS. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: STOCKBRIDGE INDIANS.

STOCKHOLM: A. D. 1471.—Battle of the Brunkeberg. See SCANDINAVIAN STATES: A. D. 1397–1527.

A. D. 1521-1523.—Siege by Gustavus Vasa. See SCANDINAVIAN STATES: A. D. 1397–1527.

A. D. 1612.—Attacked by the Danes. See SCANDINAVIAN STATES (SWEDEN): A. D. 1611–1629.

STOCKHOLM, Treaty of. See GERMANY: A. D. 1812–1813.

STOCKTON AND DARLINGTON RAILWAY. See STEAM LOCOMOTION ON LAND.

STOLA, The.—"The Roman ladies wore, by way of under garment, a long tunic descending to the feet, and more particularly denominated 'stola.' This vestment assumed all the variety of modification displayed in the corresponding attire of the Grecian females. Over the stola, they also adopted the Grecian peplum, under the name of palla."—T. Hope, *Costume of the Ancients, v.* 1, *p.* 38.

STOLHOFEN, The breaking of the lines of (1707). See GERMANY: A. D. 1706–1711.

STONE AGE.—BRONZE AGE.—IRON AGE.—"Human relics of great antiquity occur, more or less abundantly, in many parts of Europe. . . . The antiquities referred to are of many kinds—dwelling-places, sepulchral and other monuments, forts and camps, and a great harvest of implements and ornaments of stone and metal. In seeking to classify these relics and remains according to their relative antiquity, archæologists have selected the implements and ornaments as affording the most satisfactory basis for such an arrangement, and they divide prehistoric time into three periods, which are termed respectively the Stone Age, the Bronze Age, and the Iron Age. Of these periods the earliest was the Stone Age, when implements and ornaments were formed exclusively of stone, wood, horn, and bone. The use of metal for such purposes was then quite unknown. To the Stone Age succeeded the Age of Bronze, at which time cutting instruments, such as swords and knives and axes, began to be made of copper, and an alloy of that metal and tin. When in the course of time iron replaced bronze for cutting-instruments, the Bronze Age came to an end and the Iron Age supervened. . . . The archæological periods are simply so many phases of civilisation, and it is conceivable that Stone, Bronze, and Iron Ages might have been contemporaneous in different parts of one and the same continent. . . . It has been found necessary within recent years to subdivide the Stone Age into two periods, called respectively the Old Stone and New Stone Ages; or, to employ the terms suggested by Sir John Lubbock, and now generally adopted, the Palæolithic and Neolithic Periods. The stone implements belonging to the older of these periods show but little variety of form, and are very rudely fashioned, being merely roughly chipped into shape, and never ground or polished."—J. Geikie, *Prehistoric Europe, pp.* 5–11.

STONE OF DESTINY, The. See LIA-FAIL.

STONE RIVER, OR MURFREESBOROUGH, Battle of. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1862–1863 (DECEMBER—JANUARY: TENNESSEE).

STONE STREET.—An old Roman road which runs from London to Chichester.

STONEHENGE. See ABURY.

STONEMAN'S RAID. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1865 (APRIL—MAY).

STONEY CREEK, The Surprise at. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1813 (APRIL—JULY).

STONINGTON, Bombardment of. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1813–1814.

STONY POINT, The storming of. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1778–1779.

STORTHING, The. See THING; also SCANDINAVIAN STATES (NORWAY): A. D. 1814–1815; and CONSTITUTION OF NORWAY.

STORY, Judge, and his judicial services. See LAW, EQUITY: A. D. 1812.

STRAFFORD (Wentworth, Earl of) and Charles I. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1634–1637, 1640, and 1640–1641; also, IRELAND: A. D. 1633–1639.

STRALSUND: The founding of the city. See HANSA TOWNS.

A. D. 1628.—Unsuccessful siege by Wallenstein. See GERMANY: A. D. 1627–1629.

A. D. 1678.—Siege and capture by the Elector of Brandenburg. See SCANDINAVIAN STATES (SWEDEN): A. D. 1644–1697.

A. D. 1715.—Siege and capture by the Danes and Prussians. See SCANDINAVIAN STATES (SWEDEN): A. D. 1707–1718.

A. D. 1720.—Restoration by Denmark to Sweden. See SCANDINAVIAN STATES (SWEDEN): A. D. 1719–1721.

A. D. 1809.—Occupied by the Patriot Schill.—Stormed and captured by the French. See GERMANY: A. D. 1809 (APRIL—JULY).

STRASBURG: A. D. 357.—Julian's victory.—The most serious battle in Julian's campaigns against the Alemanni was fought in August, A. D. 357, at Strasburg (then a Roman post called Argentoratum) where Chnodomar had crossed the Rhine with 35,000 warriors. The result was a great victory for the Romans.—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, ch.* 19.—See GAUL: A. D. 355–361.

A. D. 842.—The Oaths.—During the civil wars which occurred between the grandsons of Charlemagne, in 842, the year following the great battle at Fontainelles, the two younger of the rivals, Karl and Ludwig, formed an alliance against Lothaire. Karl found his support in Aquitaine and Neustria; Ludwig depended on the East Franks and their German kindred. The armies of the two were assembled in February at Strasburg (Argentaria) and a solemn oath of friendship and fidelity was taken by the kings in the presence of their people and repeated by the latter. The oath was repeated in the German language, and in the Romance language—then just acquiring form in southern Gaul,—and it has been preserved in both. "In the Romance form of this oath, we have the earliest monument of the tongue out of which the modern French was formed."—P. Godwin, *Hist. of France: Ancient Gaul, ch.* 18.

ALSO IN: J. C. L. de Sismondi, *The French Under the Carlovingians; tr. by Bellingham, ch.* 8.

A. D. 1525.—Formal establishment of the Reformed Religion. See PAPACY: A. D. 1522–1525.

A. D. 1529.—Joined in the Protest which gave rise to the name Protestants. See PAPACY: A. D. 1525–1529.

A. D. 1674-1675.—The passage of the Rhine given to the Germans. See NETHERLANDS (HOLLAND): A. D. 1674–1678.

A. D. 1681.—Seizure and annexation to France.—Overthrow of the independence of the town as an Imperial city. See FRANCE: A. D. 1679–1681.

A. D. 1697.—Ceded to France by the Treaty of Ryswick. See FRANCE: A. D. 1697.

A. D. 1870.—Siege and capture by the Germans. See FRANCE: A. D. 1870 (JULY—AUGUST), and (SEPTEMBER—OCTOBER).

A. D. 1871.—Acquisition (with Alsace) by Germany. See FRANCE: A. D. 1871 (JANUARY—MAY).

STRATEGI.—In ancient Sparta, the Strategi were military commanders appointed for those armies which were not led by one of the kings. At Athens, the whole direction of the military system belonged to a board of ten Strategi.—G. Schömann, *Antiq. of Greece: The State, pt.* 3, *ch.* 1 *and* 3.

STRATHCLYDE. See CUMBRIA; also, SCOTLAND: 7TH CENTURY.

STRELITZ, OR STRELTZE. See RUSSIA: A. D. 1698–1704.

STRONGBOW'S CONQUEST OF IRELAND. See IRELAND: A. D. 1169–1175.

STUART, General J. E. B., The Raid of. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1862 (JUNE: VIRGINIA).

STUARTS, The. See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1370; and ENGLAND: A. D. 1603.

STUM, Battle of (1629). See SCANDINAVIAN STATES (SWEDEN): A. D. 1611–1629.

STUNDISTS, The.—In the neighborhood of Kherson, in southern Russia, the Stundist religious movement arose, about 1858. As its name implies, it "had a German origin. As far back as 1778 the great Empress Catherine had colonized Kherson with peasants from the Suabian land, who brought with them their religion, their pastors, and their industrious, sober ways. For many years national prejudices and the barriers of language kept Russians and Germans apart from each other. But sooner or later true life begins to tell. . . . Some of the Russian peasants who had been helped in their poverty or ministered to in their sickness by their German neighbours began to attend their services—to keep the 'stunden,' or 'hours,' of praise and prayer; they learned to read, were furnished with the New Testament in their own language, and eventually some of them found the deeper blessing of eternal life. In this simple scriptural fashion this memorable movement began. Men told their neighbours what God had done for their souls, and so the heavenly contagion spread from cottage to cottage, from village to village, and from province to province, till at length the Russian Stundists were found in all the provinces from the boundaries of the Austrian Empire in the West to the land of the Don Cossack in the East, and were supposed to number something like a quarter-of-a-million souls. . . . M. Dalton, a Lutheran clergyman, long resident in St. Petersburg, and whose knowledge of religious movements in Russia is very considerable, goes so far as to say that they are two millions strong. But it is not alone to the actual number of professing Stundists that we are to look in estimating the force and extent of the movement which they have inaugurated in Russia. . . . Compared with the enormous population of the Russian Empire, the number of Stundists, whether two millions or only a quarter of a million, is insignificant; but the spirit of Stundism has spread, and is still spreading into regions as ultra-Orthodox as the heart of the most bigoted Greek Churchman could desire, and is slowly but surely leavening the whole mass."—J. Brown, ed., *The Stundists, pref. and ch.* 14.

STUYVESANT, Peter, The administration of. See NEW YORK: A. D. 1647–1664, to 1664.

STYRIA: Origin, and annexation to Austria. See AUSTRIA: A. D. 805–1246.

A. D. 1576.—Annexation of Croatia. See HUNGARY: A. D. 1567–1604.

17th Century.—Suppression of the Reformation. See GERMANY: A. D. 1608–1618.

SUABIA, The Imperial House of. See GERMANY: A. D. 1138–1268; and ITALY: A. D. 1154–1162, to 1183–1250.

SUABIA AND SUABIANS, Ancient. See SUEVI; and ALEMANNI.

SUABIAN BUND, OR LEAGUE, The. See LANDFRIEDE, &C.; also CITIES, IMPERIAL AND FREE, OF GERMANY; and FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.

SUABIAN CIRCLE, The. See GERMANY: A. D. 1493–1519; also, ALEMANNI: A. D. 496–504.

SUABIAN WAR (1496-1499). See SWITZERLAND: A. D. 1396–1499.

SUARDONES, The. See AVIONES.

SUBLICIAN BRIDGE.—The Pons Sublicius was the single bridge in ancient Rome with which the Tiber was originally spanned. It was built of wood, and constructed for easy removal when an enemy threatened. No trace of it exists.—B. G. Niebuhr, *Lect's on Ancient Ethnog. and Geog., v.* 2, *p.* 103.

SUBLIME PORTE, The.—"The figurative language of the institutes of Mahomet II. [Sultan, A. D. 1451–1481], still employed by his successors, describes the state under the martial metaphor of a tent. The Lofty Gate of the Royal Tent (where Oriental rulers of old sate to administer justice) denotes the chief seat of government. The Italian translation of the phrase, 'La Porta Sublima,' has been adopted by Western nations, with slight modifications to suit their respective languages; and by 'The Sublime Porte' we commonly mean the Imperial Ottoman Government. The Turkish legists and historians depict the details of their government by imagery drawn from the same metaphor of a royal tent. The dome of the state is supported by four pillars. These are formed by, 1st, the Viziers; 2nd, the Kadiaskers (judges); 3rd, the Defterdars (treasurers); and 4th, the Nischandyis (the secretaries of state). Besides these, there are the Outer Agas, that is to say, the military rulers; and the Inner Agas, that is to say, the rulers employed in the court. There is also the

order of the Ulema, or men learned in the law. The Viziers were regarded as constituting the most important pillar that upheld the fabric of the state. In Mahomet II.'s time the Viziers were four in number. Their chief, the Grand Vizier, is the highest of all officers. . . . The . . . high legal dignitaries (who were at that time next in rank to the Kadiaskers) were, 1st, the Kho-dya, who was the tutor of the Sultan and the Princes Royal; 2nd, the Mufti, the authoritative expounder of the law; and, 3rdly, the Judge of Constantinople. . . . The great council of state was named the Divan; and, in the absence of the Sultan, the Grand Vizier was its president. . . . The Divan was also attended by the Reis-Effendi, a general secretary, whose power afterwards became more important than that of the Nis-chandyis; by the Grand Chamberlain, and the Grand Marshal, and a train of other officers of the court."—Sir E. S. Creasy, *Hist. of the Ottoman Turks, pp.* 96–97.—See, also, Pharaohs.

SUB-TREASURY, The. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1837.

SUBURA, at Rome, The.—"Between the converging points of the Quirinal and Esquiline hills lay the Subura, a district of ill-fame, much abused by the poets and historians of imperial times. It was one of the most ancient district communities ('pagi') of Rome, and gave name to one of the four most ancient regions. Nor was it entirely occupied by the lowest class of people, as might be inferred from the notices of it in Martial and Horace. Julius Cæsar is said to have lived in a small house here. . . . The Subura was a noisy, bustling part of Rome, full of small shops, and disreputable places of various kinds."—R. Burn, *Rome and the Campagna, ch.* 6, *pt.* 1.

SUCCESSION, The Austrian: The Question and War of. See Austria: A. D. 1718–1738, 1740, and to 1744–1745; Netherlands: A. D. 1745, and 1746–1747; Italy: A. D. 1741–1743, to 1746–1747; Aix-la-Chapelle: The Congress.

SUCCESSION, The Spanish: The question and war of. See Spain: A. D. 1698–1700, to 1713–1725; and Utrecht: A. D. 1712–1714.

SUCCOTH. See Jews: The Route of the Exodus.

SUDAN, OR SOUDAN, The.—"Forming a natural frontier to the Great Desert is that section of Africa known by the somewhat vague name of Sudan. By this term is understood the region south of the Sahara, limited on the west and south by the Atlantic Ocean as far as it reaches. From the Gulf of Guinea inland, there is no definite southern border line. It may, however, be assumed at the fifth degree of north latitude. . . . [The] Nile region is generally taken as the eastern frontier of Sudan, although it properly reaches to the foot of the Abyssinian highlands. Hence modern maps have introduced the appropriate expression 'Egyptian Sudan' for those eastern districts comprising Senaar, Kordofan, Darfur, and some others. Sudan is therefore, strictly speaking, a broad tract of country reaching right across the whole continent from the Atlantic seaboard almost to the shores of the Red Sea, and is the true home of the Negro races. When our knowledge of the interior has become sufficiently extended to enable us accurately to fix the geographical limits of the Negroes, it may become desirable to make the term Sudan convertible with the whole region inhabited by them."— Hellwald-Johnston, *Africa* (*Stanford's Compendium*), *ch.* 9.

A. D. 1870-1885. — Egyptian conquest. — General Gordon's government.—The Mahdi's rebellion.—The British campaign.—Death of Gordon. See Egypt: A. D. 1870–1883; and 1884–1885.

SUDOR ANGLICUS. See Sweating Sickness; and Plague: A. D. 1485–1593.

SUDRAS. See Caste System of India.

SUESSIONES, The. See Belgæ.

SUETONIUS PAULINUS: Campaigns in Britain. See Britain: A. D. 61.

SUEVI, OR SUEBI, The.—"I must now speak of the Suevi, who are not one nation as are the Chatti and Tencteri, for they occupy the greater part of Germany, and have hitherto been divided into separate tribes with names of their own, though they are called by the general designation of 'Suevi.' A national peculiarity with them is to twist their hair back and fasten it in a knot. This distinguishes the Suevi from the other Germans, as it also does their own freeborn from their slaves."—"Suevia would seem to have been a comprehensive name for the country between the Elbe and the Vistula as far north as the Baltic. Tacitus and Cæsar differ about the Suevi. Suabia is the same word as Suevia."—Tacitus, *Germany, tr. by Church and Brodribb, ch.* 38, *with geog. note.*—"The Suebi, that is the wandering people or nomads. . . . Cæsar's Suebi were probably the Chatti; but that designation certainly belonged in Cæsar's time, and even much later, to every other German stock which could be described as a regularly wandering one."—T. Mommsen, *Hist. of Rome, bk.* 5, *ch.* 7, *with note.*—"The name of the country called Suabia is a true ethnological term, even as Franconia is one. The one means the country occupied by the Suevi, the other the country occupied by the Franks. . . . At what time the name first became an unequivocal geographical designation of what now, in the way of politics, coincides with the Grand Duchy of Baden and part of Wurtemburg, and, in respect to its physical geography, is part of the Black Forest, is uncertain. It was not, however, later than the reign of Alexander Severus (ending A. D. 235). . . . Therein, Alamannia and Suevia appear together — as terms for that part of Germany which had previously gone under the name of 'Decumates agri,' and the parts about the 'Limes Romanus.' With this, then, begins the history of the Suevi of Suabia, or, rather, of the Suabians. Their alliances were chiefly with the Alamanni and Burgundians; their theatre the German side of France, Switzerland, Italy, and (in conjunction with the Visigoths) Spain. Their epoch is from the reign of Alexander to that of Augustulus, in round numbers, from about A. D. 225 to A. D. 475."—R. G. Latham, *The Germania of Tacitus, epilegomena, sect.* 20.—See, also, Alemanni, and Bavaria: The ethnology.

B. C. 58.—Expulsion from Gaul by Cæsar.—A large body of the Suevi, a formidable German tribe, the name of which has survived in modern Suabia, crossed the Rhine and entered Gaul about B. C. 61. They came at the invitation of the Arverni and Sequani of Gaul, who

were forming a league against the Ædui, their rivals, and who sought the aid of the German warriors. The latter responded eagerly to the call, and, having lodged themselves in the country of the Sequani, summoned fresh hordes of their countrymen to join them. The Gauls soon found that they had brought troublesome neighbors into their midst, and they all joined in praying Cæsar and his Roman legions to expel the insolent intruders. Cæsar had then just entered on the government of the Roman Gallic provinces and had signalized his first appearance in the field by stopping the attempted migration of the Helvetii, destroying two thirds of them, and forcing the remnant back to their mountains. He welcomed an opportunity to interfere further in Gallic affairs and promptly addressed certain proposals to the Suevic chieftain, Ariovistus, which the latter rejected with disdain. Some negotiations followed, but both parties meant war, and the question, which should make a conquest of Gaul, was decided speedily at a great battle fought at some place about 80 miles from Vesontio (modern Besançon) in the year 58 B. C. The Germans were routed, driven into the Rhine and almost totally destroyed. Ariovistus, with a very few followers, escaped across the river, and died soon afterwards.—C. Merivale, *History of the Romans, ch.* 6.

ALSO IN: Cæsar, *Gallic Wars, bk.* 1, *ch.* 31–53.—Napoleon III., *Hist. of Cæsar, bk.* 3, *ch.* 4.

A. D. 406-409.—Final invasion of Gaul. See GAUL: A. D. 406–409.

A. D. 409-414.—Settlement in Spain. See SPAIN: A. D. 409–414.

A. D. 409-573.—Their history in Spain.—"The Suevi kept their ground for more than half a century in Spain, before they embraced the Christian religion and became Arians. Being surrounded on all sides by the Visigoths, their history contains merely an account of the wars which they had to maintain against their neighbours: they were long and bloody; 164 years were passed in fighting before they could be brought to yield. In 573, Leovigild, king of the Visigoths, united them to the monarchy of Spain."—J. C. L. de Sismondi, *Fall of the Roman Empire, ch.* 7 (*v.* 1).—See, also, VANDALS: A. D. 428, and GOTHS (VISIGOTHS): A. D. 507–712.

A. D. 460-500.—In Germany.—Those tribes of the Suevic confederacy which remained on the German side of the Rhine, while their brethren pressed southwards, along with the Vandals and Burgundians, in the great invasive movement of 406, "dwelt in the south-west corner of Germany, in the region which is now known as the Black Forest, and away eastwards along the Upper Danube, perhaps as far as the river Lech. They were already mingled with the Alamanni of the mountains, a process which was no doubt carried yet further when, some thirty years after the time now reached by us [about 460] Clovis overthrew the monarchy of the Alamanni [A. D. 496], whom he drove remorselessly forth from all the lands north of the Neckar. The result of these migrations and alliances was the formation of the two great Duchies with which we are so familiar in the mediaeval history of Germany—Suabia and Franconia. Suabia, which is a convertible term with Alamannia, represents the land left to the mingled Suevi and Alamanni; Franconia that occupied east of the Rhine by the intrusive Franks."—T. Hodgkin, *Italy and her Invaders, bk.* 4, *ch.* 1 (*v.* 3).—See, also, ALEMANNI: A. D. 496–504.

SUEVIC SEA.—The ancient name of the Baltic.

SUEZ CANAL, Opening of the (1869). See EGYPT: A. D. 1840–1869.

SUFFERERS' LANDS, The. See OHIO: A. D. 1786–1796.

SUFFETES.—"The original monarchical constitution [of Carthage]—doubtless inherited from Tyre—was represented (practically in Aristotle's time, and theoretically to the latest period) by two supreme magistrates called by the Romans Suffetes. Their name is the same as the Hebrew Shofetim, mistranslated in our Bible, Judges. The Hamilcars and Hannos of Carthage were, like their prototypes, the Gideons and the Samsons of the Book of Judges, not so much the judges as the protectors and rulers of their respective states."—R. B. Smith, *Carthage and the Carthaginians, ch.* 1.—See, also, JEWS: ISRAEL UNDER THE JUDGES.

SUFFOLK RESOLVES, The. See BOSTON: A. D. 1774.

SUFFRAGE, Woman. See WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

SUFFRAGE QUALIFICATION IN ENGLAND. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1884–1885.

SUFIS.—A sect of Mahometan mystics. "The final object of the Sufi devotee is to attain to the light of Heaven, towards which he must press forward till perfect knowledge is reached in his union with God, to be consummated, after death, in absorption into the Divine Being."—J. W. H. Stobart, *Islam and its Founder, ch.* 10.

SUGAMBRI, OR SICAMBRI. See USIPETES; also FRANKS: ORIGIN, and A. D. 253.

SUGAR ACT, The. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1763–1764.

SUGAR-HOUSE PRISONS, The. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1776–1777 PRISONERS AND EXCHANGES.

SUIONES, The.—"Next [on the Baltic] occur the communities of the Suiones, seated in the very Ocean, who, besides their strength in men and arms, also possess a naval force. . . . These people honour wealth."—Tacitus, *Germany, Oxford Trans., ch.* 44.—"The Suiones inhabited Sweden and the Danish isles of Funen, Langland, Zeeland, Laland, etc. From them and the Cimbri were derived the Normans."—*Note to same.*

SULIOTES, The.—"The heroic struggle of the little commonwealth over a number of years [1787–1804] against all the resources and ingenuity of Ali Pacha [vizir of Jannina] is very stirring and full of episode. . . . The origin of the Suliotes is lost in obscurity. . . . The chief families traced their origin to different villages and districts; and, though their language was Greek, they appear to have consisted, for the most part, of Christian Albanians, with a small admixture of Greeks, who, flying from the oppression of the invaders, had taken refuge in the well-nigh inaccessible mountains of Chamouri (Chimari) [in Epirus], and had there established a curious patriarchal community. . . . At the time when they became conspicuous in history the Suliotes were possessed of four villages in the great ravine of Suli, namely, Kiapha, Avariko, Samoniva, and Kako-Suli, composing a group known as the Tetrachorion; and seven

villages in the plains, whose inhabitants, being considered genuine Suliotes, were allowed to retire into the mountain in time of war. . . . They also controlled between 50 and 60 tributary villages, with a mixed population of Greeks and Albanians; but these were abandoned to their fate in war. In the early part of the last century the Suliotes are said not to have had more than 200 fighting-men, although they were almost always engaged in petty warfare and marauding expeditions; and at the period of their extraordinary successes the numbers of the Suliotes proper never exceeded 5,000 souls, with a fighting strength of 1,500 men, who were, however, reinforced at need by the women. Their government was purely patriarchal; they had neither written laws nor law courts, and the family formed the political unit of the State. The families were grouped together in tribal alliances called Pharas, of which there were 29 in the Tetrachorion and 18 in the Heptachorion. All disputes were settled by arbitration by the heads of the Pharas; and these 47 elders formed a sort of general Council, the matter for discussion being almost exclusively war. As they were gradually driven from the plains which had supported them to the mountains, which produced nothing but pasture for their flocks, they were of necessity compelled to support themselves by marauding expeditions, which involved them in perpetual difficulties with the surrounding Ottoman governors. The historian of Suli enumerates no less than eight wars in which the community was involved before their great struggle with Ali."—R. Rodd, *The Customs and Lore of Modern Greece, ch.* 10.

SULLA, Proscriptions by and Dictatorship of. See Rome: B. C. 88–78.

SULLIVAN, General John, and the War of the American Revolution. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1775 (May—August); 1776 (August); 1779 (August—September).

SULTAN, The Title.—Gibbon (ch. 57) represents that the title of Sultan was first invented for Mahmud the Gaznevide, by the ambassador of the Caliph of Bagdad, "who employed an Arabian or Chaldaic word that signifies 'lord' and 'master.'" But Dr. William Smith in a note to this passage in Gibbon, citing Weil, says: "It is uncertain when the title of Sultan was first used, but it seems at all events to have been older than the time of Mahmud. It is mentioned by Halebi, under the reign of Motawaccel; but according to Ibn Chaldun it was first assumed by the Bowides." See Turks: A. D. 999–1183.

SUMIR, OR SHUMIR. See Babylonia, Primitive.

SUMTER, The Confederate cruiser. See Alabama claims: A. D. 1861–1862.

SUMTER, Fort: A. D. 1860.—Occupied and held by Major Anderson, for the United States Government. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1860 (December).

A. D. 1861 (April).—Bombardment and reduction by the Rebel batteries. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1861 (March—April).

A. D. 1863.—Attack and repulse of the Monitors. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1863 (April: South Carolina).

A. D. 1863.—Bombardment and unsuccessful assault. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1863 (August—December: South Carolina).

A. D. 1865 (February—April).—Recovery by the nation.—The restoring of the flag. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1865 (February: South Carolina).

SUNDAY SCHOOLS. Originated by Robert Raikes, at Gloucester, Eng., in 1780.

SUNNAH, The. See Islam.

SUNNI SECT, The. See Islam.

SUOVETAURILIA. Sacrifices by the Romans at the end of a lustrum and after a triumph.

SUPERIOR, Lake, The discovery of. See Canada: A. D. 1634–1673.

SUPREMACY, The Acts of.—The first Act of Supremacy, which established the independence of the Church of England and broke its relations with Rome, was passed by the English Parliament during the reign of Henry VIII., in 1534. It enacted "that the King should be taken and reputed 'the only Supreme Head on earth of the Church of England called Ecclesia Anglicana, and shall have and enjoy, annexed and united to the imperial Crown of this realm, as well the title and style thereof, as all honours, dignities, pre-eminencies, jurisdictions, privileges, authorities, immunities, profits, and commodities, to the said dignity of Supreme Head of the same church belonging and appertaining'; with full power to visit, reform, and correct all heresies, errors, abuses, offences, contempts and enormities which, by any manner of spiritual authority or jurisdiction, ought to be reformed or corrected."—T. P. Taswell-Langmead, *English Const. Hist., ch.* 11.—The Act of Supremacy was repealed in the reign of Mary and re-enacted with changes in that of Elizabeth, 1559. See England: A. D. 1527–1534; and 1559.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES, The.—"On the 24th day of September, 1789, the act organizing the Supreme Court was passed. The Court was constituted with a Chief Justice and five associates. John Jay was appointed the first Chief Justice by Washington. Webster said of him that when the ermine fell upon his shoulders, it touched a being as spotless as itself. The Court first convened in February, 1790, in New York. It does not appear from the reports that any case then came before it. Jay remained Chief Justice until 1795, when he resigned to become governor of the State of New York. A Chief Justice in our day would hardly do this. His judicial duties were so few that he found time, in 1794, to accept the mission to England to negotiate the treaty so famous in history as 'Jay's Treaty.' John Rutledge of South Carolina was appointed to succeed Jay, but he was so pronounced in his opposition to the treaty, and so bitter in his denunciation of Jay himself, that the federal Senate refused to confirm him. William Cushing of Massachusetts, one of the associate justices, was then nominated by Washington, and was promptly confirmed; but he preferred to remain associate justice, and Oliver Ellsworth of Connecticut was made Chief Justice. He held the office until 1801, when John Marshall of Virginia was appointed by President Adams. Marshall held the office thirty-four years. He was known at the time of his appointment as an ardent Federalist. In our time

he is known as 'the great Chief Justice.' Roger B. Taney was the next incumbent. He was appointed by President Jackson. His political enemies styled him a renegade Federalist, and said that his appointment was his reward for his obsequious obedience, while Secretary of the Treasury, to President Jackson. But Taney, despite the Dred Scott decision, was an honest man and a great judge. His opinions are models of lucid and orderly discussion, and are of admirable literary form. He held the office for twenty-eight years, and upon his death in 1864, President Lincoln appointed Salmon P. Chase, of Ohio. Chief Justice Chase died in 1874. President Grant then appointed Morrison R. Waite of Ohio. He died in 1888. Melville W. Fuller, of Illinois, is the present [1889] incumbent, his appointment having been made by President Cleveland. . . . In 1807 an associate judge was added by Congress; two more were added in 1837, and one in 1863. They were added to enable the Court to perform the work of the circuits, which increased with the growth of the country."—J. S. Landon, *The Const. Hist. and Gov't of the U. S., lect.* 10.—"The Supreme court is directly created by Art. iii., sect. 1 of the Constitution, but with no provision as to the number of its judges. Originally there were six; at present there are nine, a chief justice, with a salary of $10,500 (£2,100), and eight associate judges (salary $10,000). The justices are nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate. They hold office during good behaviour, i. e. they are removable only by impeachment. They have thus a tenure even more secure than that of English judges, for the latter may be removed by the Crown on an address from both Houses of Parliament. . . . The Fathers of the Constitution were extremely anxious to secure the independence of their judiciary, regarding it as a bulwark both for the people and for the States against aggressions of either Congress or the President. They affirmed the life tenure by an unanimous vote in the Convention of 1787, because they deemed the risk of the continuance in office of an incompetent judge a less evil than the subserviency of all judges to the legislature, which might flow from a tenure dependent on legislative will. The result has justified their expectations. The judges have shown themselves independent of Congress and of party, yet the security of their position has rarely tempted them to breaches of judicial duty. Impeachment has been four times resorted to, once only against a justice of the Supreme court, and then unsuccessfully. Attempts have been made, beginning from Jefferson, who argued that judges should hold office for terms of four or six years only, to alter the tenure of the Federal judges, as that of the State judges has been altered in most States; but Congress has always rejected the proposed constitutional amendment. The Supreme court sits at Washington from October till July in every year."—J. Bryce, *The Am. Commonwealth, pt.* 1, *ch.* 22 (*v.* 1).—"It is, I believe, the only national tribunal in the world which can sit in judgment on a national law, and can declare an act of all the three powers of the Union to be null and void. No such power does or can exist in England. Any one of the three powers of the state, King, Lords, or Commons, acting alone, may act illegally; the three acting together cannot act illegally. An act of parliament is final; it may be repealed by the power which enacted it; it cannot be questioned by any other power. For in England there is no written constitution; the powers of Parliament, of King, Lords, and Commons, acting together, are literally boundless. But in your Union, it is not only possible that President, Senate, or House of Representatives, acting alone, may act illegally; the three acting together may act illegally. For their powers are not boundless, they have no powers but such as the terms of the constitution, that is, the original treaty between the States, have given them. Congress may pass, the President may assent to, a measure which contradicts the terms of the constitution. If they so act, they act illegally, and the Supreme Court can declare such an act to be null and void. This difference flows directly from the difference between a written and an unwritten constitution. It does not follow that every state which has a written constitution need vest in its highest court such powers as are vested in yours, though it certainly seems to me that, in a federal constitution, such a power is highly expedient. My point is simply that such a power can exist where there is a written constitution: where there is no written constitution, it cannot."—E. A. Freeman, *The English People in its Three Homes: Lectures to American Audiences, pp.* 191–192.

SURA, Battle of (A. D. 530). See PERSIA: A. D. 226–627.

SURENA.—The title of the commander-in-chief or field-marshal of the Parthian armies, whose rank was second only to that of the king. This title was sometimes mistaken by Greek writers for an individual name, as in the case of the Parthian general who defeated Crassus.—G. Rawlinson, *Sixth Great Oriental Monarchy, p.* 23.

SURGERY. See MEDICAL SCIENCE.

SURINAM. See GUIANA: A. D. 1580–1814.

SURPLUS, The distribution of the. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1835–1837.

SURRATT, Mrs.: The Lincoln Assassination Conspiracy. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1865 (APRIL 14TH).

SUSA.—SUSIANA.—SHUSHAN.—Originally the capital of the ancient kingdom of Elam, Shushan, or Susiana, or Susa, as it has been variously called, was in later times made the principal capital of the Persian empire, and became the scene of the Biblical story of Esther. A French expedition, directed by M. Dieulafoy and wife, undertook an exploration of the ruins of Susa in 1885 and has brought to light some remarkably interesting and important remains of ancient art. The name Susiana was applied by the Greeks to the country of Elam, as well as to the capital city, and it is sometimes still used in that sense.—Z. A. Ragozin, *Story of Media, Babylon and Persia, app. to ch.* 10.—See, also, ELAM; and BABYLONIA: PRIMITIVE.

SUSIAN GATES.—A pass in the mountains which surrounded the plain of Persepolis, the center of ancient Persia proper. Alexander had difficulty in forcing the Gates.—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece, pt.* 2, *ch.* 93.

SUSIANA. See SUSA.

SUSMARSHAUSEN, Battle of (1648). See GERMANY: A. D. 1646–1648.

SUSQUEHANNA COMPANY, The. See PENNSYLVANIA: A. D. 1753–1799.

SUSQUEHANNAS, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: SUSQUEHANNAS.

SUSSEX.—Originally the kingdom formed by that body of the Saxon conquerors of Britain in the 5th and 6th centuries which acquired the name of the South Saxons. It is nearly represented in territory by the present counties of Sussex and Surrey. See ENGLAND: A. D. 477–527.

SUTRIUM, Battle of.—A victory of the Romans over the Etruscans, among the exploits ascribed to the veteran Q. Fabius Maximus.—W. Ihne, *Hist. of Rome, bk.* 3, *ch.* 10.

SUTTEE, Suppression of, in India. See INDIA: A. D. 1823–1833.

SUVARROF, OR SUWARROW, Campaigns of. See RUSSIA: A. D. 1762–1796; also FRANCE: A. D. 1798–1799 (AUGUST—APRIL); 1799 (APRIL—SEPTEMBER), and (AUGUST—DECEMBER).

SVASTIKA, The. See TRI-SKELION.

SWAANENDAEL. See DELAWARE: A. D. 1629–1631.

SWABIA. See SUABIA.

SWAMP ANGEL, The. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1863 (AUGUST — DECEMBER: SOUTH CAROLINA).

SWAN, The Order of the.—A Prussian order of knighthood, instituted in the 15th century, which disappeared in the century following, and was revived in 1843.

SWANS, The Road of the. See NORMANS.

SWEATING SICKNESS, The. — The "Sudor Anglicus," or Sweating Sickness was a strange and fearful epidemic which appeared in England in 1485 or 1486, and again in 1507, 1518, 1529, and 1551. In the last three instances it passed to the continent. Its first appearance was always in England, from which fact it took one of its names. Its peculiar characteristic was the profuse sweating which accompanied the disease. The mortality from it was very great. — J. H. Baas, *Outlines of the History of Medicine, pp.* 318–319.—See, also, PLAGUE, ETC.: A. D. 1485–1593.

SWEDEN: Early inhabitants. See SUIONES.

History. See SCANDINAVIAN STATES.

Constitution. See CONSTITUTION OF SWEDEN.

SWEENEY, Peter B., and the Tweed Ring. See NEW YORK: A. D. 1863–1871.

SWERKER I., King of Sweden, A. D. 1155.....Swerker II., King of Sweden, 1199–1210.

SWERKERSON. See CHARLES SWERKERSON; and JOHN SWERKERSON.

SWERRO, King of Norway, A. D. 1186–1202.

SWEYN I., King of Denmark, A. D. 991–1014.....Sweyn II., King of Denmark, 1047–1076.....Sweyn III., King of Denmark, 1156–1157.....Sweyn Canutson, King of Norway, 1030–1035.

SWISS CONFEDERATION AND CONSTITUTION. See SWITZERLAND: A. D. 1848–1890; and CONSTITUTION OF SWITZERLAND.

SWITZERLAND.

Early inhabitants. See HELVETII; ALEMANNI: A. D. 496–504; BURGUNDIANS: A. D. 443–451; also, below: THE THREE FOREST CANTONS.

The Three Forest Cantons, their original Confederation (Eidgenossenschaft), and their relations with the House of Austria.— History divested of Legend.—"It is pretty clear that among those Helvetii with whom Cæsar had his cruel struggle [see HELVETII, THE ARRESTED MIGRATION OF THE], and who subsequently became an integral portion of the empire, there were no people from the Forest Cantons of Schwytz, Uri, and Unterwalden. The men who defied the Roman eagles were inhabitants of the mountain slopes between the lakes of Geneva and Constance. On the North, the authority of the Romans penetrated no farther in the direction of the mountainous Oberland than to Zurich or Turicum. They, no doubt, ascended far up the valley of the Rhone, where they have left their mark in the speech of the people to this day; but they did not climb the mountain passes leading across the great chain of the Alps. It may be questioned if the higher valleys of Switzerland were then, or for centuries after the fall of the Western Empire, inhabited. . . . In the district of these Forest Cantons no remains of lake inhabitancy have yet been found. . . . Yet none of the places where they are met with could have been more naturally suited for lake-dwellings than these. The three Forest Cantons began the political history of Switzerland, having established among themselves that political centre round which the other Cantons clustered. In ethnological history, they were the latest members of the Swiss family, since their territory remained without occupants after the more accessible portions of the country had been peopled. In the same sense, the canton from which the confederation derived its name—that of Schwytz—is the youngest of all. When the Irish monk, afterwards canonised as St. Gall, settled near the Lake of Constance in the 7th century, he had gone as completely to the one extreme of the inhabited world, as his brother Columba had gone to the other when he sailed to Iona. If the districts of Thurgau, Appenzell, and St. Gall were at that period becoming gradually inhabited, it is supposed that Schwytz was not occupied by a permanent population until the latter half of the 9th century. . . . M. Rilliet [in 'Les Origines de la Confédération Suisse,' par Albert Rilliet] is one of the first writers who has applied himself to the study of . . . original documents [title-deeds of property, the chartularies of religious houses, records of litigation, etc.] as they are still preserved in Switzerland, for the purpose of tracing the character and progress of the Swiss people and of their free institutions. It was among the accidents propitious to the efforts of the Forest Cantons, that, among the high feudal or manorial rights existing within their territory, a large proportion was in the hands of monastic bodies. Throughout Europe the estates of the ecclesiastics were the best husbanded, and inhabited by the most prosperous vassals. These bodies ruled their vassals through the aid of a secular officer, a Vogt or advocate, who sometimes was the master, sometimes the servant, of the community. In either case there

was to some extent a division of rule, and it was not the less so that in these Cantons the larger estates were held by nuns. The various struggles for supremacy in which emperors and competitors for empire, the successive popes, and the potentates struggling for dominion, severally figured, gave many opportunities to a brave and sagacious people, ever on the watch for the protection of their liberties; but the predominant feature in their policy — that, indeed, which secured their final triumph — was their steady adherence in such contests to the Empire, and their acknowledgment of its supremacy. This is the more worthy of notice since popular notions of Swiss history take the opposite direction, and introduce us to the Emperor and his ministers as the oppressors who drove an exasperated people to arms. In fact, there still lurk in popular history many fallacies and mistakes about the nature of the 'Holy Roman Empire' as an institution of the middle ages [see ROMAN EMPIRE, THE HOLY]. . . . It is not natural or easy indeed to associate that mighty central organisation with popular liberty and power; and yet in the feudal ages it was a strong and effective protector of freedom. . . . Small republics and free cities were scattered over central Europe and protected in the heart of feudalism. . . . M. Rilliet aptly remarks, that in the Swiss valleys, with their isolating mountains, and their narrow strips of valuable pasture, political and local conditions existed in some degree resembling those of a walled city." The election, in 1273, of Rudolph of Hapsburg, as King of the Romans, was an event of great importance in the history of the Swiss Cantons, owing to their previous connexion with the House of Hapsburg (see AUSTRIA: A. D. 1246–1282), "a connexion geographically so close that the paternal domains, whence that great family takes its ancient name, are part of the Swiss territory at the present day." Such agencies as belonged naturally to the most powerful family in the district fell to the House of Hapsburg. Its chiefs were the chosen advocates or champions of the religious communities neighbor to them; and "under such imperial offices as are known by the title Bailiff, Procurator, or Reichsvogt, they occasionally exercised what power the Empire retained over its free communities. Such offices conferred authority which easily ripened into feudal superiorities, or other forms of sovereignty. M. Rilliet attributes considerable, but not, it seems to us, too much importance to a rescript bearing date the 26th May, 1231. It is granted by Henry VII., King of the Romans, or more properly of the aggregated German communities, as acting for his father, the Emperor Frederic II. This instrument revokes certain powers over the people of the community of Uri, which had been granted at a previous time by Frederic himself to the Count of Hapsburg. It addresses the people of Uri by the term Universitas — high in class among the enfranchised communities of the Empire — and promises to them that they shall no more under any pretext be withdrawn from the direct jurisdiction of the Empire. . . . The great point reached through this piece of evidence, and corroborated by others, is, that at this remote period the district which is now the Canton of Uri was dealt with as a Roman Universitas — as one of the communities of the Empire, exempt from the immediate authority of any feudal chief. . . . M. Rilliet's researches show that Uri is the Canton in which the character of a free imperial community was first established, perhaps we should rather say it was the Canton in which the privilege was most completely preserved from the dangers that assailed it. The Hapsburgs and their rivals had a stronger hold on Schwytz. . . . In many of the documents relating to the rights of Rudolph over this district, bearing date after he became Cæsar, it is uncertain whether he acts as emperor or as immediate feudal lord. . . . Rudolph, however, found it, from whatever cause, his policy to attach the people of Schwytz to his interests as emperor rather than as feudal lord; and he gave them charters of franchise which seem ultimately to have made them, like their neighbours of Uri, a free community of the Empire, or to have certified their right to that character. In the fragmentary records of the three Cantons, Unterwalden does not hold rank as a free community of the Empire at so early a time even as Schwytz. It is only known that in 1291 Unterwalden acted with the other two as an independent community. In the disputes for supremacy between the Empire and the Church all three had been loyal to the Empire. There are some indications that Rudolph had discovered the signal capacity of these mountaineers for war, and that already there were bands of Swiss among the imperial troops. The reign of Rudolph lasted for 18 years. . . . During his 18 years of possession he changed the character of the Cæsarship, and the change was felt by the Swiss. In the early part of his reign he wooed them to the Empire — before its end he was strengthening the territorial power of his dynasty. . . . When Rudolph died in 1291, the imperial crown was no longer a disputable prize for a chance candidate. There was a conflict on the question whether his descendants should take it as a hereditary right, or the electors should show that they retained their power by another choice. The three Cantons felt that there was danger to their interests in the coming contest, and took a great step for their own protection. They formed a league or confederacy [Eidgenossenschaft] for mutual co-operation and protection. Not only has it been handed down to us in literature, but the very parchment has been preserved as a testimony to the early independence of the Forest Cantons, the Magna Charter of Switzerland. This document reveals the existence of unexplained antecedents by calling itself a renewal of the old league — the Antique Confederatio. . . . Thus we have a Confederation of the Three Cantons, dated in 1291, and referring to earlier alliances; while popular history sets down the subsequent Confederation of 1314 as the earliest, for the purpose of making the whole history of Swiss independence arise out of the tragic events attributed to that period. If this leads the way to the extinction of the story on which the Confederation is based, there is compensation in finding the Confederation in active existence a quarter of a century earlier. But the reader will observe that the mere fact of the existence of this anterior league overturns the whole received history of Switzerland, and changes the character of the alleged struggle with the House of Austria, prior to the battle of Morgarten. There is nothing in this document or in contemporary events breathing of disloyalty to the Empire. The two parties whom the Swiss

held in fear were the Church, endeavouring to usurp the old prerogatives of the Empire in their fullness; and the feudal barons, who were encroaching on the imperial authority. Among the three the Swiss chose the chief who would be least of a master. . . . Two years before the end of the 13th century [by the election of Albert, son of Rudolph, the Hapsburg family] . . . again got possession of the Empire, and retained it for ten years. It passed from them by the well-known murder of the Emperor Albert. The Swiss and that prince were ill-disposed to each other at the time of the occurrence, and indeed the murder itself was perpetrated on Swiss ground; yet it had no connexion with the cause of the quarrel which was deepening between the House of Hapsburg and the Cantons. . . . There exist in contemporary records no instances of wanton outrage and insolence on the Hapsburg side. It was the object of that power to obtain political ascendancy, not to indulge its representatives in lust or wanton insult. . . . There are plentiful records of disputes in which the interests of the two powers were mixed up with those of particular persons. Some of these were trifling and local, relating to the patronage of benefices, the boundaries of parishes, the use of meadows, the amount of toll duties, and the like; others related to larger questions, as to the commerce of the lake of the Four Cantons, or the transit of goods across the Alps. But in these discussions the symptoms of violence, as is natural enough, appear rather on the side of the Swiss communities than on that of the aggrandising imperial house. The Canton of Schwytz, indeed, appears to have obtained by acts of violence and rapacity the notoriety which made its name supreme among the Cantons. . . . We are now at a critical point, the outbreak of the long War of Swiss Independence, and it would be pleasant if we had more distinct light than either history or record preserves of the immediate motives which brought Austria to the point of invading the Cantons. . . . The war was no doubt connected with the struggle for the Empire [between Frederic of Austria and Louis of Bavaria — see GERMANY: A. D. 1314–1347]; yet it is not clear how Frederic, even had he been victorious over the three Cantons, could have gained enough to repay him for so costly an expedition. . . . We are simply told by one party among historical writers that his army was sent against his rebellious subjects to reduce them to obedience, and by the other that it was sent to conquer for the House of Hapsburg the free Cantons. That a magnificent army did march against them, and that it was scattered and ruined by a small body of the Swiss at Morgarten, on the 15th November, 1315, is an historical event too clearly attested in all its grandeur to stand open to dispute. After the battle, the victorious Cantons renewed their Confederation of 1291, with some alterations appropriate to the change of conditions. The first bond or confederation comes to us in Latin, the second is in German. . . . Such was the base around which the Cantons of the later Swiss Confederation were gradually grouped. . . . To this conclusion we have followed M. Rilliet without encountering William Tell, or the triumvirate of the meadow of Rütli, and yet with no consciousness that the part of Hamlet has been left out of the play." According to the popular tradition, the people of the Three Cantons were maddened by wanton outrages and insolences on the part of the Austrian Dukes, until three bold leaders, Werner Stauffacher, Arnold of the Melkthal, and Walter Fürst, assembled them in nightly meetings on the little meadow of Grütli or Rütli, in 1307, and bound them by oaths in a league against Austria, which was the beginning of the Swiss Confederation. This story, and the famous legend of William Tell, connected with it, are fading out of authentic history under the light which modern investigation has brought to bear on it.—*The Legend of Tell and Rütli* (*Edinburgh Rev., January*, 1869).

ALSO IN: O. Delepierre, *Historical Difficulties.*—J. Heywood, *The Establishment of Swiss Freedom, and the Scandinavian Origin of the Legend of William Tell* (*Royal Hist. Soc. Trans., v.* 5).

4-11th Centuries. See BURGUNDY.

A. D. 1207-1401.—Extension of the dominions of the House of Savoy beyond Lake Geneva.—The city of Geneva surrounded. See SAVOY: 11–15TH CENTURIES.

A. D. 1332-1460.—The extension of the old Confederation, or "Old League of High Germany."—The Three Cantons increased to Eight.—"All the original cantons were German in speech and feeling, and the formal style of their union was 'the Old League of High Germany.' But in strict geographical accuracy there was . . . a small Burgundian element in the Confederation, if not from the beginning, at least from its aggrandizement in the 13th and 14th centuries. That is to say, part of the territory of the states which formed the old Confederation lay geographically within the kingdom of Burgundy, and a further part lay within the Lesser Burgundy of the Dukes of Zähringen. But, by the time when the history of the Confederation begins, the kingdom of Burgundy was pretty well forgotten, and the small German-speaking territory which it took in at its extreme north-east corner may be looked on as practically German ground. . . . It is specially needful to bear in mind, first, that, till the last years of the 13th century, not even the germ of modern Switzerland had appeared on the map of Europe; secondly, that the Confederation did not formally become an independent power till the 17th century; lastly, that, though the Swiss name had been in common use for ages, it did not become the formal style of the Confederation till the 19th century. Nothing in the whole study of historical geography is more necessary than to root out the notion that there has always been a country of Switzerland, as there has always been a country of Germany, Gaul, or Italy. And it is no less needful to root out the notion that the Swiss of the original cantons in any way represent the Helvetii of Cæsar. The points to be borne in mind are that the Swiss Confederation is simply one of many German Leagues, which was more lasting and became more closely united than other German Leagues — that it gradually split off from the German Kingdom — that in the course of this process, the League and its members obtained a large body of Italian and Burgundian allies and subjects — lastly, that these allies and subjects have in modern times been joined into one Federal body with the original German Confederates. The three Swabian lands [the Three Forest Cantons] which formed the kernel of the Old League lay

at the point of union of the three Imperial kingdoms, parts of all of which were to become members of the Confederation in its later form. . . . The Confederation grew for a while by the admission of neighbouring lands and cities as members of a free German Confederation, owning no superior but the Emperor. First of all [1332], the city of Luzern joined the League. Then came the Imperial city of Zürich [1351], which had already begun to form a little dominion in the adjoining lands. Then [1352] came the land of Glarus and the town of Zug with its small territory. And lastly came the great city of Bern [1353], which had already won a dominion over a considerable body of detached and outlying allies and subjects. These confederate lands and towns formed the Eight Ancient Cantons. Their close alliance with each other helped the growth of each canton separately, as well as that of the League as a whole. Those cantons whose geographical position allowed them to do so, were thus able to extend their power, in the form of various shades of dominion and alliance, over the smaller lands and towns in their neighbourhood. . . . Zürich, and yet more Bern, each formed, after the manner of an ancient Greek city, what in ancient Greece would have passed for an empire. In the 15th century [1415–1460], large conquests were made at the expense of the House of Austria, of which the earlier ones were made by direct Imperial sanction. The Confederation, or some or other of its members, had now extended its territory to the Rhine and the Lake of Constanz. The lands thus won, Aargau, Thurgau, and some other districts, were held as subject territories in the hands of some or other of the Confederate States. . . . No new states were admitted to the rank of confederate cantons. Before the next group of cantons was admitted, the general state of the Confederation and its European position had greatly changed. It had ceased to be a purely German power. The first extension beyond the original German lands and those Burgundian lands which were practically German began in the direction of Italy. Uri had, by the annexation of Urseren, become the neighbour of the Duchy of Milan, and in the middle of the 15th century, this canton acquired some rights in the Val Levantina on the Italian side of the Alps. This was the beginning of the extension of the Confederation on Italian ground. But far more important than this was the advance of the Confederates over the Burgundian lands to the west."—E. A. Freeman, *Historical Geog. of Europe, ch.* 8, *sect.* 6.

A. D. 1386-1388.—Austrian defeats at Sempach and Naefels. — "Seldom, if ever, has Switzerland seen a more eventful month than that of July, 1386, for in that month she fought and won the ever-memorable battle of Sempach. To set down all the petty details as to the causes which led to this engagement would be tedious indeed. It is sufficient to point out . . . that there is seldom much love lost between oppressor and oppressed, and Austria and the Swiss Confederation had for some time held that relation to each other. A ten years' peace had indeed been concluded between the two powers, but it was a sham peace, and the interval had been used by both to prepare for new conflicts. . . . Zurich laid siege to Rapperswyl with the intent to destroy the odious Austrian toll-house; Lucerne levelled with the ground the Austrian fort Rothenburg, and entered into alliances with Entlebuch and Sempach to overthrow the Austrian supremacy. This was equal to a declaration of war, and war was indeed imminent. Duke Leopold III., of Austria, was most anxious to bring the quarrel to an issue, and to chastise the insolent Swiss citizens and peasantry. . . . The nobles of Southern Germany rallied round the gallant swordsman, and made him their leader in the expeditions against the bourgeoisie and peasantry. And no sooner had the truce expired (June, 1386), than they directed their first attack on the bold Confederation. . . . Leopold's plan was to make Lucerne the centre of his military operations, but in order to draw away attention from his real object, he sent a division of 5,000 men to Zurich to simulate an attack on that town. Whilst the unsuspecting Confederates lay idle within the walls of Zurich, he gathered reinforcements from Burgundy, Swabia, and the Austro-Helvetian Cantons, the total force being variously estimated at from 12,000 to 24,000 men. He marched his army in the direction of Lucerne, but by a round-about way, and seized upon Willisan, which he set on fire, intending to punish Sempach 'en passant' for her desertion. But the Confederates getting knowledge of his stratagem left Zurich to defend herself, and struck straight across the country in pursuit of the enemy. Climbing the heights of Sempach, . . . they encamped at Meyersholz, a wood fringing the hilltop. The Austrians leaving Sursee, for want of some more practicable road towards Sempach, made their way slowly and painfully along the path which leads from Sursee to the heights, and then turns suddenly down upon Sempach. Great was their surprise and consternation when at the junction of the Sursee and Hiltisrieden roads they came suddenly upon the Swiss force. . . . The Swiss . . . drew up in battle order, their force taking a kind of wedge-shaped mass, the shorter edge foremost, and the bravest men occupying the front positions. . . . The onset was furious, and the Austrian Hotspurs, each eager to outstrip his fellows in the race for honour, rushed on the Swiss, drove them back a little, and then tried to encompass them and crush them in their midst. . . . All the fortune of the battle seemed against the Swiss, for their short weapons could not reach a foe guarded by long lances. But suddenly the scene changed. 'A good and pious man,' says the old chronicler, deeply mortified by the misfortune of his country, stepped forward from the ranks of the Swiss — Arnold von Winkelried. Shouting to his comrades in arms, 'I will cut a road for you; take care of my wife and children!' he dashed on the enemy, and, catching hold of as many spears as his arms could encompass, he bore them to the ground with the whole weight of his body. His comrades rushed over his corpse, burst through the gap made in the Austrian ranks, and began a fierce hand-to-hand encounter. . . . A fearful carnage followed, in which no mercy was shown, and there fell of the common soldiers 2,000 men, and no fewer than 700 of the nobility. The Swiss lost but 120 men. . . . This great victory . . . gave to the Confederation independence, and far greater military and political eminence. . . . The story of Winkelried's heroic action has given rise to much fruitless but interesting discussion.

The truth of the tale, in fact, can neither be confirmed nor denied, in the absence of any sufficient proof. But Winkelried is no myth, whatever may be the case with the other great Swiss hero, Tell. · There is proof that a family of the name of Winkelried lived at Unterwalden at the time of the battle. . . . The victory of Naefels [April, 1388] forms a worthy pendant to that of Sempach. . . . The Austrians, having recovered their spirits after the terrible disaster," invaded the Glarus valley in strong force, and met with another overthrow, losing 1,700 men. "In 1389 a seven years' peace was arranged. . . . This peace was first prolonged for 20 years, and afterwards, in 1412, for 50 years."— Mrs. L. Hug and R. Stead, *The Story of Switzerland, ch.* 15.

A. D. 1396-1499.—The Grey Leagues.—Democratic Independence of Graubünden (Grisons) achieved.—Their Alliance with the Swiss Cantons.—The Swabian War.—Practical separation of the Confederacy from the Empire.— "It was precisely at this epoch [the later years of the 14th century] that the common people of Graubünden [or the Grisons] felt the necessity of standing for themselves alone against the world. Threatened by the Habsburgs, suspicious of the See of Chur [see TYROL], ill-governed by their decadent dynastic nobles, encouraged by the example of the Forest Cantons, they began to form leagues and alliances for mutual protection and the preservation of peace within the province. Nearly a century was occupied in the origination and consolidation of those three Leagues which turned what we now call Graubünden into an independent democratic state. . . . The town of Chur, which had been steadily rising in power, together with the immediate vassals of the See, took the lead. They combined into an association, which assumed the name of the Gotteshausbund; and of which the Engadine [the upper valley of the Inn] formed an important factor. Next followed a league between the Abbot of Dissentis, the nobles of the Oberland, the Communes of that district, and its outlying dependencies. This was called the Grey League — according to popular tradition because the folk who swore it wore grey serge coats, but more probably because it was a League of Counts, Gräfen, Grawen. The third league was formed after the final dispersion of the great inheritance of Vaz, which passed through the Counts of Toggenburg into the hands of females and their representatives. This took the name of Zehn Gerichte, or Ten Jurisdictions, and embraced Davos, Belfort, Schanfigg, the Prättigau, and Maienfeld. The date of the formation of the Gotteshausbund is uncertain; but its origin may be assigned to the last years of the 14th century [some writers date it 1396]. That of the Grey League, or Graue Bund, or Obere Theil, as it is variously called, is traditionally 1424. (It is worth mentioning that this League took precedence of the other two, and that the three were known as the Grey Leagues.) That of the Zehn Gerichte is 1438. In 1471 these three Leagues formed a triple alliance, defensive and offensive, protective and aggressive, without prejudice to the Holy Roman Empire of which they still considered themselves to form a part, and without due reservation of the rights acquired by inheritance or purchase by the House of Austria within their borders. This important revolution, which defeudalized a considerable Alpine territory, and which made the individual members of its numerous Communes sovereigns by the right of equal voting, was peaceably effected. . . . The constitution of Graubünden after the formation of the Leagues, in theory and practise, . . . was a pure democracy, based on manhood suffrage. . . . The first difficulties with which this new Republic of peasants had to contend, arose from the neighbourhood of feudal and imperial Austria. The Princes of the House of Habsburg had acquired extensive properties and privileges in Graubünden. . . . These points of contact became the source of frequent rubs, and gave the Austrians opportunities for interfering in the affairs of the Grey Leagues. A little war which broke out in the Lower Engadine in 1475, a war of raids and reprisals, made bad blood between the people of Tirol and their Grisons neighbours. But the real struggle of Graubünden with Austria began in earnest, when the Leagues were drawn into the so-called Swabian War (1496–1499). The Emperor Maximilian promoted an association of south German towns and nobles, in order to restore his Imperial authority over the Swiss Cantons. They resisted his encroachments, and formed a close alliance with the Grey Leagues. That was the commencement of a tie which bound Graubünden, as a separate political entity, to the Confederation, and which subsisted for several centuries. Graubünden acted as an independent Republic, but was always ready to cooperate with the Swiss. . . . Fighting side by side [in the Swabian War] with the men of Uri, Glarus, Zürich, the Bündners learned the arts of warfare in the lower Rheinthal. Afterwards, in 1499, they gained the decisive battle of this prolonged struggle on their own ground and unassisted. In a narrow gorge called Calven, just where the Münsterthal opens out into the Vintschgau above Glurns, 5,000 men of the Grey Leagues defeated the whole chivalry and levies of Tirol. Many thousands of the foe (from 4,000 to 5,000 is the mean estimate) were left dead upon the field." Maximilian hastened to the scene with a fresh army, but found only deserted villages, and was forced by famine to retreat. "The victory of Calven raised the Grisons to the same rank as the Swiss, and secured their reputation in Europe as fighting men of the best quality. It also led to a formal treaty with Austria, in which the points at issue between the two parties were carefully defined."— J. A. Symonds, *Hist. of Graubünden (in Strickland's "The Engadine," pp.* 29–33).— During the Swabian War, in 1499, the Swiss concluded a treaty with France. "Willibald Pirkheimer, who was present with 400 red-habited citizens of Nuremberg, has graphically described every incident of this war. The imperial reinforcements arrived slowly and in separate bodies; the princes and nobles fighting in real earnest, the cities with little inclination. The Swiss were, consequently, able to defeat each single detachment before they could unite, and were in this manner victorious in ten engagements." The Emperor, "dividing his forces, despatched the majority of his troops against Basle, under the Count von Fürstenburg, whilst he advanced towards Geneva, and was occupied in crossing the lake when the news of Fürstenburg's defeat and death, near Dornach, arrived. The princes, little desirous of staking their honour against their low-born opponents, instantly returned home in great numbers, and the emperor

was therefore compelled to make peace [1499]. The Swiss retained possession of the Thurgau and of Basle, and Schaffhausen joined the confederation, which was not subject to the imperial chamber, and for the future belonged merely in name to the empire, and gradually fell under the influence of France."— W. Menzel, *Hist. of Germany, ch.* 191 (*v.* 2).

A. D. 1476-1477. — Defeat of Charles the Bold. See BURGUNDY (THE FRENCH DUKEDOM): A. D. 1476–1477.

A. D. 1481-1501.—Disagreements over the spoils of the war with Charles the Bold.— Threatened rupture. — The Convention of Stanz.— Enlargement of the Confederacy.— Its loose and precarious constitution.—"In the war with Charles the Bold, Bern had gained greatly in extent on the west, while the immense booty taken in battle and the tributes laid on conquered cities seemed to the country cantons to be unfairly divided, for all were supposed to receive an equal share. The cities protested that it was no fair division of booty to give each one of the country states, who had altogether furnished 14,000 men for the war, an even share with Bern which had sent out 40,000. Another bone of contention was the enlargement of the union. The cities had for a long time desired to bring the cantons of Freiburg and Solothurn into the League. . . . But these were municipal governments, and the Forest States, unwilling to add more to the voting strength of the cities and thereby place themselves in the minority, refused again and again to admit these cantons. The situation daily grew more critical. Schwyz, Uri, and Unterwalden made an agreement with Glarus to stand by each other in case of attack. Luzern, Bern, and Zürich made a compact of mutual citizenship, a form of agreement by which they sought to circumvent the oath they had taken in the League of Eight to enter into no new alliances. Just at this point there was alleged to have been discovered a plot to destroy the city of Luzern by countrymen of Obwalden and Entlibuch. The cities were thrown into a frenzy and peace was strained to the utmost. Threats and recriminations passed from side to side, but finally, as an almost hopeless effort toward reconciliation, a Diet was called to meet at Stanz on the 8th of December, 1481. The details of this conference read like romance, so great was the transformation which took place in the feelings of the confederates. . . . Just as the Diet was about to break up in confusion a compromise was effected, and an agreement was drawn up which is known as the Convention of Stanz (Stanzerverkomniss). . . . As to the matter latest in contention, it was agreed that movable booty should be divided according to the number of men sent into war, but new acquisitions of territory should be shared equally among the states participating. Thus the principle of state-rights was preserved and the idea of popular representation received its first, and for 300 years almost its only recognition. In another agreement, made the same day, Freiburg and Solothurn were admitted to the League on equal terms with the others. In 1501 the confederation was enlarged by the admission of Basel, which, on account of its situation and importance, was a most desirable acquisition, and in the same year the addition of Schaffhausen, like Basel, a free imperial city with outlying territories, still further strengthened the Union. The next, and for 285 years the last, addition to the inner membership of the alliance was Appenzell. . . . Connected with the confederacy there were, for varying periods and in different relationships, other territories and cities more or less under its control. One class consisted of the so-called Allied Districts ('Zugewandte and Verbündete Orte'), who were attached to the central body not as equal members, but as friends for mutual assistance. This form of alliance began almost with the formation of the league, and gradually extended till it included St. Gallen, Biel, Neuchatel, the Bishopric of Basel (which territory lay outside the city), the separate confederacies of Graubünden and Valais, Geneva and several free imperial cities of Germany, at one time so distant as Strassburg. More closely attached to the confederation were the 'Gemeine Vogteien,' or subject territories [Aargau, Thurgau, etc.], whose government was administered by various members of the league in partnership. These lands had been obtained partly by purchase or forfeiture of loans and partly by conquest. . . . Before the middle of the 16th century nearly all the territory now included in Switzerland was in some way connected with the confederation. Upon this territorial basis of states, subject lands and allies, the fabric of government stood till the close of the 18th century. It was a loose confederation, whose sole organ of common action was a Diet in which each state was entitled to one vote. . . . Almost the only thread that held the Swiss Confederation together was the possession of subject lands. In these they were interested as partners in a business corporation. . . . These common properties were all that prevented complete rupture on several critical occasions."—J. M. Vincent, *State and Federal Gov't in Switzerland, ch.* 1.

A. D. 1515.—Defeat by the French at Marignano.—Treaties of perpetual alliance with Francis I. See FRANCE: A. D. 1515; and 1515–1518.

A. D. 1519.—Geneva in civic relations with Berne and Freiburg. See GENEVA: A. D. 1504–1535.

A. D. 1519-1524.—Beginning of the Reformation at Zurich, under Zwingli. See PAPACY: A. D. 1519–1524.

A. D. 1528-1531.—The spreading of the Reformation.—Adhesion of the Forest Cantons to Romanism.—Differences between the Swiss Reformers and the German Protestants.—The Conference at Marburg.— Civil war among the Cantons.—Death of Zwingli.— From Zurich, "the reformed faith penetrated, but only gradually, into the northern and eastern cantons. Bern was reached in 1528, after a brilliant disputation held in that city. Basel and Schaffhausen followed in 1529, and then St. Gall, Appenzell, Graubünden, and Solothurn, though some of them had serious struggles within themselves and fell in only partly with the reforms. But in the Central or Forest Cantons it was that the fiercest opposition was encountered. . . . From the very simplicity of their lives the people ignored the degeneracy of the priesthood, and amongst these pastoral peoples the priests were of simpler manners and more moral life than those in the cities; they disliked learning and enlightenment. Then there was the old feeling of antipathy to the cities, coupled with a

strong dislike for the reforms which had abolished 'Reislaufen' [military service under foreign pay], that standing source of income to the cantons. Lucerne, bought with French gold, struggled with Zurich for the lead. So far was the opposition carried that the Catholic districts by a majority of votes insisted (at the Diet) on a measure for suppressing heresy in Zurich, whilst some were for expelling that canton from the league. The Forest Cantons issued orders that Zwingli should be seized should he be found within their territories; consequently he kept away from the great convocation at Baden, 1526. . . . Wider and wider grew the chasm between the two religious parties, and Zwingli at length formed a 'Christian League' between the Swiss Protestants and some of the German cities and the Elector of Hesse. On the other hand, the Catholics entered into an alliance with Ferdinand of Austria, a determined enemy to the reformed religion. At last the Protestant party was exasperated beyond bearing, and Zurich declared war on the Forest Cantons, Zwingli himself joining in the vicissitudes of the campaign. His camp presented the 'picture of a well-organized, God-fearing army of a truly Puritan stamp.' The encounter at Kappel, in June, 1529, however, took a peaceful turn, thanks to the mediation of Landammann Aebli, of Glarus, greatly to the disgust of Zwingli, who prophetically exclaimed that some day the Catholics would be the stronger party, and then they would not show so much moderation. All ill-feeling, indeed, subsided when the two armies came within sight of each other. The curious and touching episode known as the 'Kappeler Milchsuppe' took place here. A band of jolly Catholics had got hold of a large bowl of milk, but lacking bread they placed it on the boundary line between Zug and Zurich. At once a group of Zurich men turned up with some loaves, and presently the whole party fell to eating the 'Milchsuppe' right merrily. A peace was concluded on the 29th of June, 1529, by which the Austrian League was dissolved, and freedom of worship granted to all. . . . By his treatise, 'De verâ et falsâ religione' (1525), Zwingli had, though unwillingly, thrown the gauntlet into the Wittenberg camp. The work was intended to be a scientific refutation of the Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation, and a war of words arose. The contest was by each disputant carried on 'suo more;' by Luther with his usual authoritative and tempestuous vehemence, by Zwingli in his own cool reasoning, dignified, and courteous style and republican frankness. Presently there came a strong desire for a union between the German Protestants, and the Swiss Reformers [called Sacramentarians by the Lutherans], . . . the impulse to it being given by Charles V.'s 'Protest' against the Protestants. Landgrave Philip of Hesse, the political leader of the German reformers, invited Luther and Zwingli to meet at his castle of Marburg [1529], with the view of reconciling the two sections. The religious colloquium was attended by many savants, princes, nobles, and all the chief leaders of the Reformation, and might have done great things, but came to grief through the obstinacy of Luther, as is well known, or rather through his determination to approve of no man's views except they should agree exactly with his own. Luther insisted on a literal interpretation of the words 'This is my body,' whilst Zwingli saw in them only a metaphorical or symbolical signification. . . . To return for a moment to home politics. The peace of 1529 was a short-lived one. Zwingli, anxious only to spread the reformed faith over the whole republic, did not realize clearly the hatred of the Forest district against the new creed. . . . War was imminent, and was indeed eagerly desired on both sides. Bern, finding that war was likely to be injurious to her private ends, insisted on a stoppage of mercantile traffic between the opposing districts, but Zwingli scorned to use such a means to hunger the enemy and so bring them to submit. However Zurich was outvoted in the Christian League (May 16th), and the Forest was excluded from the markets of that city and Bern. The rest may be easily guessed. On Zurich was turned all the fury of the famished Forest men, and they sent a challenge in October, 1531. A second time the hostile armies met at Kappel, but the positions were reversed. Zurich was unprepared to meet a foe four times as numerous as her own, and Bern hesitated to come to her aid. However Göldlin, the captain of the little force, recklessly engaged with the opposing army, whether from treachery or incapacity is not known, but he was certainly opposed to the reformed faith. Zwingli had taken leave of his friend Bullinger, as though foreseeing his own death in the coming struggle, and had joined the Zurich force. He was with the chief banner, and, with some 500 of his overmatched comrades, fell in the thickest of the battle. . . . But the reformation was far too deeply rooted to be thus destroyed. Bullinger, the friend of Zwingli, and, later on, of Calvin, worthily succeeded to the headship of the Zurich reformers."—Mrs. L. Hug and R. Stead, *Switzerland, ch.* 22.

Also in: J. H. Merle d' Aubigne, *Hist. of the Reformation in the 16th century, bk.* 11 *and* 15–16 (*v.* 3–4).—L. von Ranke, *Hist. of the Reformation in Germany, bk.* 6, *ch.* 2–4 (*v.* 3).

A. D. 1531-1648.—Religious divisions and conflicts.—Annexations of territory.—Peace with the Duke of Savoy.—The coming of Protestant refugees.—Industrial progress.—Peace.—"A peace at Dennikon in 1531 marks the acknowledgement of the principle of each Canton's independence. . . . The Confederacy was now fatally divided. There is, perhaps, no other instance of a State so deeply and so permanently sundered by the Reformation. Other governments adopted or rejected the reformed religion for their dominions as a whole; the Confederacy, by its constitution, was constrained to allow each Canton to determine its religion for itself; and the presence of Catholic and Reformed States side by side, each clinging with obstinacy to the religion of their choice, became the origin of jealousies and wars which have threatened more than once to rend asunder the ties of union. Next to the endless but uninteresting theme of religious differences comes the history of the annexations" by which the Confederacy extended its limits. "In the direction of the Jura was a country divided between many governments, which the princes of Savoy, the Hapsburgs of the West, had once effectually ruled, but which had become morselled among many claimants during a century and a half of weakness, and which Duke Charles III. of Savoy was now seeking to reconcile to his authority. Geneva was

the chief city of these parts. . . . Factions in favour of or against [the rule of the Duke of Savoy] . . . divided the city [see GENEVA: A. D. 1504–1535]. The alliance of Bern and Freyburg was at length sought for; and the conclusion of a treaty of co-citizenship in 1526 opened at once the prospect of a collision between the House of Savoy and the Confederacy. That collision was not long delayed. In 1536, after repeated acts of provocation by Charles III., 7,000 men of Bern appeared within Geneva. To reach the city they had traversed the Pays de Vaud; after entering it they passed onwards to the provinces of Gex and Chablais. All that they traversed they annexed. Even the city which they had entered they would have ruled, had not some sparks of honour and the entreaties of its inhabitants restrained them from the annihilation of the liberties which they had been called on to defend. The men of Freyburg and of the Valais at the same time made humbler conquests from Savoy. Later, the strong fortress of Chillon, and the rich bishopric of Lausanne, were seized upon by Bern. A wide extent of territory was thus added to the Confederacy; and again a considerable population speaking the French tongue was brought under the dominion of the Teutonic Cantons. These acquisitions were extended, in 1555, by the cession of the county of Gruyère, through the embarrassments of its last impoverished Count. They were diminished, however, by the loss of Gex and Chablais in 1564. The jealousy of many of the cantons at the good fortune of their confederates, and the reviving power of the House of Savoy, had made the conquests insecure. Emmanuel Philibert, the hero of St. Quentin, the ally of the great sovereigns of France and Spain, asked back his provinces; and prudence counselled the surrender of the two, in order to obtain a confirmation of the possession of the rest [see SAVOY AND PIEDMONT: A. D. 1559–1580]. The southern side of the Lake Leman, which had thus been momentarily held, and which nature seemed to have intended to belong to the Confederacy, was thus abandoned. The frontiers, however, which were now secured became permanent ones. The Dukes of Savoy had transferred much of their ambition, with their capital, beyond the Alps; and the Confederates remained secure in their remaining possessions. The Confederacy might now have added further to its power by admitting new members to its League. . . . Constance . . . had urged its own incorporation. The religious tendencies of its inhabitants, however, had made it suspected; and it was allowed to fall, in 1548, without hope of recovery, under the dominion of Austria. Geneva . . . was pleading loudly for admission. The jealousy of Bern, and later the hostility of the Catholic Cantons to the faith of which the city had become the centre, refused the request. She remained a mere ally, with even her independence not always ungrudgingly defended against the assaults of her enemies. Religious zeal indeed was fatal during this century to political sagacity. Under its influence the alliance with the rich city of Mulhausen, which had endured for more than a hundred years, was thrown off in 1587; the overtures of Strasburg for alliance were rejected; the proposals of the Grisons Leagues were repulsed. The opportunities of the Confederates were thus neglected, while those of their neighbours became proportionately increased. . . . The progress that is to be traced during the 16th century is such as was due to the times rather than to the people. The cessation of foreign wars and the fewer inducements for mercenary service gave leisure for the arts of peace; and agriculture and trade resumed their progress. Already Switzerland began to be sought by refugees from England, France, and Italy. The arts of weaving and of dyeing were introduced, and the manufacture of watches began at Geneva. . . . War, which had been almost abandoned except in the service of others, comes little into the annals of the Confederation as a State. . . . As another century advances, there is strife at the very gates of the Confederation. . . . But the Confederacy itself was never driven into war."—C. F. Johnstone, *Historical Abstracts, ch.* 7.

ALSO IN: H. Zschokke, *Hist. of Switzerland, ch.* 33–41.

A. D. 1536-1564.—Calvin's Ecclesiastical State at Geneva. See GENEVA: A. D. 1536–1564.

A. D. 1579-1630.—The Catholic revival and rally.—The Borromean or Golden League.— "Pre-eminent amongst those who worked for the Catholic revival was the famous Carlo Borromeo, Archbishop of Milan and nephew of Pius IV. He lived the life of a saint, and in due time was canonized. To his see belonged the Swiss bailliages in the Ticino and Valtellina. Indefatigable in his labours, constantly visiting every part of his diocese, toiling up to the Alpine huts, he gathered the scattered flocks into the Papal fold, whether by mildness or by force. . . . For the spread of Catholic doctrines he hit upon three different means. He called into being the Collegium Helveticum in 1579 at Milan, where the Swiss priests were educated free. He sent the Jesuits into the country, and placed a nuncio at Lucerne, in 1580. In 1586 was signed, between the seven Catholic cantons, the Borromean or Golden League, directed against the reformers, and in the following year a coalition was, by the same cantons, excepting Solothurn, entered into with Philip of Spain and with Savoy. The Jesuits settled themselves in Lucerne and Freiburg, and soon gained influence amongst the rich and the educated, whilst the Capuchins, who fixed themselves at Altorf, Stanz, Appenzell, and elsewhere, won the hearts of the masses by their lowliness and devotion. In this way did Rome seek to regain her influence over the Swiss peoples, and the effect of her policy was soon felt in the semi-Protestant and subject lands. . . . In the Valais, the Protestant party, though strong, was quite swept out by the Jesuits, before 1630."—Mrs. L. Hug and R. Stead, *Switzerland, ch.* 25.

A. D. 1620-1626.—The Valtelline revolt and war with the Grisons. See FRANCE: A. D. 1624–1626.

A. D. 1648.—The Peace of Westphalia.—Acknowledged independence and separation from the German Empire. See GERMANY: A. D. 1648.

A. D. 1652-1789.—The Peasant Revolt and the Toggenburg War.—Religious conflicts.—Battles of Villmergen.—The Peace of Aarau.— "About the middle of the 17th century there was growing up, in all the cantons except the Waldstätten, a feeling of strong discontent among the peasants, who still suffered from

many of the tyrannies which had descended to them from the old days of serfdom. They felt the painful contrast between their lot and that of the three old cantons, where every peasant voted for his own magistrates and his own laws, and helped to decide the taxes and contributions which he should pay. . . . Now that their liberty had been proclaimed at Westphalia, they were inspired with the idea of trying to make it a reality. . . . They rose on the occasion of the reduction of the value of their copper coinage. . . . Opposition began among the Entlibuchers of Lucerne, a tall and sturdy race, that lived in the long, fertile valley on the banks of the Emmen. . . . Their spirit was soon quenched, however, by the threats of Zurich and Berne; but though they yielded for the moment, their example had spread, and there were popular risings, excited in the large canton of Berne by the same causes, which were not so easily checked. There was a second revolt in Lucerne, which was intended to be nothing less than a league of all the lower classes throughout the ten cantons. The peasants of Lucerne, Berne, Basel, Solothurn, and the territory of Aargau, all joined in this and held an assembly at Sumiswald, in April 1653, where they chose Nicholas Leuenberger as their chief, and proclaimed their purpose of making themselves free as the Small Cantons. To this union, unfortunately, they brought neither strength of purpose nor wisdom. . . . Meanwhile the cities were not idle. Zurich, the capital, gave the order for the whole confederacy to arm, in May 1653. The struggle was short and decisive. For a few weeks Leuenberger's soldiers robbed and murdered where they could, and made feeble and futile attempts upon the small cities of Aargau. Towards the end of May he met, near Herzogenbuchsee, the Bernese troops. . . . A desperate fight ensued, but the insurgents were soon overpowered. . . . This battle ended the insurrection." Leuenberger was beheaded. "No sooner was this revolt of the peasants over than the smouldering fires of religious hatred, zealously fanned by the clergy on both sides, broke out again. . . . Several families of Arth, in Schwyz had been obliged by the Catholics to abjure their faith, or fly from their homes." Zurich took up their cause, and "a general war broke out. . . . Berne first despatched troops to protect her own frontier, and then sent 40 banners to the help of Zurich." The Bernese troops were so careless that they allowed themselves to be surprised (January 14, 1656) by 4,000 Lucerners, in the territory of Villmergen, and were ruinously defeated, losing 800 men and eleven guns. "Soon afterwards a peace was concluded, where everything stood much as it had stood at the beginning of this war, which had lasted only nine weeks. . . . A second insurrection, on a smaller scale than the peasants' revolt, took place in St. Gall in the first years of the 18th century. The Swiss, free in the eyes of the outside world, were, as we have already seen, mere serfs in nearly all the cantons, and such was their condition in the country of Toggenburg. . . . The greater part of the rights over these estates had been sold to the abbot of St. Gall in 1468. In the year 1700, the abbey of St. Gall was presided over by Leodegar Burgisser as sovereign lord. . . . He began by questioning all the commune rights of the Toggenburgers, and called the people his serfs, in order that they might become so used to the name as not to rebel against the hardness of the condition. Even at the time when he became abbot, there was very little, either of right or privilege, remaining to these poor people. . . . When, in 1701, Abbot Leodegar ordered them to build and keep open, at their own expense, a new road through the Hummelwald, crushed as they had been, they turned." After much fruitless remonstrance and appeal they took up arms, supported by the Protestant cantons and attacked by the Catholics, with aid contributed by the nuncio of the pope, himself. "The contest was practically ended on the 25th of July, 1712, by a decisive victory by the Protestants on the battle-field of Villmergen, where they had been beaten by the Lucerne men 56 years before. The battle lasted four hours, and 2,000 Catholics were slain. . . . In the month of August, a general peace was concluded at Aarau, to the great advantage of the conquerors. The five Catholic cantons were obliged to yield their rights over Baden and Rapperswyl, and to associate Berne with themselves in the sovereignty over Thurgau and the Rheinfeld. By this provision the two religions became equalized in those provinces. . . . The Toggenburgers came once more under the jurisdiction of an abbot of St. Gall, but with improved rights and privileges, and under the powerful protection of Zurich and Berne. The Catholic cantons were long in recovering from the expenses of this war. . . . During 86 years from the peace of Aarau, the Swiss were engaged in neither foreign nor civil war, and the disturbances which agitated the different cantons from time to time were confined to a limited stage. But real peace and union were as far off as ever. Religious differences, plots, intrigues, and revolts, kept people of the same canton and village apart, until the building which their forefathers had raised in the early days of the republic was gradually weakened and ready to fall, like a house of cards, at the first blow from France."— H. D. S. Mackenzie, *Switzerland, ch.* 15-16.

Also in: H. Zschokke, *Hist. of Switzerland, ch.* 42-56.

A. D. 1792-1798.—The ferment of the French Revolution.— Invasion and subjugation by the French.— Robbing of the treasure of Berne.— Formation of the Helvetic Republic.—"The world rang with arms and cries of war, with revolutions, battles and defeats. The French promised fraternity and assistance to every people who wished to make themselves free. . . . Their arms advanced victorious through Savoy and the Netherlands and over the Rhine. Nearer and nearer drew the danger around the country of the Alpine people. But the government of the Confederate states showed no foresight in view of the danger. They thought themselves safe behind the shield of their innocence and their neutrality between the contending parties. They had no arms and prepared none; they had no strength and did not draw closer the bands of their everlasting compact. Each canton, timidly and in silence, cared for its own safety, but little for that of the others. . . . All kinds of pamphlets stirred up the people. At Lausanne, Vevey, Rolle and other places, fiery young men, in noisy assemblages, drank success to the arms of emancipated France. Although public order was nowhere disturbed by such proceedings, the gov-

ernment of Berne thought it necessary to put a stop to them by severe measures and to compel silence by wholesome fear. They sent plenipotentiaries supported by an armed force. The guilty and even the innocent were punished. More fled. This silenced Vaud, but did not quell her indignation. The fugitives breathed vengeance. . . . In foreign countries dwelt sadly many of those who, at various times, had been banished from the Confederacy because they had, by word or deed, too boldly or importunately defended the rights and freedom of their fellow-citizens. Several of these addressed the chiefs of the French republic. . . . Such addresses pleased the chiefs of France. They thought in their hearts that Switzerland would be an excellent bulwark for France, and a desirable gate, through which the way would be always open to Italy and Germany. They also knew of and longed for the treasures of the Swiss cities. And they endeavored to find cause of quarrel with the magistrates of the Confederates. . . . Shortly afterwards, came the great general Napoleon Buonaparte, and marched through Savoy into Italy against the forces of the emperor. . . . In a very few months, though in many battles, Buonaparte vanquished the whole power of Austria, conquered and terrified Italy from one end to the other, took the whole of Lombardy and compelled the emperor to make peace. He made Lombardy a republic, called the Cisalpine. When the subjects of Grisons in Valtelina, Chiavenna and Bormio saw this, they preferred to be citizens of the neighboring Cisalpine republic, rather than poor subjects of Grisons. For their many grievances and complaints were rarely listened to. But Buonaparte said to Grisons: 'If you will give freedom and equal rights to these people, they may be your fellow-citizens, and still remain with you. I give you time; decide and send word to me at Milan.'. . . When the last period for decision had passed, Buonaparte became indignant and impatient, and united Valtelina, Chiavenna and Bormio to the Cisalpine republic (22d Oct., 1797). . . . So the old limits of Switzerland were unjustly contracted; four weeks afterwards also, that part of the bishopric of Bâle which had hitherto been respected on account of its alliance with the Swiss, was added to France. Thereat great fear fell on the Confederates. . . . Then the rumor spread that a French army was approaching the frontiers of Switzerland to protect the people of Vaud. They had called for the intervention of France in virtue of ancient treaties. But report said that the French intended to overthrow the Confederate authorities and to make themselves masters of the country. . . . Almost the whole Confederacy was in a state of confusion and dissolution. The governments of the cantons, powerless, distrustful and divided, acted each for itself, without concert. . . . In the mean while a large army of French advanced. Under their generals Brune and Schauenberg they entered the territory of the Confederates, and Vaud, accepting foreign protection, declared herself independent of Berne. Then the governments of Switzerland felt that they could no longer maintain their former dominion. Lucerne and Schauffhausen declared their subjects free and united to themselves. Zurich released the prisoners of Stafa, and promised to ameliorate her constitution to the advantage of the people. . . . Even Freiburg now felt that the change must come for which Chenaur had bled. And the council of Berne received into their number 52 representatives of the country and said: 'Let us hold together in the common danger.' All these reforms and revolutions were the work of four weeks; all too late. Berne, indeed, with Freiburg and Solothurn, opposed her troops to the advancing French army. Courage was not wanting; but discipline, skill in arms and experienced officers. . . . On the very first day of the war (2d March, 1798), the enemy's light troops took Freiburg and Solothurn, and on the fourth (5th March), Berne itself. . . . France now authoritatively decided the future fate of Switzerland and said: 'The Confederacy is no more. Henceforward the whole of Switzerland shall form a free state, one and indivisible, under the name of the Helvetian republic. All the inhabitants, in country as well as city, shall have equal rights of citizenship. The citizens in general assembly shall choose their magistrates, officers, judges and legislative council; the legislative council shall elect the general government; the government shall appoint the cantonal prefects and officers.' The whole Swiss territory was divided into 18 cantons of about equal size. For this purpose the district of Berne was parcelled into the cantons of Vaud, Oberland, Berne and Aragau; several small cantons were united in one; as Uri, Schwyz, Unterwalden and Zug in the canton of Waldstatten; St. Gallen district, Rheinthal and Appenzell in the canton of Santis; several countries subject to the Confederacy, as Baden, Thurgau, Lugano and Bellinzona, formed new cantons. Valais was also added as one; Grisons was invited to join; but Geneva, Muhlhausen and other districts formerly parts of Switzerland, were separated from her and incorporated with France. So decreed the foreign conquerors. They levied heavy war-taxes and contributions. They carried off the tons of gold which Berne, Zurich and other cities had accumulated in their treasure-chambers during their dominion. . . . But the mountaineers of Uri, Nidwalden, Schwyz and Glarus, original confederates in liberty, said: 'In battle and in blood, our fathers won the glorious jewel of our independence; we will not lose it but in battle and in blood.' . . . Then they fought valiantly near Wollrau and on the Schindellegi, but unsuccessfully. . . . But Aloys Reding reassembled his troops on the Rothenthurm, near the Morgarten field of victory. There a long and bloody battle took place. . . . Thrice did the French troops renew the combat: thrice were they defeated and driven back to Aegeri in Zug. It was the second of May. Nearly 2,000 of the enemy lay slain upon that glorious field. Gloriously also fought the Waldstatten on the next day near Arth. But the strength of the heroes bled away in their very victories. They made a treaty, and, with sorrow in their hearts, entered the Helvetian republic. Thus ended the old Bond of the Confederates. Four hundred and ninety years had it lasted; in seventy-four days it was dissolved."—H. Zschokke, *The History of Switzerland, ch.* 57 *and* 60.—"A system of robbery and extortion, more shameless even than that practised in Italy, was put in force against the cantonal governments, against the monasteries, and against private individuals. In compensation for the material losses inflicted upon the country, the new Helvetic Republic, one and in-

divisible, was proclaimed at Aarau. It conferred an equality of political rights upon all natives of Switzerland, and substituted for the ancient varieties of cantonal sovereignty a single national government, composed, like that of France, of a Directory and two Councils of Legislature. The towns and districts which had been hitherto excluded from a share in government welcomed a change which seemed to place them on a level with their former superiors: the mountain-cantons fought with traditional heroism in defence of the liberties which they had inherited from their fathers; but they were compelled, one after another, to submit to the overwhelming force of France, and to accept the new constitution. Yet, even now, when peace seemed to have been restored, and the whole purpose of France attained, the tyranny and violence of the invaders exhausted the endurance of a spirited people. The magistrates of the Republic were expelled from office at the word of a French Commission; hostages were seized; at length an oath of allegiance to the new order was required as a condition for the evacuation of Switzerland by the French army. It was refused by the mountaineers of Unterwalden, and a handful of peasants met the French army at the village of Stanz, on the eastern shore of the Lake of Lucerne (Sept. 8). There for three days they fought with unyielding courage. Their resistance inflamed the French to a cruel vengeance: slaughtered families and burning villages renewed, in this so-called crusade of liberty, the savagery of ancient war."—C. A. Fyffe, *Hist. of Modern Europe, v.* 1, *ch.* 4.—"Geneva at the same time [1798] fell a prey to the ambition of the all-engrossing Republic. This celebrated city had long been an object of their desire; and the divisions by which it was now distracted afforded a favourable opportunity for accomplishing the object. The democratic party loudly demanded a union with that power, and a commission was appointed by the Senate to report upon the subject. Their report, however, was unfavourable; upon which General Gerard, who commanded a small corps in the neighbourhood, took possession of the town; and the Senate, with the bayonet at their throats, formally agreed to a union with the conquering Republic."—Sir A. Alison, *Hist. of Europe*, 1789–1815, *ch.* 25 (*v.* 6).

Also in: A. Thiers, *Hist. of the Fr. Rev.* (*Am. ed.*), *v.* 4, *pp.* 248–252.—Mallet du Pan, *Memoirs and Cor., v.* 2, *ch.* 13–14.

A. D. 1797. — Bonaparte's dismemberment of the Graubünden. See France: A. D. 1797 (May—October).

A. D. 1798-1799.—Battlefield of the second Coalition against France. See France: A. D. 1798–1799 (August—April).

A. D. 1799 (August — December). — Campaign of the French against the Russians.—Battle of Zurich.—Carnage in the city.—Suwarrow's retreat. See France: A. D. 1799 (August—December).

A. D. 1800.—Bonaparte's passage of the Great St. Bernard. See France: A. D. 1800–1801 (May—February).

A. D. 1802.—Revolution instigated and enforced by Bonaparte. See France: A. D. 1801–1803.

A. D. 1803-1848.—Napoleon's Act of Mediation.—Independence regained and Neutrality guaranteed by the Congress of Vienna.—Geneva, the Valais, and Neuchâtel.—The Federal Pact of 1815.—The Sonderbund and Civil War.—The Federal Constitution of 1848.—"Bonaparte summoned deputies of both parties to Paris, and after long consultation with them he gave to Switzerland, on the 2d February 1803, a new Constitution termed the Act of Mediation. Old names were restored, and in some cases what had been subject lands were incorporated in the League, which now consisted of 19 Cantons, each having a separate Constitution. The additional six were: St. Gallen, the Grisons, Aargau, Thurgau, Ticino, and Vaud. This was the fifth phase of the Confederation. A Diet was created, there being one deputy to each Canton, but still with limited powers, for he could only vote according to his instructions. The 19 deputies had, however, between them 25 votes, because every deputy who represented a Canton with more than 100,000 inhabitants possessed two votes, and there were six of these Cantons. The Diet met once a year in June, by turns at Zürich, Bern, Luzern, Freiburg, Solothurn, and Basel, the Cantons of which these were the capitals becoming successively directing Cantons. Three were Catholic and three Protestant. The head of the directing Canton for the time being was Landammann of Switzerland and President of the Diet. The Act of Mediation was not acceptable to all parties, and before Switzerland could become entirely independent there was to be one more foreign intervention. The fall of the Emperor Napoleon brought with it the destruction of his work in that country, the neutrality and independence of which were recognized by the Congress of Vienna [see Vienna: Congress of], though upon condition of the maintenance in the Confederation of the new Cantons; and in 1814 the Valais (a Republic allied to the Confederation from the Middle Ages till 1798), Neuchâtel (which, from being subject to the King of Prussia, had been bestowed by Napoleon upon Marshal Berthier), and Geneva (which had been annexed to France under the Directory in 1798, but was now independent and rendered more compact by the addition of some territory belonging to France and Savoy) were added to the existing Cantons. Finally, the perpetual neutrality of Switzerland and the inviolability of her territory were guaranteed by Austria, Great Britain, Portugal, Prussia, and Russia, in an Act signed at Paris on the 20th November 1815. Neuchâtel, however, only really gained its independence in 1857, when it ceased to be a Prussian Principality. The Confederation now consisted of 22 Cantons, and a Federal Pact, drawn up at Zürich by the Diet in 1815, and accepted by the Congress of Vienna, took the place of the Act of Mediation, and remained in force till 1848. It was in some respects a return to the state of things previous to the French Revolution, and restored to the Cantons a large portion of their former sovereignty. . . . Then came an epoch of agitation and discord. The Confederation suffered from a fundamental vice, i. e. the powerlessness of the central authority. The Cantons had become too independent, and gave to their deputies instructions differing widely from each other. The fall of the Bourbons in 1830 had its echo in Switzerland, the patricians of Bern and the aristocratic class in other Cantons lost the ascendency which they had grad-

ually recovered since the beginning of the century, and the power of the people was greatly increased. In several months 12 Cantons, among which were Luzern and Freiburg, modified their Constitutions in a democratic sense, some peaceably, others by revolution. . . . Between 1830 and 1847 there were in all 27 revisions of cantonal Constitutions. To political disputes religious troubles were added. In Aargau the Constitution of 1831, whereby the Grand Council was made to consist of 200 members, half being Protestants and half Catholics, was revised in 1840, and by the new Constitution the members were no longer to be chosen with any reference to creed, but upon the basis of wide popular representation, thus giving a numerical advantage to the Protestants. Discontent arose among the Catholics, and eventually some 2,000 peasants of that faith took up arms, but were beaten by Protestants of Aargau at Villmergen in January 1841, and the consequence was the suppression of the eight convents in that Canton, and the confiscation of their most valuable property. . . . A first result of the suppression of these convents was the fall of the Liberal government of Luzern, and the advent to power of the chiefs of the Ultramontane party in that Canton. Two years later the new government convoked delegates of the Catholic Cantons at Rothen, near Luzern, and there in secret conferences, and under the pretext that religion was in danger, the bases of a separate League or Sonderbund were laid, embracing the four Forest Cantons, Zug, and Freiburg. Subsequently the Valais joined the League, which was clearly a violation not only of the letter but also of the spirit of the Federal Pact. In 1844 the Grand Council of Luzern voted in favour of the Jesuits' appeal to be entrusted with the direction of superior public education, and this led to hostilities between the Liberal and Ultramontane parties. Bands of volunteers attacked Luzern and were defeated, the expulsion of the Jesuits became a burning question, and finally, when the ordinary Diet assembled at Bern in July 1847, the Sonderbund Cantons declared their intention of persevering in their separate alliance until the other Cantons had decreed the re-establishment of the Aargau convents, abandoned the question of the Jesuits, and renounced all modifications of the Pact. These conditions could evidently not be accepted. . . . On the 4th November 1847, after the deputies of the Sonderbund had left the Diet, this League was declared to be dissolved, and hostilities broke out between the two contending parties. A short and decisive campaign of 25 days ensued, Freiburg was taken by the Federal troops, under General Dufour, later Luzern opened its gates, the small Cantons and the Valais capitulated and the strife came to an end. . . . As soon as the Sonderbund was dissolved, it became necessary to proceed to the revision of the Federal Pact."—Sir F. O. Adams and C. D. Cunningham, *The Swiss Confederation, ch.* 1.

A. D. 1810.—Annexation of the Valais to France. See FRANCE: A. D. 1810 (FEBRUARY—DECEMBER).

A. D. 1817.—Accession to the Holy Alliance. See HOLY ALLIANCE.

A. D. 1832.—Educational reforms. See EDUCATION, MODERN: EUROPEAN COUNTRIES.—SWITZERLAND.

A. D. 1848-1890.—The existing Federal Constitution.—On the conclusion of the Sonderbund Secession and War, the task of drawing up a Constitution for the Confederacy was confided to a committee of fourteen members, and the work was finished on the 8th of April, 1848. "The project was submitted to the Cantons, and accepted at once by thirteen and a half; others joined during the summer, and the new Constitution was finally promulgated with the assent of all on the 12th September. Hence arose the seventh and last phase of the Confederation, by the adoption of a Federal Constitution for the whole of Switzerland, being the first which was entirely the work of Swiss, without any foreign influence, although its authors had studied that of the United States. . . . It was natural that, as in process of time commerce and industry were developed, and as the differences between the legislation of the various Cantons became more apparent, a revision of the first really Swiss Constitution should be found necessary. This was proposed both in 1871 and 1872, but the partisans of a further centralization, though successful in the Chambers, were defeated upon an appeal to the popular vote on the 12th May 1872, by a majority of between five and six thousand, and by thirteen Cantons to nine. The question was, however, by no means settled, and in 1874 a new project of revision, more acceptable to the partisans of cantonal independence, was adopted by the people, the numbers being 340,199, to 198,013. The Cantons were about two to one in favour of the revision, 14½ declaring for and 7½ against it. This Constitution bears date the 29th May 1874, and has since been added to and altered in certain particulars."—Sir F. O. Adams and C. D. Cunningham, *The Swiss Confederation, ch.* 1.—"Since 1848 . . . Switzerland has been a federal state, consisting of a central authority, the Bund, and 19 entire and 6 half states, the Cantons; to foreign powers she presents an united front, while her internal policy allows to each Canton a large amount of independence. . . . The basis of all legislative division is the Commune or 'Gemeinde,' corresponding in some slight degree to the English 'Parish.' The Commune in its legislative and administrative aspect or 'Einwohnergemeinde' is composed of all the inhabitants of a Commune. It is self-governing and has the control of the local police; it also administers all matters connected with pauperism, education, sanitary and funeral regulations, the fire brigade, the maintenance of public peace and trusteeships. . . . At the head of the Commune is the 'Gemeinderath,' or 'Communal Council,' whose members are elected from the inhabitants for a fixed period. It is presided over by an 'Ammann,' or 'Mayor,' or 'President.' . . . Above the Commune on the ascending scale comes the Canton. . . . Each of the 19 Cantons and 6 half Cantons is a sovereign state, whose privileges are nevertheless limited by the Federal Constitution, particularly as regards legal and military matters; the Constitution also defines the extent of each Canton, and no portion of a Canton is allowed to secede and join itself to another Canton. . . . Legislative power is in the hands of the 'Volk'; in the political sense of the word the 'Volk' consists of all the Swiss living in the Canton, who have passed their 20th year and are not under disability from

crime or bankruptcy. The voting on the part of the people deals mostly with alterations in the cantonal constitution, treaties, laws, decisions of the First Council involving expenditures of Frs. 100,000 and upward, and other decisions which the Council considers advisable to subject to the public vote, which also determines the adoption of propositions for the creation of new laws, or the alteration or abolition of old ones, when such a plebiscite is demanded by a petition signed by 5,000 voters. . . . The First Council (Grosse Rath) is the highest political and administrative power of the Canton. It corresponds to the 'Chamber' of other countries. Every 1,300 inhabitants of an electoral circuit send one member. . . . The Kleine Rath or special council (corresponding to the 'Ministerium' of other continental countries) is composed of three members and has three proxies. It is chosen by the First Council for a period of two years. It superintends all cantonal institutions and controls the various public boards. . . . The populations of the 22 sovereign Cantons constitute together the Swiss Confederation. . . . The highest power of the Bund is exercised by the 'Bundesversammlung,' or Parliament, which consists of two chambers, the 'Nationalrath,' and the 'Ständerath.' The Nationalrath corresponds to the English House of Commons, and the Ständerath partially to the House of Lords; the former represents the Swiss people, the latter the Cantons. The Nationalrath consists of 145 members. . . . Every Canton or half Canton must choose at least one member; and for the purpose of election Switzerland is divided into 49 electoral districts. The Nationalrath is triennial. . . . The Ständerath consists of 44 members, each Canton having two representatives and each half Canton one. . . . A bill is regarded as passed when it has an absolute majority in both chambers, but it does not come into force until either a plebiscite is not demanded for a space of three months, or, if it is demanded (for which the request of 30,000 voters is necessary) the result of the appeal to the people is in favor of the bill. This privilege of the people to control the decision of their representatives is called Das Referendum [see REFERENDUM]. . . . The highest administrative authority in Switzerland is the Bundesrath, composed of seven members, which [like the Bundesversammlung] . . . meets in Bern. Its members are chosen by the Bundesversammlung and the term of office is ten years. . . . The president of the Confederation (Bundespresident) is chosen by the Bundesversammlung from the members of the Bundesrath for one year. . . . The administration of justice, so far as it is exercised by the Bund, is entrusted to a Court, the Bundesgericht, consisting of nine members."—P. Hauri, *Sketch of the Const. of Switzerland (in Strickland's "The Engadine")*.

ALSO IN: Sir F. O. Adams and C. D. Cunningham, *The Swiss Confederation.*—J. M. Vincent, *State and Federal Gov't in Switzerland.*—*Old South Leaflets, gen. series, no.* 18.—*Univ. of Penn., Pub's, no.* 8.—For the text of the Swiss Constitution, see CONSTITUTION OF SWITZERLAND.

A. D. 1871. — Exclusion of Jesuits. See JESUITS: A. D. 1769–1871.

A. D. 1894.—The President of the Swiss Federal Council for 1894 is Émile Frey, the Vice President, Joseph Zemp. According to the latest census, taken in 1888, the population of Switzerland was 2,917,740.

SWORD, German Order of the. See LIVONIA: 12–13TH CENTURIES.

SWORD, Swedish Order of the.— An Order, ascribed to Gustavus Vasa. It was revived, after long neglect, by King Frederick I. in 1748.

SYAGRIUS, Kingdom of. See GAUL: A. D. 457–486.

SYBARIS.—SYBARITES. — Sybaris and Kroton were two ancient Greek cities, founded by Achæan colonists, on the coast of the gulf of Tarentum, in southern Italy. "The town of Sybaris was planted between two rivers, the Sybaris and the Krathis (the name of the latter borrowed from a river of Achaia); the town of Kroton about twenty-five miles distant, on the river Æsarus. . . . The fatal contest between these two cities, which ended in the ruin of Sybaris, took place in 510 B. C., after the latter had subsisted in growing prosperity for 210 years. . . . We are told that the Sybarites, in that final contest, marched against Kroton with an army of 300,000 men. . . . The few statements which have reached us respecting them touch, unfortunately, upon little more than their luxury, fantastic self-indulgence and extravagant indolence, for which qualities they have become proverbial in modern times as well as in ancient. . Anecdotes illustrating these qualities were current, and served more than one purpose in antiquity."—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece, pt.* 2, *ch.* 22.

SYBOTA, Naval Battle of.— Fought, B. C. 432, between the fleets of Corinth and Corcyra, in the quarrel which led up to the Peloponnesian War. The Athenians had ten ships present, as allies of the Corcyreans, intending only to watch affairs, but at the end they were drawn into the fight. The Corcyreans were beaten. — Thucydides, *History, bk.* 1, *sect.* 46.

SYCOPHANTS. — "Not until now [about B. C. 428, when the demagogue Cleon rose to power at Athens] did the activity of the Sycophants attain to its full height; a class of men arose who made a regular trade of collecting materials for indictments, and of bringing their fellow citizens before a legal tribunal. These denunciations were particularly directed against those who were distinguished by wealth, birth and services, and who therefore gave cause for suspicion; for the informers wished to prove themselves zealous friends of the people and active guardians of the constitution. . . . Intrigues and conspiracies were suspected in all quarters, and the popular orators persuaded the citizens to put no confidence in any magistrate, envoy or commission, but rather to settle everything in full assembly and themselves assume the entire executive. The Sycophants made their living out of this universal suspicion. . . . They threatened prosecutions in order thus to extort money from guilty and innocent alike; for even among those who felt free from guilt were many who shunned a political prosecution beyond all other things, having no confidence in a jury."—E. Curtius, *Hist. of Greece, bk.* 4, *ch.* 2 (*v.* 3).

SYDENHAM, and Rational Medicine. See MEDICAL SCIENCE: 17TH CENTURY.

SYDNEY: First settlement (1788). See AUSTRALIA: A. D. 1601-1800.

SYLLA. See SULLA.

SYLLABARIES.—"A good deal of the [Assyrian] literature was of a lexical and grammatical kind, and was intended to assist the Semitic student in interpreting the old Accadian texts. Lists of characters were drawn up with their pronunciation in Accadian and the translation into Assyrian of the words represented by them. Since the Accadian pronunciation of a character was frequently the phonetic value attached to it by the Assyrians, these syllabaries, as they have been termed—in consequence of the fact that the cuneiform characters denoted syllables and not letters—have been of the greatest possible assistance in the decipherment of the inscriptions."—A. H. Sayce, *Assyria, its Princes, Priests and People, ch.* 4.

SYLLABUS OF 1864, The. See PAPACY: A. D. 1864.

SYLVANIA, The proposed State of. See NORTHWEST TERRITORY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1784.

SYLVESTER II., Pope, A. D. 999-1003. ....Sylvester III., Antipope, 1044.

SYMMACHIA.—An offensive and defensive alliance between two states was so called by the Greeks.

SYMMORIÆ, The.—"In the archonship of Nausinicus in Olymp. 100,3 (B. C. 378) the institution of what were called the symmoriæ (collegia, or companies), was introduced [at Athens] in relation to the property taxes. The object of this institution, as the details of the arrangement themselves show, was through the joint liability of larger associations to confirm the sense of individual obligation to pay the taxes, and to secure their collection, and also, in case of necessity, to cause those taxes which were not received at the proper time to be advanced by the most wealthy citizens."—A. Boeckh, *Public Economy of the Athenians* (*tr. by Lamb*), *bk.* 4, *ch.* 9.

SYMPOSIUM.—The Symposium of the ancient Greeks was that part of a feast which ensued when the substantial eating was done, and which was enlivened with wine, music, conversation, exhibitions of dancing, etc.—C. C. Felton, *Greece, Ancient and Modern, course* 2, *lect.* 5.

SYNHEDRION, OR SYNEDRION, The. See SANHEDRIM.

SYNOECIA. See ATHENS: THE BEGINNING.

SYNOD OF THE OAK, The. See ROME: A. D. 400-518.

SYRACUSE: B. C. 734.—The Founding of the city.—"Syracuse was founded the year after Naxos, by Corinthians, under a leader named Archias, a Heracleid, and probably of the ruling caste, who appears to have been compelled to quit his country to avoid the effects of the indignation which he had excited by a horrible outrage committed in a family of lower rank. . . . Syracuse became, in course of time, the parent of other Sicilian cities, among which Camarina was the most considerable. . . . Forty-five years after Syracuse, Gela was founded by a band collected from Crete and Rhodes, chiefly from Lindus, and about a century later (B. C. 582) sent forth settlers to the banks of the Acragas, where they built Agrigentum."—C. Thirlwall, *Hist. of Greece, ch.* 12.—The first settlement at Syracuse was on the islet of Ortygia. "Ortygia, two English miles in circumference, was separated from the main island only by a narrow channel, which was bridged over when the city was occupied and enlarged by Gelôn in the 72nd Olympiad, if not earlier. It formed only a small part, though the most secure and best-fortified part, of the vast space which the city afterwards occupied. But it sufficed alone for the inhabitants during a considerable time, and the present city in its modern decline has again reverted to the same modest limits. Moreover, Ortygia offered another advantage of not less value. It lay across the entrance of a spacious harbour, approached by a narrow mouth, and its fountain of Arethusa was memorable in antiquity both for the abundance and goodness of its water."—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece, pt.* 2, *ch.* 22.

B. C. 480.—Defeat of the Carthaginians at Himera. See SICILY: B. C. 480.

B. C. 415-413.—Siege by the Athenians.—The Greek city of Syracuse, in Sicily, having been founded and built up by colonization from Corinth, naturally shared the deep hatred of Athens which was common among the Dorian Greeks, and which the Corinthians particularly found many reasons to cherish. The feeling at Athens was reciprocal, and, as the two cities grew supreme in their respective spheres and arrogant with the consciousness of superior power, mutual jealousies fed their passion of hostility, although nothing in their affairs, either politically or commercially, brought them really into conflict with one another. But Syracuse, enforcing her supremacy in Sicily, dealt roughly with the Ionian settlements there, and Athens was appealed to for aid. The first call upon her was made (B. C. 428) in the midst of the earlier period of the Peloponnesian War, and came from the people of Leontini, then engaged in a struggle with Syracuse, into which other Sicilian cities had been drawn. The Athenians were easily induced to respond to the call, and they sent a naval force which took part in the Leontine War, but without any marked success. The result was to produce among the Sicilians a common dread of Athenian interference, which led them to patch up a general peace. But fresh quarrels were not long in arising, in the course of which Leontini was entirely destroyed, and another Sicilian city, Egesta, which Athens had before received into her alliance, claimed help against Syracuse. This appeal reached the Athenians at a time (B. C. 416) when their populace was blindly following Alcibiades, whose ambition craved war, and who chafed under the restraints of the treaty of peace with Sparta which Nicias had brought about. They were carried by his influence into the undertaking of a great expedition of conquest, directed against the Sicilian capital—the most costly and formidable which any Greek state had ever fitted out. In the summer of B. C. 415 the whole force assembled at Corcyra and sailed across the Ionian sea to the Italian coast and thence to Sicily. It consisted of 134 triremes, with many merchant, ships and transports, bearing 5,100 hoplites, 480 bowmen and 700 Rhodian slingers. The commanders were Nicias, Lamachus and Alcibiades. On the arrival of the expedition in Sicily a disagreement among the generals made efficient action impossible and gave the Syracusans time to prepare a stubborn resistance. Meantime the enemies of Alcibiades

at Athens had brought about a decree for his arrest, on account of an alleged profanation of the sacred Eleusinian mysteries, and, fearing to face the accusation, he fled, taking refuge at Sparta, where he became the implacable enemy of his country. Three months passed before Nicias, who held the chief command, made any attempt against Syracuse. He then struck a single blow, which was successful, but which led to nothing; for the Athenian army was withdrawn immediately afterwards and put into winter quarters. In the following spring the regular operations of a siege and blockade were undertaken, at sea with the fleet and on land by a wall of circumvallation. The undertaking promised well at first and the Syracusans were profoundly discouraged. But Sparta, where Alcibiades worked passionately in their favor, sent them a general, Gylippus, who proved to be equal to an army, and promised reinforcements to follow. The more vigorous Athenian general, Lamachus, had been killed, and Nicias, with incredible apathy, suffered Gylippus to gather up a small army in the island and to enter Syracuse with it, in defiance of the Athenian blockade. From that day the situation was reversed. The besieged became the assailants and the besiegers defended themselves. Nicias sent to Athens for help and maintained his ground with difficulty through another long winter, until a second great fleet and army arrived, under the capable general Demosthenes, to reinforce him. But it was too late. Syracuse had received powerful aid, in ships and men, from Corinth, from Sparta and from other enemies of Athens, had built a navy and trained sailors of her own, and was full of confident courage. The Athenians were continually defeated, on land and sea, and hoped for nothing at last but to be able to retreat. Even the opportunity to do that was lost for them in the end by the weakness of Nicias, who delayed moving on account of an eclipse, until his fleet was destroyed in a final sea-fight and the island roads were blocked by an implacable enemy. The flight when it was undertaken proved a hopeless attempt, and there is nothing in history more tragical than the account of it which is given in the pages of Thucydides. On the sixth day of the struggling retreat the division under Demosthenes gave up and surrendered to the pursuers who swarmed around it. On the next day Nicias yielded with the rest, after a terrible massacre at the river Assinarus. Nicias and Demosthenes were put to the sword, although Gylippus interceded for them. Their followers were imprisoned in the Syracusan quarries. "There were great numbers of them and they were crowded in a deep and narrow place. At first the sun by day was still scorching and suffocating, for they had no roof over their heads, while the autumn nights were cold, and the extremes of temperature engendered violent disorders. Being cramped for room they had to do everything on the same spot. The corpses of those who died from their wounds, exposure to the weather, and the like, lay heaped one upon another. The smells were intolerable; and they were at the same time afflicted by hunger and thirst. During eight months they were allowed only about half a pint of water and a pint of food a day. Every kind of misery which could befall man in such a place befell them. This was the condition of all the captives for about ten weeks. At length the Syracusans sold them, with the exception of the Athenians and of any Sicilian or Italian Greeks who had sided with them in the war. The whole number of the public prisoners is not accurately known, but they were not less than 7,000. Of all the Hellenic actions which took place in this war, or indeed of all Hellenic actions which are on record, this was the greatest — the most glorious to the victors, the most ruinous to the vanquished; for they were utterly and at all points defeated, and their sufferings were prodigious. Fleet and army perished from the face of the earth; nothing was saved, and of the many who went forth few returned home. Thus ended the Sicilian expedition."— Thucydides, *History* (*tr. by Jowett*), *bk.* 6–7.

Also in: E. A. Freeman, *Hist. of Sicily*, *v.* 3. —G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece*, *pt.* 2, *ch.* 58–60.—Sir E. Creasy, *Fifteen Decisive Battles*, *ch.* 2.— See, also, Athens: B. C. 415–413.

B. C. 397-396.—Dionysius and the Carthaginians.—Eighteen years after the tragic deliverance of Syracuse from the besieging host and fleet of the Athenians, the Sicilian capital experienced a second great peril and extraordinary escape of like kind. The democratic government of Syracuse had meantime fallen and a new tyrant had risen to power. Dionysius, who began life in a low station, made his way upward by ruthless energy and cunning, practising skilfully the arts of a demagogue until he had won the confidence of the people, and making himself their master in the end. When the sovereignty of Dionysius had acquired firmness and the fortifications and armament of his city had been powerfully increased, it suited his purposes to make war upon the Carthaginians, which he did, B. C. 397. He attacked Motye, which was the most important of their cities in Sicily, and took it after a siege of some months' duration, slaughtering and enslaving the wretched inhabitants. But his triumph in this exploit was brief. Imilkon, or Himilco, the Carthaginian commander, arrived in Sicily with a great fleet and army and recaptured Motye with ease. That done he made a rapid march to Messene, in the northeastern extremity of the island, and gained that city almost without a blow. The inhabitants escaped, for the most part, but the town is said to have been reduced to an utter heap of ruins — from which it was subsequently rebuilt. From Messene he advanced to Syracuse, Dionysius not daring to meet him in the field. The Syracusan fleet, encountering that of the Carthaginians, near Katana, was almost annihilated, and when the vast African armament, numbering more than seventeen hundred ships of every description, sailed into the Great Harbor of Syracuse, there was nothing to oppose it. The city was formidably invested, by land and sea, and its fate would have appeared to be sealed. But the gods interposed, as the ancients thought, and avenged themselves for insults which the Carthaginians had put upon them. Once more the fatal pestilence which had smitten the latter twice before in their Sicilian Wars appeared and their huge army was palsied by it. "Care and attendance upon the sick, or even interment of the dead, became impracticable; so that the whole camp presented a scene of deplorable agony, aggravated by the horrors and stench of

150,000 unburied bodies. The military strength of the Carthaginians was completely prostrated by such a visitation. Far from being able to make progress in the siege, they were not even able to defend themselves against moderate energy on the part of the Syracusans; who . . . were themselves untouched by the distemper." In this situation the Carthaginian commander basely deserted his army. Having secretly bribed Dionysius to permit the escape of himself and the small number of native Carthaginians in his force, he abandoned the remainder to their fate (B. C. 394). Dionysius took the Iberians into his service; but the Libyans and other mercenaries were either killed or enslaved. As for Imilkon, soon after his return to Carthage he shut himself in his house and died, refusing food. The blow to the prestige of Carthage was nearly fatal, producing a rebellion among her subjects which assumed a most formidable character; but it lacked capable command and was suppressed.—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece, pt.* 2, *ch.* 82.

B. C. 394-384.—Conquests and dominion of Dionysius.—"The successful result of Dionysios' first Punic War seems to have largely spread his fame in Old Greece," while it increased his prestige and power at home. But "he had many difficulties. He too, like the Carthaginians, had to deal with a revolt among his mercenaries, and he had to give up to them the town of Leontinoi. And the people of Naxos and Katanê, driven out by himself, and the people of Messana, driven out by Himilkôn, were wandering about, seeking for dwelling-places. He restored Messana, but he did not give it back to its old inhabitants. He peopled it with colonists from Italy and from Old Greece. . . . He also planted a body of settlers from the old Messenian land in Peloponnêsos," at Tyndaris. "Thus the north-eastern corner of Sicily was held by men who were really attached to Dionysios. And he went on further to extend his power along the north coast. . . . The Sikel towns were now fast taking to Greek ways, and we hear of commonwealths and tyrants among them, just as among the Greeks. Agyris, lord of Agyrium, was said to be the most powerful prince in Sicily after Dionysios himself. . . . With him Dionysios made a treaty, and also with other Sikel lords and cities." But he attacked the new Sikel town of Tauromenion, and was disastrously repulsed. "This discomfiture at Tauromenion checked the plans of Dionysios for a while. Several towns threw off his dominion. . . . And the Carthaginians also began to stir again. In B. C. 393 their general Magôn, seemingly without any fresh troops from Africa, set out from Western Sicily to attack Messana." But Dionysios defeated him, and the next year he made peace with the Carthaginians, as one of the consequences of which he captured Tauromenion in 391. "Dionysios was now at the height of his power in Sicily. . . . He commanded the whole east coast, and the greater part of the north and south coasts. . . . Dionysios and Carthage might be said to divide Sicily between them, and Dionysios had the larger share." Being at peace with the Carthaginians, he now turned his arms against the Greek cities in Southern Italy, and took Kaulônia, Hippônion, and Rhêgion (B. C. 387), making himself, "beyond all doubt, the chief power, not only in Sicily, but in Greek Italy also." Three years later (B. C. 384) Dionysios sent a splendid embassy to the Olympic festival in Greece. "Lysias called on the assembled Greeks to show their hatred of the tyrant, to hinder his envoys from sacrificing or his chariots from running. His chariots did run; but they were all defeated. Some of the multitude made an attack on the splendid tents of his envoys. He had also sent poems of his own to be recited; but the crowd would not hear them."—E. A. Freeman, *The Story of Sicily, ch.* 10.

B. C. 383.—War with Carthage. See Sicily: B. C. 383.

B. C. 344.—Fall of the Dionysian tyranny.—The elder Dionysius,—he who climbed by cunning demagoguery from an obscure beginning in life to the height of power in Syracuse, making himself the typical tyrant of antiquity,—died in 367 B. C. after a reign of thirty-eight years. He was succeeded by his son, Dionysius the younger, who inherited nothing in character from his father but his vices and his shameless meannesses. For a time the younger Dionysius was largely controlled by the admirable influence of Dion, brother-in-law and son-in-law of the elder tyrant (who had several wives and left several families). Dion had Plato for his teacher and friend, and strove with the help of the great Athenian—who visited Sicily thrice—to win the young tyrant to a life of virtue and to philosophical aims. The only result was to finally destroy the whole influence with which they began, and Dion, ere long, was driven from Syracuse, while Dionysius abandoned himself to debaucheries and cruelties. After a time Dion was persuaded to lead a small force from Athens to Syracuse and undertake the overthrow of Dionysius. The gates of Syracuse were joyfully opened to him and his friends, and they were speedily in possession of the whole city except the island-stronghold of Ortygia, which was the entrenchment of the Dionysian tyranny. Then ensued a protracted and desperate civil war in Syracuse, which half ruined the magnificent city. In the end Ortygia was surrendered, Dionysius having previously escaped with much treasure to his dependent city of Lokri, in southern Italy. Dion took up the reins of government, intending to make himself what modern times would call a constitutional monarch. He wished the people to have liberty, but such liberty as a philosopher would find best for them. He was distrusted,—misunderstood,—denounced by demagogues, and hated, at last, as bitterly as the tyrants who preceded him. His high-minded ambitions were all disappointed and his own character suffered from the disappointment. At the end of a year of sovereignty he was assassinated by one of his own Athenian intimates, Kallippus, who secured the goodwill of the army and made himself despot. The reign of Kallippus was maintained for something more than a year, and he was then driven out by Hipparinus, one of the sons of Dionysius the elder, and half-brother to the younger of that name. Hipparinus was presently murdered and another brother, Nysæus, took his place. Then Nysæus, in turn, was driven out by Dionysius, who returned from Lokri and re-established his power. The condition of Syracuse under the restored despotism of Dionysius was worse than it ever had been in the past, and the great city seemed likely to perish. At the last extremity of suffering, in

344 B. C., its people sent a despairing appeal to Corinth (the mother-city of Syracuse) for help. The Corinthians responded by despatching to Sicily a small fleet of ten triremes and a meagre army of 1,200 men, under Timoleon. It is the first appearance in history of a name which soon shone with immortality; for Timoleon proved himself to be one of the greatest and the noblest of Greeks. He found affairs in Sicily complicated by an invasion of Carthaginians, co-operating with one Hiketas, who had made himself despot of Leontini and who hoped to become master of Syracuse. By skilfully using the good fortune which the gods were believed to have lavished upon his enterprise, Timoleon, within a few months, had defeated Hiketas in the field; had accepted the surrender of Dionysius in Ortygia and sent the fallen tyrant to Corinth; had caused such discouragement to the Carthaginians that they withdrew fleet and army and sailed away to Africa. The whole city now fell quickly into his hands. His first act was to demolish the stronghold of tyranny in Ortygia and to erect courts of justice upon its site. A free constitution of government was then re-established, all exiled citizens recalled, a great immigration of Greek inhabitants invited, and the city revivified with new currents of life. The tyranny in other cities was overthrown and all Sicily regenerated. The Carthaginians returning were defeated with fearful losses in a great battle on the Krimesus, and a peace made with them which narrowed their dominion in Sicily to the region west of the Halykus. All these great achievements completed, Timoleon resigned his generalship, declined every office, and became a simple citizen of Syracuse, living only a few years, however, to enjoy the grateful love and respect of its people.—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece, pt.* 2, *ch.* 84–85.

Also in: Plutarch, *Timoleon.*

B. C. 317-289.—Under Agathokles.—A little more than twenty years after Timoleon expelled the brood of the tyrant Dionysius from Syracuse, and liberated Sicily, his work was entirely undone and a new and worse despot pushed himself into power. This was Agathokles, who rose, like his prototype, from a humble grade of life, acquired wealth by a lucky marriage, was trusted with the command of the Syracusan army — of mercenaries, chiefly — obtained a complete ascendancy over these soulless men, and then turned them loose upon the city, one morning at daybreak (B. C. 317), for a carnival of unrestrained riot and massacre. "They broke open the doors of the rich, or climbed over the roofs, massacred the proprietors within, and ravished the females. They chased the unsuspecting fugitives through the streets, not sparing even those who took refuge in the temples. . . . For two days Syracuse was thus a prey to the sanguinary, rapacious, and lustful impulses of the soldiery; 4,000 citizens had been already slain, and many more were seized as prisoners. The political purposes of Agathokles, as well as the passions of the soldiers, being then sated, he arrested the massacre. He concluded this bloody feat by killing such of his prisoners as were most obnoxious to him, and banishing the rest. The total number of expelled or fugitive Syracusans is stated at 6,000." In a city so purged and terrorized, Agathokles had no difficulty in getting himself proclaimed by acclamation sole ruler or autocrat, and he soon succeeded in extending his authority over a large part of Sicily. After some years he became involved in war with the Carthaginians, and suffered a disastrous defeat on the Himera (B. C. 310). Besieged in Syracuse, as a consequence, he resorted to bolder tactics than had been known before his time and "carried the war into Africa." His invasion of Carthage was the first that the Punic capital ever knew, and it created great alarm and confusion in the city. The Carthaginians were repeatedly beaten, Tunes, and other dependent towns, as well as Utica, were captured, the surrounding territory was ravaged, and Agathokles became master of the eastern coast. But all his successes gained him no permanent advantage, and, after four years of wonderful campaigning in Africa, he saw no escape from the difficulties of his situation except by basely stealing away from his army, leaving his two sons to be killed by the furious soldiers when they discovered his flight. Returning to Sicily, the wonderfully crafty and unscrupulous abilities which he possessed enabled him to regain his power and to commit outrage after outrage upon the people of Syracuse, Egesta, and other towns, until his death in 289 B. C.—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece, pt.* 2, *ch.* 97.

B. C. 212.—Siege by the Romans. See Punic Wars: The Second.

A. D. 279.—Sacked by Franks.—The Emperor Probus, who expelled from Gaul, A. D. 277, the invaders then beginning to swarm upon the hapless province, removed a large body of captive Franks to the coast of Pontus, on the Euxine, and settled them there. The restive barbarians soon afterwards succeeded (A. D. 279) in capturing a fleet of vessels, in which they made their way to the Mediterranean, plundering the shores and islands as they passed towards the west. "The opulent city of Syracuse, in whose port the navies of Athens and Carthage had formerly been sunk, was sacked by a handful of barbarians, who massacred the greatest part of the trembling inhabitants." This was the crowning exploit of the escaping Franks, after which they continued their voyage and reached in due time their own shores, among the islands of the delta of the Rhine.—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, ch.* 12.

A. D. 878.—Siege and capture by the Saracens. See Sicily: A. D. 827–878.

SYRIA.—"Between the Arabian Desert and the eastern coast of the Levant there stretches — along almost the full extent of the latter, or for nearly 400 miles — a tract of fertile land varying from 70 to 100 miles in breadth. This is so broken up by mountain range and valley, that it has never all been brought under one native government; yet its well-defined boundaries — the sea on the west, Mount Taurus on the north, and the desert to east and south — give it a certain unity, and separate it from the rest of the world. It has rightly, therefore, been covered by one name, Syria. Like that of Palestine, the name is due to the Greeks, but by a reverse process. As 'Palestina,' which is really Philistina, was first the name of only a part of the coast, and thence spread inland to the desert, so Syria, which is a shorter form of Assyria, was originally applied by the Greeks to the whole of the Assyrian Empire from the Caucasus to the

Levant, then shrank to this side of the Euphrates, and finally within the limits drawn above. . . . Syria is the north end of the Arabian world. . . . The population of Syria has always been essentially Semitic [see SEMITES]. . . . Syria's position between two of the oldest homes of the human race made her the passage for the earliest intercourse and exchanges of civilisation. It is doubtful whether history has to record any great campaigns . . . earlier than those which Egypt and Assyria waged against each other across the whole extent of Syria [see EGYPT: ABOUT B. C. 1700–1400, to B. C. 670–525]. . . . The Hittites came south from Asia Minor over Mount Taurus, and the Ethiopians came north from their conquest of the Nile. Towards the end of the great duel between Assyria and Egypt, the Scythians from north of the Caucasus devastated Syria. When the Babylonian Empire fell, the Persians made her a province of their empire, and marched across her to Egypt [see EGYPT: B. C. 525–332]. At the beginning of our era, she was overrun by the Parthians. The Persians invaded her a second time, just before the Moslem invasion of the seventh century [see MAHOMETAN CONQUEST: A. D. 632–639]; she fell, of course, under the Seljuk Turks in the eleventh [see TURKS: A. D. 1063–1073, and after]; and in the thirteenth and fourteenth the Mongols thrice swept through her. Into this almost constant stream of empires and races, which swept through Syria from the earliest ages, Europe was drawn under Alexander the Great [see MACEDONIA: B. C. 334–330, and after]. . . . She was scoured during the following centuries by the wars of the Seleucids and Ptolemies, and her plains were planted all over by their essentially Greek civilisation [see SELEUCIDÆ; and JEWS: B. C. 332–167]. Pompey brought her under the Roman Empire, B. C. 65 [see ROME: B. C. 69–63; and JEWS: B. C. 166–40], and in this she remained till the Arabs took her, 634 A. D. [see MAHOMETAN CONQUEST: A. D. 632–639]. The Crusaders held her for a century, 1098–1187, and parts of her for a century more [see CRUSADES: A. D. 1096–1099]. . . . Napoleon the Great made her the pathway of his ambition towards that empire on the Euphrates and Indus whose fate was decided on her plains, 1799 [see FRANCE: A. D. 1798–1799 (AUGUST—AUGUST)]. Since then, Syria's history has mainly consisted in a number of sporadic attempts on the part of the Western world to plant upon her both their civilisation and her former religion."—George Adam Smith, *Historical Geography of the Holy Land, bk.* 1, *ch.* 1.

ALSO IN: C. R. Conder, *Syrian Stone Lore.*—É. Reclus, *The Earth and its Inhabitants: Asia, v.* 4, *ch.* 9.—See, also, DAMASCUS.

SYRIA, CŒLE-. See CŒLE-SYRIA.

SYRO-CHALDEAN LANGUAGE, The. See SEMITIC LANGUAGES.

SYRTIS MAJOR AND SYRTIS MINOR.—These were the names given by the Greeks to the two gulfs (or rather the two corners of the one great gulf) which deeply indent the coast of North Africa. Syrtis Major, or the Greater Syrtis, is now known as the Gulf of Sidra; Syrtis Minor as the Gulf of Khabs, or Cabes.

SYSSITIA, The.—"The most important feature in the Cretan mode of life is the usage of the Syssitia, or public meals, of which all the citizens partook, without distinction of rank or age. The origin of this institution cannot be traced: we learn however from Aristotle that it was not peculiar to the Greeks, but existed still earlier in the south of Italy among the Œnotrians. . . . At Sparta [which retained this institution, in common with Crete, to the latest times], the entertainment was provided at the expense, not of the state, but of those who shared it. The head of each family, as far as his means reached, contributed for all its members; but the citizen who was reduced to indigence lost his place at the public board. The guests were divided into companies, generally of fifteen persons, who filled up vacancies by ballot, in which unanimous consent was required for every election. No member, not even the king, was permitted to stay away, except on some extraordinary occasion, as of a sacrifice, or a lengthened chase, when he was expected to send a present to the table: such contributions frequently varied the frugal repast."—C. Thirlwall, *History of Greece, ch.* 7–8.

SZATHMAR, Treaty of (1711). See HUNGARY: A. D. 1699–1718.

SZECHENYI, and the Hungarian wakening. See HUNGARY: A. D., 1815–1844.

SZEGEDIN, Battle of (1849). See AUSTRIA: A. D. 1848–1849.

SZEGEDIN, The broken Treaty of. See TURKS (THE OTTOMANS): A. D. 1402–1451.

SZIGETH, Siege of (1566). See HUNGARY: A. D. 1526–1567.

T.

TABELLARIÆ, Leges.—"For a long period [at Rome] the votes in the Comitia were given vivâ voce . . . ; but voting by ballot ('per tabellas') was introduced at the beginning of the 7th century [2d century B. C.] by a succession of laws which, from their subject, were named Leges Tabellariae. Cicero tells us that there were in all four, namely: 1. Lex Gabinia, passed B. C. 139. . . . 2. Lex Cassia, carried in B. C. 137. . . . 3. Lex Papiria, passed B. C. 131. . . . 4. Lex Caelia, passed B. C. 107."—W. Ramsay, *Manual of Roman Antiq., ch.* 4.

TABLES, The. See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1638.

TABORITES, The. See BOHEMIA: A. D. 1419–1434.

TABREEZ, Battle of. See PERSIA: A. D. 1499–1887.

TACHIES, The. See TEXAS: THE ABORIGINAL INHABITANTS.

TACITUS, Roman Emperor, A. D. 275–276.

TACNA, Battle of (1880). See CHILE: A. D. 1833–1884.

TACULLIES, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: ATHAPASCAN FAMILY.

TADCASTER FIGHT (1642).—Lord Fairfax, commanding in Yorkshire for the Parliament, and having his headquarters at Tadcaster, where he had assembled a small force, was attacked by 8,000 royalists, under the Earl of Newcastle, December 7, 1642, and forced to retire, after obstinate resistance. This was one of the earliest encounters of the great English Civil War.—C. R. Markham, *Life of the Great Lord Fairfax, ch.* 8.

TADMOR. See PALMYRA.

TAENSAS, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: NATCHESAN FAMILY.

TAEXALI, The.—A tribe which held the northeastern coast of ancient Caledonia. See BRITAIN, CELTIC TRIBES.

TAGLIACOZZO, Capture of Conradin at. See ITALY (SOUTHERN): A. D. 1250–1268.

TAGLIAMENTO, Battle of the (1797). See FRANCE: A. D. 1796–1797 (OCTOBER—APRIL).

TAGOS, OR TAGUS, The Greek title. See DEMIURGI.

TAIFALÆ, The.—In the fourth century, "the Taifalæ inhabited that part of the province of Dacia which is now called Wallachia. They are first mentioned as allies of the Thervingi in A. D. 291 (Mamertin, Panegyr. ii. c. 17). Their ethnological relations are uncertain. Zosimus vaguely calls them Scythians (ii. c. 31); St. Martin conjectures that they were the last remains of the great and powerful nation of the Dacians, and Latham that they were Slavonians. But we only know for certain that they were constantly allies of the Visigoths, and that Farnobius, one of their chiefs, is expressly called a Goth by Ammianus (xxxi. c. 9). They subsequently accompanied the Visigoths in their migrations westward, and settled on the south side of the Liger, in the country of the Pictavi, where they were in the time of Gregory of Tours, who calls them Theiphali, and their district Theiphalia."— W. Smith, *Note to Gibbon's Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, ch.* 26.

TAILLE AND GABELLE, The.—Under the old régime, before the Revolution, "the chief item in the French budget was the taille [analagous to the English word 'tally']. This was a direct tax imposed upon the property of those assessed, and in theory it was in proportion to the amount they possessed. But in the most of France it fell chiefly upon personal property. It was impossible that with the most exact and honest system it should be accurately apportioned, and the system that was in force was both loose and dishonest. The local assessors exempted some and overtaxed others; they released their friends or their villages, and imposed an increased burden upon others, and, to a very large extent, exemptions or reductions were obtained by those who had money with which to bribe or to litigate. The bulk of this tax fell upon the peasants. From it, indeed, a large part of the population, and the part possessing the most of the wealth of the country, was entirely exempt. The nobility were free from any personal tax, and under this head were probably included 400,000 people. The clergy were free, almost all of the officials of every kind, and the members of many professions and trades. Many of the cities had obtained exemption from the taille by the payment of a sum of money, which was either nominal or very moderate. Only laborers and peasants, it was said, still remained subject to it. Out of 11,000,000 people [in the 17th century] in those portions of France where the taille was a personal tax, probably 2,500,000 were exempt. . . . Next to the taille, the most important tax was the gabelle, and, though less onerous, it also produced a vast amount of misery. The gabelle was a duty on salt, and it was farmed by the government. The burden of an excessive tax was increased by the cupidity of those who bought the right to collect its proceeds. The French government retained a monopoly of salt, much like that which it now possesses of tobacco, but the price which it charged for this article of necessity was such, that the States of Normandy declared that salt cost the people more than all the rest of their food. In some provinces the price fixed imposed a duty of about 3,000 per cent., and salt sold for nearly ten sous a pound, thirty times its present price in France, though it is still subject to a considerable duty. From this tax there were no personal exemptions, but large portions of the country were not subject to the gabelle. Brittany was free, Guienne, Poitou, and several other provinces were wholly exempt or paid a trifling subsidy. About one third of the population were free from this duty, and the exemption was so valued that a rumor that the gabelle was to be imposed was sufficient to excite a local insurrection. Such a duty, on an article like salt, was also necessarily much more oppressive for the poor than the rich. As the exorbitant price would compel many to go without the commodity, the tax was often rendered a direct one. The amount of salt was fixed which a family should consume, and this they were forced to take at the price established by the government. . . . The gabelle was farmed for about 20,000,000 livres, and to cover the expenses and profits of the farmers probably 27,000,000 in all was collected from the people. A family of six would, on an average, pay the equivalent of ninety francs, or about eighteen dollars a year, for this duty."—J. B. Perkins, *France under Mazarin, ch.* 18 (*v.* 2).—"Not only was the price of salt rendered exorbitant by the tax, but its consumption at this exorbitant price was compulsory. Every human being above seven years of age was bound to consume seven pounds of salt per annum, which salt, moreover, was to be exclusively used with food or in cooking. To use it for salting meat, butter, cheese, &c., was prohibited under severe penalties. The average price of salt [in the reign of Louis XIV.] over two-thirds of the country, was a shilling a pound. To buy salt of any one but the authorised agents of the Government was punished by fines of 200, 300, and 500 livres (about £80 of our money), and smugglers were punished by imprisonment, the galleys, and death. . . . The use of salt in agriculture was rendered impossible, and it was forbidden, under a penalty of 300 livres (about £50), to take a beast to a salt-marsh, and allow it to drink sea-water. Salted hams and bacon were not allowed to enter the country. The salt used in the fisheries was supervised and guarded by such a number of vexatious regulations that one might suppose the object of the Government was to render that branch of commerce impossible. . . . But even the Gabelle was less onerous than the Taille. The amount of the Taille was fixed in the secret councils of the Government, according to the exigencies of the financial situation every year. The thirty-two Intendants of the provinces were informed of the amount which their districts were expected to forward to the Treasury. Each Intendant then made known to the Elections (sub-districts) of his Généralité the sum which they had to find, and the officers called Elus apportioned to each parish its quota of contribution. Then, in the parishes, was set in motion a system of blind, stupid, and

remorseless extortion, of which one cannot read even now without a flash of indignation. First of all, the most flagitious partiality and injustice presided over the distribution of the tax. Parishes which had a friend at Court or in authority got exempt, and with them the tax was a mere form. But these exemptions caused it to fall with more crushing weight on their less fortunate neighbours, as the appointed sum must be made up, whoever paid it. The inequalities of taxation almost surpass belief. . . . But this was far from being the worst feature. The chief inhabitants of the country villages were compelled to fill, in rotation, the odious office of collectors. They were responsible for the gross amount to be levied, which they might get as they could out of their parishioners. . . . Friends, or persons who had powerful patrons, were exempted; while enemies, or the unprotected, were drained of their last farthing. . . . The collectors went about, we are told, always keeping well together for fear of violence, making their visits and perquisitions, and met everywhere with a chorus of imprecations. As the Taille was always in arrear, on one side of the street might be seen the collectors of the current year pursuing their exactions, while on the other side were those of the year previous engaged on the same business, and further on were the agents of the Gabelle and other taxes employed in a similar manner. From morning to evening, from year's beginning to year's ending, they tramped, escorted by volleys of oaths and curses, getting a penny here and a penny there; for prompt payment under this marvellous system was not to be thought of."—J. C. Morison, *The Reign of Louis XIV.* (*Fortnightly Rev., April*, 1874, *v.* 21). —Under Colbert (1661–1683), in the reign of Louis XIV., both the taille (or villein tax, as it was often called) and the gabelle were greatly reduced, and the iniquities of their distribution and collection were much lessened.—H. Martin, *Hist. of France: Age of Louis XIV.*, *v.* 1, *ch.* 1. —For an intimation of the origin of the taille, see FRANCE: A. D. 1453–1461.

TAIPING REBELLION, The. See CHINA: A. D. 1850–1864.

TAJ MAHAL, The. See INDIA: A. D. 1605–1658.

TAKBIR, The.—The Mahometan war-cry—"God is Great."

TAKILMAN FAMILY, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: TAKILMAN FAMILY.

TALAJOTS. See SARDINIA, THE ISLAND: NAME AND EARLY HISTORY.

TALAVERA, Battle of. See SPAIN: A. D. 1809 (FEBRUARY—JULY).

TALCA, Battle of (1818). See CHILE: A. D. 1810–1818.

TALENT, Attic, Babylonian, &c. —"Not only in Attica, but in almost all the Hellenic States, even in those which were not in Greece but were of Hellenic origin, money was reckoned by talents of sixty minas, the mina at a hundred drachmas, the drachma at six oboli. At Athens the obolus was divided into eight chalci . . . the chalcûs into seven lepta. Down to the half obolus, the Athenian money was, in general, coined only in silver; the dichalchon, or quarter obolus, in silver or copper; the chalcûs and the smaller pieces only in copper. . . . The value of the more ancient Attic silver talent, silver value reckoned for silver value, will be 1,500 thlr. Prussian currency; of the mina, 25 thaler; of the drachma, 6 gute groschen; of the obolus 1 g. gr., —equivalent to $1.026, $17.10, 71.1 cts., 2.85 cts. respectively. . . . Before the time of Solon, the Attic money was heavier; also the commercial weight was heavier than that by which money was weighed. One hundred new drachmas were equivalent to 72–73 ancient drachmas; but the ancient weight remained with very little alteration as commercial weight, to which, in later times, an increase was also added. Through the alterations of Solon, the Attic money, which before stood to the Æginetan in the relation of 5:6, had to the same the relation of 3:5. The new was related to the ancient Attic money as 18:25. Compared with the heavy Æginetan drachma . . . , the Attic was called the light drachma. . . . The former was equivalent to ten Attic oboli; so that the Æginetan talent weighed more than 10,000 Attic drachmas. It was equal to the Babylonian talent. Nevertheless the Æginetan money was soon coined so light that it was related to the Attic nearly as 3:2. . . . The Corinthian talent is to be estimated as originally equivalent to the Æginetan, but it was also in later times diminished. . . . The Egyptian talent . . . contained, according to Varro in Pliny, eighty Roman pounds, and cannot, therefore, have been essentially different from the Attic talent, since the Attic mina is related to the Roman pound as 4:3. . . . The Euboic talent is related . . . to the Æginetan as five to six, and is no other than the money-talent of the Athenians in use before the time of Solon, and which continued in use as commercial weight. According to the most accurate valuation, therefore, one hundred Euboic drachmas are equivalent to 138⅔ drachmas of Solon. . . . Appian has given the relation of the Alexandrian to the Euboic talent in round numbers as 6 to 7 = 120 to 140; but it was rather more accurately as 120 to 138⅔. . . . So much gold . . . as was estimated to be equivalent to a talent of silver, was undoubtedly also called a talent of gold. And, finally, a weight of gold of 6,000 drachmas, the value of which, compared with silver, always depended upon the existing relation between them, was sometimes thus called."—A. Boeckh, *Public Economy of Athens* (*tr. by Lamb*), *bk.* 1, *ch.* 4–5.—See, also, SHEKEL.

TALLAGE, The.—"Under the general head of donum, auxilium, and the like, came a long series of imposts [in the period of the Norman kings], which were theoretically gifts of the nation to the king, and the amount of which was determined by the itinerant justices after separate negotiation with the payers. The most important of these, that which fell upon the towns and demesne lands of the Crown, is known as the tallage. This must have affected other property besides land, but the particular method in which it was to be collected was determined by the community on which it fell, or by special arrangement with the justices."—W. Stubbs, *Const. Hist. of Eng.*, *ch.* 13, *sect.* 161 (*v.* 1).

TALLEYRAND, Prince de: Alienation from Napoleon. See FRANCE: A. D. 1807–1808.

TALLIGEWI, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: ALLEGHANS.

TALMUD, The.—"The Talmud [from a Hebrew verb signifying 'to learn'] is a vast irregular repertory of Rabbinical reflections, discussions, and animadversions on a myriad of

topics treated of or touched on in Holy Writ; a treasury, in chaotic arrangement, of Jewish lore, scientific, legal, and legendary; a great storehouse of extra-biblical, yet biblically referable, Jewish speculation, fancy, and faith. . . . The Talmud proper is throughout of a twofold character, and consists of two divisions, severally called the Mishna and the Gemara. . . . The Mishna, in this connection, may be regarded as the text of the Talmud itself, and the Gemara as a sort of commentary. . . . The Gemara regularly follows the Mishna, and annotates upon it sentence by sentence. . . . There are two Talmuds, the Yerushalmi [Jerusalem], or, more correctly, the Palestinian, and the Babli, that is, the Babylonian. The Mishna is pretty nearly the same in both these, but the Gemaras are different. The Talmud Yerushalmi gives the traditional sayings of the Palestinian Rabbis, . . . the 'Gemara of the Children of the West,' as it is styled; whereas the Talmud Babli gives the traditional sayings of the Rabbis of Babylon. This Talmud is about four times the size of the Jerusalem one; it is by far the more popular, and to it almost exclusively our remarks relate." —P. I. Hershon, *Talmudic Miscellany, introd.*— The date of the compilation of the Babylonian Talmud is fixed at about A. D. 500; that of Jerusalem was a century or more earlier. See, also, MISCHNA.

TALUKDARS.—"A Taluka [in India] is a large estate, consisting of many villages, or, as they would be called in English, parishes. These villages had originally separate proprietors, who paid their revenue direct to the Government treasury. The Native Government in former times made over by patent, to a person called Talukdar, its right over these villages, holding him responsible for the whole revenue. . . . The wealth and influence thus acquired by the Talukdar often made him, in fact, independent. . . . When the country came under British rule, engagements for payment of the Government Revenue were taken from these Talukdars, and they were called Zamindars."—Sir R. Temple, *James Thomason, p.* 158.—See INDIA: A. D. 1785–1793.

TAMANES, Battle of. See SPAIN: A. D. 1809 (AUGUST—NOVEMBER).

TAMASP I., Shah of Persia, A. D. 1523–1576.....Tamasp II., Shah of Persia, 1730–1732.

TAMERLANE, OR TIMOUR. See TIMOUR.

TAMMANY RING, The. See NEW YORK: A. D. 1863–1871.

TAMMANY SOCIETY.—TAMMANY HALL.—"Shortly after the peace of 1783, a society was formed in the city of New York, known by the name of the Tammany Society. It was probably originally instituted with a view of organizing an association antagonist to the Cincinnati Society. That society was said to be monarchical or rather aristocratical in its tendency, and, when first formed, and before its constitution was amended, on the suggestion of General Washington and other original members, it certainly did tend to the establishment of an hereditary order, something like an order of nobility. The Tammany Society originally seems to have had in view the preservation of our democratic institutions. . . . 'Tammany Society, or Columbian Order, was founded by William Mooney, an upholsterer residing in the city of New York, some time in the administration of President Washington. . . . William Mooney was one of those who, at that early day, regarded the powers of the general government as dangerous to the independence of the state governments, and to the common liberties of the people. His object was to fill the country with institutions designed, and men determined, to preserve the just balance of power. His purpose was patriotic and purely republican. . . . Tammany was, at first, so popular, that most persons of merit became members; and so numerous were they that its anniversary [May 12] was regarded as a holiday. At that time there was no party politics mixed up in its proceedings. But when President Washington, in the latter part of his administration, rebuked "self created societies," from an apprehension that their ultimate tendency would be hostile to the public tranquility, the members of Tammany supposed their institution to be included in the reproof; and they almost forsook it. The founder, William Mooney, and a few others, continued steadfast. At one anniversary they were reduced so low that but three persons attended its festival. From this time it became a political institution, and took ground with Thomas Jefferson.'"—J. D. Hammond, *History of Political Parties in the State of New York, v.* 1, *ch.* 18.—"The ideal patrons of the society were Columbus and Tammany, the last a legendary Indian chief, once lord, it was said, of the island of Manhattan, and now adopted as the patron saint of America. The association was divided into thirteen tribes, each tribe typifying a state, presided over by a sachem. There were also the honorary posts of warrior and hunter, and the council of sachems had at their head a grand sachem, a type evidently of the President of the United States."—R. Hildreth, *Hist. of the U. S., v.* 4, *ch.* 3.—"Shortly after Washington's inauguration, May 12, 1789, the 'Tammany Society or Columbian Order' was founded. It was composed at first of the moderate men of both political parties, and seems not to have been recognized as a party institution until the time of Jefferson as President. William Mooney was the first Grand Sachem; his successor in 1790 was William Pitt Smith, and in 1791 Josiah Ogden Hoffman received the honor. John Pintard was the first Sagamore. De Witt Clinton was scribe of the council in 1791. It was strictly a national society, based on the principles of patriotism, and had for its object the perpetuation of a true love for our own country. Aboriginal forms and ceremonies were adopted in its incorporation."—Mrs. M. J. Lamb, *Hist. of the City of N. Y., v.* 2, *p.* 362, *foot-note.*—"One must distinguish between the 'Tammany Society or Columbian Order' and the political organization called for shortness 'Tammany Hall.'. . . The Tammany Society owns a large building on Fourteenth Street, near Third Avenue, and it leases rooms in this building to the 'Democratic Republican General Committee of the City of New York,' otherwise and more commonly known as 'Tammany Hall' or 'Tammany.' Tammany Hall means, therefore, first, the building on Fourteenth Street where the 'Democracy' have their headquarters; and secondly, the political body officially known as the Democratic Republican General Committee of the City of New York.

. . . The city of New York is divided by law into thirty 'assembly districts;' that is, thirty districts, each of which elects an assemblyman to the state legislature. In each of these assembly districts there is held annually an election of members of the aforesaid Democratic Republican General Committee. This committee is a very large one, consisting of no less than five thousand men; and each assembly district is allotted a certain number of members, based on the number of Democratic votes which it cast in the last preceding presidential election. Thus the number of the General Committeemen elected in each assembly district varies from sixty to two hundred and seventy. There is intended to be one General Committeeman for every fifty Democratic electors in the district. In each assembly district there is also elected a district leader, the head of Tammany Hall for that district. He is always a member of the General Committee, and these thirty men, one leader from each assembly district, form the executive committee of Tammany Hall. 'By this committee,' says a Tammany official, 'all the internal affairs of the organization are directed, its candidates for offices are selected, and the plans for every campaign are matured.' The General Committee meets every month, five hundred members constituting a quorum; and in October of each year it sits as a county convention, to nominate candidates for the ensuing election. There is also a sub-committee on organization, containing one thousand members, which meets once a month. This committee takes charge of the conduct of elections. There is, besides, a finance committee, appointed by the chairman of the General Committee, and there are several minor committees, unnecessary to mention. The chairman of the finance committee is at present Mr. Richard Croker. Such are the general committees of Tammany Hall. . . . Each assembly district is divided by law into numerous election districts, or, as they are called in some cities, voting precincts,— each election district containing about four hundred voters. The election districts are looked after as follows: Every assembly district has a district committee, composed of the members of the General Committee elected from that district, and of certain additional members chosen for the purpose. The district committee appoints in each of the election districts included in that particular assembly district a captain. This man is the local boss. He has from ten to twenty-five aids, and he is responsible for the vote of his election district. There are about eleven hundred election districts in New York, and consequently there are about eleven hundred captains, or local bosses, each one being responsible to the (assembly) district committee by which he was appointed. Every captain is held to a strict account. If the Tammany vote in his election district falls off without due cause, he is forthwith removed, and another appointed in his place. Usually, the captain is an actual resident in his district; but occasionally, being selected from a distant part of the city, he acquires a fictitious residence in the district. Very frequently the captain is a liquor dealer, who has a clientele of customers, dependents, and hangers-on, whom he 'swings,' or controls. He is paid, of course, for his services; he has some money to distribute, and a little patronage, such as places in the street-cleaning department, or perhaps a minor clerkship. The captain of a district has a personal acquaintance with all its voters; and on the eve of an election he is able to tell how every man in his district is going to vote. He makes his report; and from the eleven hundred reports of the election district captains the Tammany leaders can predict with accuracy what will be the vote of the city."—H. C. Merwin, *Tammany Hall* (*Atlantic, Feb.*, 1894).

Also in: R. Home, *The Story of Tammany* (*Harper's Monthly, v.* 44, *pp.* 685, 835).

TAMULS, The. See Turanian Races.

TAMWORTH MANIFESTO, The. See England: A. D. 1834–1837.

TANAGRA, Battle of (B. C. 457). See Greece: B. C. 458–456.

TANAIM, The.—A name assumed by the Jewish Rabbins who especially devoted themselves to the interpretation of the Mischna.— H. H. Milman, *Hist. of the Jews, bk.* 19.

TANAIS, The.—The name anciently given to the Russian river now called the Don,— which latter name signifies simply 'water.'

TANCRED, King of Naples and Sicily, A. D. 1189–1194.

TANCRED'S CRUSADE. See Crusades: A. D. 1096–1099; and Jerusalem: A. D. 1099, and 1099–1144.

TANEY, Roger B., and President Jackson's removal of the Deposits. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1833–1836. . . . . **The Dred Scott Decision.** See United States of Am.: A. D. 1857.

TANFANA, Feast and massacre of. See Germany: A. D. 14–16.

TANIS. See Zoan.

TANISTRY, Law of.—"These chieftainships [in ancient Ireland], and perhaps even the kingdoms themselves, though not partible, followed a very different rule of succession than that of primogeniture. They were subject to the law of tanistry, of which the principle is defined to be that the demesne lands and dignity of chieftainship, descended to the eldest and most worthy of the same blood; these epithets not being used, we may suppose, synonymously, but in order to indicate that the preference given to seniority was to be controlled by a due regard to desert. No better mode, it is evident, of providing for a perpetual supply of those civil quarrels, in which the Irish are supposed to place so much of their enjoyment, could have been devised."—H. Hallam, *Const. Hist. of Eng., ch.* 18 (*v.* 3).—See, also, Tuath.

TANNENBURG, Battle of (1410). See Poland: A. D. 1333–1572.

TANOAN FAMILY, The. See American Aborigines: Tañoan Family.

TANTALIDÆ, The. See Argos.

TAOUISM. See China: The Religions.

TAPÆ, Battles at. See Dacia: A. D. 102–106.

TAPIO BISCKE, Battle of (1849). See Austria: A. D. 1848–1849.

TAPPANS, The. See American Aborigines: Algonquian Family.

TAPROBANE.— The name by which the island of Ceylon was known to the ancients. Hipparchus advanced the opinion that it was not merely a large island, but the beginning of another world.—E. H. Bunbury, *Hist. of Ancient Geog., ch.* 23, *sect.* 2 (*v.* 2).

TAPURIANS, The.—"To the west of the Hyrcanians, between Elburz and the Caspian, lay the Tapurians, whose name has survived in the modern Taberistan, and further yet, on the sea-coast, and at the mouth of the Mardus (now Safidrud), were the Mardians."—M. Duncker, *Hist. of Antiquity, bk.* 8, *ch.* 1 (*v.* 5).

TARA, The Hill, the Feis, and the Psalter of.—The Feis Teavrach, or Feis of Tara, in Irish history, was a triennial assembly on the royal hill of Tara, in Meath, which is claimed to have been instituted by a certain King Ollamh Fodhla, at so remote a period as 1,300 years before Christ. "All the chieftains or heads of septs, bards, historians, and military leaders throughout the country were regularly summoned, and were required to attend under the penalty of being treated as the king's enemies. The meeting was held in a large oblong hall, and the first three days were spent in enjoying the hospitality of the king, who entertained the entire assembly during its sittings. The bards give long and glowing accounts of the magnificence displayed on these occasions, of the formalities employed, and of the business transacted. Tables were arranged along the centre of the hall, and on the walls at either side were suspended the banners or arms of the chiefs, so that each chief on entering might take his seat under his own escutcheon. Orders were issued by sound of trumpet, and all the forms were characterized by great solemnity. What may have been the authority of this assembly, or whether it had any power to enact laws, is not clear; but it would appear that one of its principal functions was the inspection of the national records, the writers of which were obliged to the strictest accuracy under the weightiest penalties."—M. Haverty, *Hist. of Ireland, p.* 24.—The result of the examination and correction of the historical records of the kingdom were "entered in the great national register called the Psalter of Tara, which is supposed to have been destroyed at the period of the Norman invasion. . . . It is supposed that part of the contents of the Psalter of Cashel, which contains much of the fabulous history of the Irish, was copied from it."—T. Wright, *Hist. of Ireland, bk.* 1, *ch.* 2 (*v.* 1).

TARANTEENS, OR TARENTINES, OR TARRATINES. See American Aborigines: Abnakis, and Algonquian Family; also, New England: A. D. 1675 (July—September).

TARAS. See Tarentum.

TARASCANS, The. See American Aborigines: Tarascans.

TARBELLI, The. See Aquitaine: The ancient tribes.

TARENTINE WAR, The. See Rome: B. C. 282–275.

TARENTUM.—Tarentum (or Taras), the most important of the ancient Greek cities in Italy, "lay at the northern corner of the great gulf which still bears its name. It had an excellent harbour, almost land-locked. On its eastern horn stood the city. Its form was triangular; one side being washed by the open sea, the other by the waters of the harbour, while the base or land side was protected by a line of strong fortifications. Thus advantageously posted for commerce the city grew apace. She possessed an opulent middle class; and the poorer citizens found an easy subsistence in the abundant supply of fish which the gulf afforded. These native fishermen were always ready to man the navy of the state. But they made indifferent soldiers. Therefore when any peril of war threatened the state, it was the practice of the government to hire foreign captains, soldiers of fortune, who were often kings or princes, to bring an army for their defence. . . . The origin of Lacedæmonian Tarentum is veiled in fable. The warriors of Sparta (so runs the well-known legend) went forth to the second Messenian war under a vow not to see their homes till they had conquered the enemy. They were long absent, and their wives sought paramours among the slaves and others who had not gone out to war. When the warriors returned, they found a large body of youth grown up from this adulterous intercourse. These youths (the Parthenii as they were called), disdaining subjection, quitted their native land under the command of Phalantus, one of their own body, and founded the colony of Tarentum."—H. G. Liddell, *Hist. of Rome, bk.* 3, *ch.* 25 (*v.* 1).—See, also, Siris.

B. C. 282-275.—Alliance with Pyrrhus and war with Rome. See Rome: B. C. 282–275.

B. C. 212.—Betrayed to Hannibal. See Punic Wars: The Second.

TARENTUM, Treaty of.—The treaty in which Octavius and Antony extended their triumvirate to a second term of five years; negotiated at Tarentum, B. C. 37.—C. Merivale, *Hist. of the Romans, ch.* 27.

TARGOWITZ, Confederates of. See Poland: A. D. 1791–1792.

TARIFA: A. D. 1291.—Taken by the Christians from the Moors. See Spain: A. D. 1273–1460.

TARIFF LEGISLATION AND CONVENTIONS.

(The Netherlands): 15th Century.—Early Free Trade and Reciprocity.—In the Netherlands, at the close of a short war with the English, in 1437, "the import of raw wool was entirely relieved from the payment of even the ordinary customs. . . . And this was then their notion of protection,—to be allowed to buy what they liked where they liked, to live at peace with their neighbours, and to be let alone. Four hundred years have passed and gone since the Netherlands persuaded their rulers to take off all duty on raw wool, and to permit half-finished clothes to be brought into their country in order that they might be dyed and taken out again duty free; yet we live in the midst of tariffs whose aim it is to hinder the importation of the raw material by prohibitory duties and to prevent competition in every kind of fabric by so-called protecting ones! And in England, also, at the period in question, the suicidal spirit of commercial envy had seized hold of the government, and in every parliament some fresh evidence was afforded of the jealousy with which foreign skill and competition were viewed. But the Dutch held on

the tenour of their discerning and sagacious way without waiting for reciprocity or resenting its reverse. If the English would not admit their cloths, that was no reason why they should cheat themselves of the advantage of English and Irish wool. If not cloths, there was doubtless something else that they would buy from them. Among other articles, there was salt, which they had acquired a peculiar skill in refining; and there was an extensive carrying trade in the produce of the Northern countries, and in various costly luxuries, which the English obtained from remoter regions generally through them. In 1496, when Philip (father of the Emperor Charles V.) assumed the government of the Netherlands, as Duke of Brabant, he "presented to the senates of the leading cities the draught of a commercial treaty with England, conceived in a wise and liberal spirit, and eminently fitted to advance the real welfare of both countries. Their assent was gladly given. . . . Nor did they over-estimate the value of the new compact, which long went by the name of 'The Grand Treaty of Commerce.' Its provisions were, in all respects, reciprocal, and enabled every kind of merchandise to be freely imported from either country by the citizens of the other. The entire liberty of fishing on each other's coast was confirmed; measures were prescribed for the suppression of piracy; and property saved from wrecks, when none of the crew survived, was vested in the local authorities in trust for the proper owners, should they appear to claim it within a year and a day. . . . The industrial policy of the Dutch was founded on ideas wholly and essentially different from that of the kingdoms around them. 'The freedom of traffic had ever been greater with them than amongst any of their neighbours;' and its different results began to appear. Not only were strangers of every race and creed sure of an asylum in Holland, but of a welcome; and singular pains were taken to induce those whose skill enabled them to contribute to the wealth of the state to settle permanently in the great towns."—W. T. McCullagh, *Industrial History of Free Nations, v.* 2, *pp.* 110–111, 150–151, 266–267.

(Venice): 15-17th Centuries.—Beginning of systematic exclusion and monopoly. See VENICE: 15–17TH CENTURIES.

(England): A. D. 1651-1672.—The Navigation Laws and their effect on the American colonies. See NAVIGATION LAWS: A. D. 1651; and UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1651–1672.

(France): A. D. 1664-1667.—The System of Colbert.—Colbert, the great minister of Louis XIV., was the first among statesmen who had an economic system, "settled, complete and consistent in all its parts; and it is to the eternal honor of his name that he made it triumph in spite of obstacles of every kind. Although this system was far from being irreproachable in all its parts, it was an immense progress at the time of its appearance; and we have had nothing since then which can be compared with it, for breadth and penetration. . . . It was . . . the need of restoring order in the finances which gave rise to the attempts at amelioration made by Colbert. This illustrious minister soon comprehended that the surest way to increase public fortune was to favor private fortune, and to open to production the broadest and freest ways. . . . One of the first acts of his ministry, the reëstablishment of the taxes on a uniform basis, is an homage rendered to true principles; and one cannot doubt that all the others would have been in conformity with this glorious precedent, if the science of wealth had been, at that time, as advanced as it is to-day. Colbert would certainly have carried out in France what Mr. Huskisson had begun in England at the time of his sudden death. . . . The edict of September, 1664, reduced the import and export duties on merchandise to suitable limits, and suppressed the most onerous. 'It is our intention,' said the king, 'to make known to all our governors and intendants in what consideration we hold at present everything that may concern commerce. . . . As the most solid and most essential means for the reëstablishment of commerce are the diminution and the regulation of the duties which are levied on all commodities, we have arranged to reduce all these duties to one single import and one export duty, and also to diminish these considerably, in order to encourage navigation, reëstablish the ancient manufactures, banish idleness.'. . . At the same time Colbert prohibited the seizure for the tailles (villein-tax) [see TAILLE AND GABELLE] of beds, clothes, bread, horses and cattle serving for labor; or the tools by which artisans and manual laborers gained their livelihood. The register of the survey of lands was revised, so that property should be taxed only in proportion to its value and the actual extent of the land. The great highways of the kingdom and all the rivers were then guarded by armies of receivers of tolls, who stopped merchandise on its passage and burdened its transportation with a multitude of abusive charges, to say nothing of the delays and exactions of every kind. An edict was issued ordering the investigation of these degrading charges; and most of them were abolished or reduced to just limits. . . . The lease of Customs duties being about to expire, Colbert improved this occasion to revise the tariff; and although this fatal measure has since been considered as the finest monument of his administration, we think we should present it in its true aspect, which seems to us to have been invariably misapprehended. Colbert's aim in revising the customs was to make them a means of protection for national manufactures, in the place of a simple financial resource, as they formerly were. Most articles of foreign manufacture had duties imposed upon them, so as to secure to similar French merchandise the home market. At the same time, Colbert spared neither sacrifices nor encouragement to give activity to the manufacturing spirit in our country. He caused the most skilful workmen of every kind to come from abroad; and he subjected manufactures to a severe discipline, that they should not lose their vigilance, relying on the tariffs. Heavy fines were inflicted on the manufacturers of an article recognized as inferior in quality to what it should be. For the first offence, the products of the delinquents were attached to a stake, with a carcan and the name of the manufacturer; in case of a second offence, the manufacturer himself was fastened to it. These draconian rigors would have led to results entirely contrary to those Colbert expected, if his enlightened solicitude had not tempered by other measures what was cruel in them. Thus, he appointed inspectors of the manufactures, who often directed the

workmen into the best way, and brought them information of the newest processes, purchased from foreign manufacturers, or secretly obtained at great expense. Colbert was far from attaching to the customs the idea of exclusive and blind protection that has ever been attributed to them since his ministry. He knew very well that these tariffs would engender reprisals, and that, while encouraging manufactures, they would seriously hinder commerce. Moreover, all his efforts tended to weaken their evil effects. His instructions to consuls and ambassadors testify strongly to his prepossessions in this regard. . . . The more one studies the administrative acts of this great minister, the more one is convinced of his lofty sense of justice, and of the liberal tendencies of his system, which has hitherto been generally extolled as hostile to the principle of commercial liberty. In vain the Italians have hailed it by the name of 'Colbertism,' to designate the exclusive system invented by themselves and honored by the Spanish: Colbert never approved the sacrifice of the greater part of his fellow citizens to a few privileged ones, nor the creation of endless monopolies for the profit of certain branches of industry. We may reproach him with having been excessively inclined to make regulations, but not with having enfeoffed France to a few spinners of wool and cotton. He had himself summed up in a few words his system in the memorial he presented to the king: 'To reduce export duties on provisions and manufactures of the kingdom; to diminish import duties on everything which is of use in manufactures; and to repel the products of foreign manufactures, by raising the duties.' Such was the spirit of his first tariff, published in September, 1664. He had especially aimed at facilitating the supply of raw materials in France, and promoting the interests of her home trade by the abolition of provincial barriers, and by the establishment of lines of customs-houses at the extreme frontiers. . . . The only reproach that can be justly made against him is the abuse of the protective instrument he had just created, by increasing in the tariff of 1667 the exclusive measures directed against foreign manufactures in that of 1664. It was no longer then a question of manufactures, but of war, namely, with Holland; and this war broke out in 1672. . . . From the same epoch date the first wars of commercial reprisals between France and England, hostilities which were to cost both nations so much blood and so many tears. Manufactures were then seen to prosper and agriculture to languish in France under the influence of this system."—J. A. Blanqui, *Hist. of Pol. Economy in Europe, ch.* 26.

Also in: H. Martin, *Hist. of France: The Age of Louis XIV., v.* 1, *ch.* 2.—J. B. Perkins, *France under the Regency, ch.* 4.—See, also, France: A. D. 1661-1683.

(Pennsylvania): A. D. 1785.—Beginning of "Protection" in Pennsylvania.—"Before the Revolution Pennsylvania had always been slow to impose burdens on trade. While Massachusetts, New York and South Carolina were raising considerable sums from imposts, Pennsylvania commerce was free from restrictions. In 1780, however, the need of revenue overcame the predilection of the Quakers for free trade and they decided 'that considerable sums can be raised by a small impost on goods and merchandise imported into this state without burdening commerce.' Accordingly, low duties were laid on wines, liquors, molasses, sugar, cocoa and tea, with 1 per cent. on all other imports. In 1782 the duties were doubled and the revenue was appropriated to the defence of commerce on the Delaware river and bay. This was done at the request of the merchants who wished to have their interests protected and 'signified their willingness to submit to a further impost on the importation of goods for that purpose.' When peace came, however, the merchants at once represented it as detrimental to the interests of the state to continue the duties, and they were repealed. In 1784 low duties were again imposed, and later in the same year increased. Early in 1785 more careful provisions were made for their collection. September 20, came the important act 'to encourage and protect the manufactures of this state by laying additional duties on certain manufactures which interfere with them.' . . . More than forty of the articles which Pennsylvania had begun to make were taxed at high specific rates. Coaches and carriages, paid £10 to £20; clocks, 30s.; scythes, 15s. per dozen; beer, ale and porter, 6d. per gallon; soap or candles, 1d. per pound; shoes and boots, 1s. to 6s. per pair; cordage and ropes, 8s. 4d. per hundred weight; and so on. The ten per cent. schedule included manufactures of iron and steel, hats, clothing, books and papers, whips, canes, musical instruments and jewelry. . . . The Pennsylvania act is of importance because it shows the nature of commodities which the country was then producing, as well as because it formed the basis of the tariff of 1789."—W. Hill, *First Stages of the Tariff Policy of the United States, pp.* 53-54.—The preamble of the Pennsylvania act of 1785 set forth its reasons as follows: "Whereas, divers useful and beneficial arts and manufactures have been gradually introduced into Pennsylvania, and the same have at length risen to a very considerable extent and perfection, insomuch that in the late war between the United States of America and Great Britain, when the importation of European goods was much interrupted, and often very difficult and uncertain, the artizans and mechanics of this state were able to supply in the hours of need, not only large quantities of weapons and other implements, but also ammunition and clothing, without which the war could not have been carried on, whereby their oppressed country was greatly assisted and relieved. And whereas, although the fabrics and manufactures of Europe, and other foreign parts, imported into this country in times of peace, may be afforded at cheaper rates than they can be made here, yet good policy and a regard to the wellbeing of divers useful and industrious citizens, who are employed in the making of like goods, in this state, demand of us that moderate duties be laid on certain fabrics and manufactures imported, which do most interfere with, and which (if no relief be given) will undermine and destroy the useful manufactures of the like kind in this country, for this purpose. Be it enacted" &c.—*Pennsylvania Laws*, 1785.—The duties enacted, which were additional to the then existing impost of 2½ per cent., were generally specific, but ad valorem on some commodities as on British steel, 10 per cent.; earthen ware, the same; glass and glass-ware, 2½ per cent.; linens the same. Looked

at in the light of recent American tariffs, they would hardly be recognized as "protective" in their character; but the protective purpose was plainly enough declared.

(United States): A. D. 1789-1791.— The first tariff enactment.—Hamilton's Report on Manufactures. — The "American System" proposed.—"The immediate necessity of raising some ready money led to the passage of a tariff bill at the first session of Congress. It was prepared and carried through the House chiefly by Madison; and its contents, no less than the general tone of the debate in which it was discussed, showed a decided leaning towards the protective system. But this legislation was temporary, and was at the time known to be so. The permanent system of the country was left for subsequent and more leisurely development. When at last Congress felt able to give the subject due attention, it applied as usual to Hamilton to furnish information and opinions. A topic so important and so congenial to his tastes called forth his best exertions. A series of extensive investigations conducted by every feasible kind of inquiry and research, both in foreign parts and in the United States, furnished the material for his reflections. He took abundant time to digest as well as to collect the great mass of information thus acquired, and it was not until nearly two years had elapsed since the order for the report was passed that he sent in the document to the House of Representatives. . . . The inferences and arguments constituted as able a presentation of the protectionist theory as has ever been made. . . . It is, however, an incorrect construction of that report to regard it as a vindication of the general or abstract doctrine of protection. Hamilton was very far from assuming any such position; protection always and everywhere was not his theory; protection was not his ideal principle of commercial regulation. . . . So far from entertaining any predilection for protection in the abstract, it would seem that in a perfect commercial world he would have expected to find free trade the prevalent custom. . . . If free trade were the rule of the whole commercial world, Hamilton was not prepared to say that the United States would find it for her interest to be singular. But such were not the premises from which he had to draw a conclusion. . . . The report of Hamilton determined the policy of the country. For good or for evil protection was resorted to, with the avowed purpose of encouraging domestic manufacturing as well as of raising a revenue. . . . The principles upon which Hamilton based his tariff were not quite those of pure protection, but constituted what was known as the 'American System'; a system which has been believed in by former generations with a warmth of conviction not easy to withstand."—J. T. Morse, Jr., *Life of Alex. Hamilton, ch.* 11.— Hamilton's celebrated report opens with an elaborate argument to prove the desirability of manufacturing industries in the country, and then proceeds: "A full view having now been taken of the inducements to the promotion of manufactures in the United States, accompanied with an examination of the principal objections which are commonly urged in opposition, it is proper, in the next place, to consider the means by which it may be effected, as introductory to a specification of the objects which in the present state of things appear the most fit to be encouraged, and of the particular measures which it may be advisable to adopt in respect to each. In order to a better judgment of the means proper to be resorted to by the United States, it will be of use to advert to those which have been employed with success in other countries. The principle of these are:—I. Protecting duties, or duties on those foreign articles which are the rivals of the domestic ones intended to be encouraged. Duties of this nature evidently amount to a virtual bounty on the domestic fabrics, since by enhancing the charges on foreign articles they enable the national manufacturers to undersell all their foreign competitors. The propriety of this species of encouragement need not be dwelt upon, as it is not only a clear result from the numerous topics which have been suggested, but is sanctioned by the laws of the United States in a variety of instances; it has the additional recommendation of being a resource of revenue. Indeed, all the duties imposed on imported articles, though with an exclusive view to revenue, have the effect in contemplation; and, except where they fall on raw materials, wear a beneficent aspect towards the manufacturers of the country. II. Prohibitions of rival articles, or duties equivalent to prohibitions. This is another and an efficacious mean of encouraging manufactures; but in general it is only fit to be employed when a manufacture has made such a progress, and is in so many hands, as to insure a due competition and an adequate supply on reasonable terms. Of duties equivalent to prohibitions there are examples in the laws of the United States; and there are other cases to which the principle may be advantageously extended, but they are not numerous. Considering a monopoly of the domestic market to its own manufacturers as the reigning policy of manufacturing nations, a similar policy on the part of the United States, in every proper instance, is dictated, it might almost be said, by the principles of distributive justice; certainly by the duty of endeavoring to secure to their own citizens a reciprocity of advantages. III. Prohibitions of the exportation of materials of manufactures. The desire of securing a cheap and plentiful supply for the national workmen; and, where the article is either peculiar to the country, or of peculiar quality there, the jealousy of enabling foreign workmen to rival those of the nation with its own materials, are the leading motives to this species of regulation. It ought not to be affirmed that it is in no instance proper, but it is certainly one which ought to be adopted with great circumspection and only in very plain cases. IV. Pecuniary bounties. This has been found one of the most efficacious means of encouraging manufactures, and it is, in some views, the best, though it has not yet been practiced upon the government of the United States,— unless the allowance on the exportation of dried and pickled fish and salted meat could be considered as a bounty — and though it is less favored by public opinion than some other modes. Its advantages are these:—1. It is a species of encouragement more positive and direct than any other, and for that very reason has a more immediate tendency to stimulate and uphold new enterprises, increasing the chances of profit, and diminishing the risks of loss in the first attempts. 2. It avoids the inconvenience of a temporary augmentation

of price, which is incident to some other modes, or it produces it to a less degree, either by making no addition to the charges on the rival foreign article, as in the case of protecting duties, or by making a smaller addition. The first happens when the fund for the bounty is derived from a different object (which may or may not increase the price of some other article according to the nature of that object); the second when the fund is derived from the same or a similar object of foreign manufacture. One per cent. duty on the foreign article, converted into a bounty on the domestic, will have an equal effect with a duty of 2% exclusive of such bounty; and the price of the foreign commodity is liable to be raised in the one case in the proportion of 1%, in the other in that of 2%. Indeed, the bounty when drawn from another source, is calculated to promote a reduction of price, because, without laying any new charge on the foreign article, it serves to introduce a competition with it, and to increase the total quantity of the article in the market. 3. Bounties have not, like high protecting duties, a tendency to produce scarcity. An increase of price is not always the immediate, though where the progress of a domestic manufacture does not counteract a rise, it is commonly the ultimate effect of an additional duty. In the interval between the laying of the duty and a proportional increase of price, it may discourage importation by interfering with the profits to be expected from the sale of the article. 4. Bounties are sometimes not only the best, but the only proper expedient for uniting the encouragement of a new object of agriculture with that of a new object of manufacture. It is the interest of the farmer to have the production of the raw material promoted by counteracting the interference of the foreign material of the same kind. It is the interest of the manufacturer to have the material abundant and cheap. If prior to the domestic production of the material in sufficient quantity to supply the manufacturer on good terms, a duty be laid upon the importation of it from abroad, with a view to promote the raising of it at home, the interest both of the farmer and manufacturer will be disserved. By either destroying the requisite supply, or raising the price of the article beyond what can be afforded to be given for it by the conductor of an infant manufacture, it is abandoned or fails; and there being no domestic manufactories to create a demand for the raw material which is raised by the farmer, it is in vain that the competition of the like foreign article may have been destroyed. It cannot escape notice that a duty upon the importation of an article can no otherwise aid the domestic production of it than by giving the latter greater advantages in the home market. It can have no influence upon the advantageous sale of the article produced in foreign markets, no tendency, therefore, to promote its exportation. The true way to conciliate these two interests is to lay a duty on foreign manufactures of the material, the growth of which is desired to be encouraged, and to apply the produce of that duty by way of bounty either upon the production of the material itself, or upon its manufacture at home, or upon both. In this disposition of the thing the manufacturer commences his enterprise under every advantage which is attainable as to quantity or price of the raw material. And the farmer, if the bounty be immediately to him, is enabled by it to enter into a successful competition with the foreign material. . . . There is a degree of prejudice against bounties, from an appearance of giving away the public money without an immediate consideration, and from a supposition that they serve to enrich particular classes at the expense of the community. But neither of these sources of dislike will bear a serious examination. There is no purpose to which public money can be more beneficially applied than to the acquisition of a new and useful branch of industry, no consideration more valuable than a permanent addition to the general stock of productive labor. As to the second source of objection, it equally lies against other modes of encouragement, which are admitted to be eligible. As often as a duty upon a foreign article makes an addition to its price, it causes an extra expense to the community for the benefit of the domestic manufacturer. A bounty does no more. But it is the interest of the society in each case to submit to a temporary expense, which is more than compensated by an increase of industry and wealth, by an augmentation of resources and independence, and by the circumstance of eventual cheapness, which has been noticed in another place. It would deserve attention, however, in the employment of this species of encouragement in the United States, as a reason for moderating the degree of it in the instances in which it might be deemed eligible, that the great distance of this country from Europe imposes very heavy charges on all the fabrics which are brought from thence, amounting from 15% to 30% on their value according to their bulk. . . . V. Premiums. These are of a nature allied to bounties, though distinguishable from them in some important features. Bounties are applicable to the whole quantity of an article produced or manufactured or exported, and involve a correspondent expense. Premiums serve to reward some particular excellence or superiority, some extraordinary exertion or skill, and are dispensed only in a small number of cases. But their effect is to stimulate general effort. . . . VI. The exemption of the materials of manufactures from duty. The policy of that exemption, as a general rule, particularly in reference to new establishments, is obvious. . . . VII. Drawbacks of the duties which are imposed on the materials of manufactures. It has already been observed as a general rule, that duties on those materials ought, with certain exceptions, to be forborne. Of these exceptions, three cases occur which may serve as examples. One where the material is itself an object of general or extensive consumption, and a fit and productive source of revenue. Another where a manufacture of a simpler kind, the competition of which with a like domestic article is desired to be restrained, partakes of the nature of a raw material from being capable by a further process to be converted into a manufacture of a different kind, the introduction or growth of which is desired to be encouraged. A third where the material itself is the production of the country, and in sufficient abundance to furnish a cheap and plentiful supply to the national manufacturers. . . . Where duties on the materials of manufactures are not laid for the purpose of preventing a competition with some domestic production, the same reasons which recommend, as a general rule, the exemption of those materials from

duties, would recommend, as a like general rule, the allowance of drawbacks in favor of the manufacturer. . . . VIII. The encouragement of new inventions and discoveries at home, and of the introduction into the United States of such as may have been made in other countries; particularly those which relate to machinery. This is among the most useful and unexceptionable of the aids which can be given to manufactures. The usual means of that encouragement are pecuniary rewards, and, for a time, exclusive privileges. . . . IX. Judicious regulations for the inspection of manufactured commodities. This is not among the least important of the means by which the prosperity of manufactures may be promoted. It is indeed in many cases one of the most essential. Contributing to prevent frauds upon consumers at home and exporters to foreign countries, to improve the quality and preserve the character of the national manufactures; it cannot fail to aid the expeditious and advantageous sale of them, and to serve as a guard against successful competition from other quarters. . . . X. The facilitating of pecuniary remittances from place to place—is a point of considerable moment to trade in general and to manufactures in particular, by rendering more easy the purchase of raw materials and provisions, and the payment for manufactured supplies. A general circulation of bank paper, which is to be expected from the institution lately established, will be a most valuable mean to this end. . . . XI. The facilitating of the transportation of commodities. Improvements favoring this object intimately concern all the domestic interests of a community; but they may, without impropriety, be mentioned as having an important relation to manufactures. . . . The foregoing are the principal of the means by which the growth of manufactures is ordinarily promoted. It is, however, not merely necessary that the measures of government which have a direct view to manufactures should be calculated to assist and protect them; but that those which only collaterally affect them, in the general course of the administration, should be guarded from any peculiar tendency to injure them. There are certain species of taxes which are apt to be oppressive to different parts of the community, and, among other ill effects, have a very unfriendly aspect towards manufactures. All poll or capitation taxes are of this nature. They either proceed according to a fixed rate, which operates unequally and injuriously to the industrious poor; or they vest a discretion in certain officers to make estimates and assessments, which are necessarily vague, conjectural, and liable to abuse. . . . All such taxes (including all taxes on occupations) which proceed according to the amount of capital supposed to be employed in a business, or of profits supposed to be made in it, are unavoidably hurtful to industry."—A. Hamilton, *Report on Manufactures* (*Works, v.* 3).

Also in: *State Papers and Speeches on the Tariff.*—R. W. Thompson, *Hist. of Protective Tariff Laws, ch.* 6-7.

(England): **A. D. 1815-1828.—The Corn Laws and Provision Laws.—The sliding-scale.**—During the Napoleonic wars in Europe there was a prolonged period of scarcity, approaching to famine, in Great Britain. There were scant harvests at home and supplies from abroad were cut off by the "Continental system" of Napoleon. "In 1801 wheat was 115 shillings and 11 pence per quarter; from 1801 to 1818 the price averaged 84s.; whilst in the 20 years ending 1874, it averaged only 52s. per quarter. . . . The cry of starvation was everywhere heard amongst the working classes, and tradesmen of all kinds suffered severely; whilst the only well-to-do people were the Farmers and the Landlords. As soon as the war was over, and our ports were opened for the reception of foreign grain, prices came down rapidly. Then the Landlords took alarm, and appealed to Parliament to resist the importation of foreign grain, which they asserted, would be the ruin of the English Farmers. They insisted that in this country, the costs of cultivation were extremely heavy, as compared with those of foreign producers of grain, and that therefore the British Farmer must receive protection in order to prevent his ruin. Hence a Parliament, composed mostly of Landlords, proceeded, in 1815, to enact the Corn Law, which excluded foreign wheat, except at high rates of duty, until the market price should reach 80s. per quarter; and other kinds of grain, until there was a proportionate elevation in prices. The discussions in Parliament on this question made a great impression, and led to a wide-spread sympathy, and to the belief that there was need of a measure, which, according to its advocates, would preserve our Agriculture from ruin, and be at the same time a provision against famine. But by many thoughtful and patriotic people this law was viewed with intense dislike, and was characterised as an atrocious fraud. The fact was, that . . . when rents ought either to have been lowered, or the methods of cultivation improved, the Corn Law was passed by the Landlords in order to keep out foreign corn and to maintain high rents; and many of the common people saw, or thought they saw, what would be the effect; for whilst the legislature was engaged in the discussion of the question, the people of London became riotous, and the walls were chalked with invectives such as 'Bread or Blood,' 'Guy Fawkes for ever,' etc. A loaf, steeped in blood, was placed on Carlton House, (now the Tory Club House.) The houses of some of the most unpopular of the promoters of the measure were attacked by the mob. At Lord Eldon's house the iron railings were torn up, whilst every pane of glass and many articles of furniture were broken and destroyed, and it was facetiously remarked that at last his lordship kept open house. The military were called out, and two persons were killed; the Houses of Parliament were guarded by soldiers, and, indeed, the whole of London appeared to be in possession of the Army. In various parts of the country similar disturbances prevailed. . . . Large popular meetings were held at Spa Fields, in London, public meetings were also held at Birmingham, and in many other parts of the kingdom. . . . In some of the towns and populous localities, the operatives having in view a large aggregate meeting to be held on St. Peter's field in Manchester, submitted themselves to marching discipline. . . . Regardless, however, of the public demonstrations of dislike to the Corn and Provision Laws, the Legislature persisted in upholding the most stringent provisions thereof until the year 1828, when the duties on the importation of

grain were adjusted by a sliding scale, in accordance with the average prices in the English market. The following abstract may serve to denote the provisions of the amended Law:—When the average price of wheat was 36 shillings the duty was 50 shillings 8 pence per qr.; when 46s. the duty was 40s. 8d. per qr.; when 56s. it was 30s. 8d. per qr.; when 62s. it was 24s. 8d. per qr.; when 72s. it was 2s. 8d. per qr.; and when 73s. it was 1s. per qr. It was soon found that as a means of protection to the British Farmer, the operation of the sliding scale of duties was scarcely less effective, by deterring imports of grain, than the previous law, which absolutely excluded wheat until it reached 80s. per quarter. The Act certainly provided that foreign grain might at any time be imported, and be held in bond till the duty was paid; a provision under which it was expected to be stored until the price should be high, and the duty low; but the expenses attendant upon warehousing and preserving it from injury by keeping, were usually looked upon as an undesirable or even dangerous investment of a merchant's capital. . . . Agricultural protection, as exhibited by the Corn Law, would, however, have been very incomplete without the addition of the Provision Laws. By these Laws the importation of Foreign Cattle and foreign meat were strictly prohibited. Butter and Lard were indeed allowed to be imported, but they were not to be used as food, and in order to provide against any infraction of the law, the officers at the Custom Houses were employed to 'spoil' these articles on their arrival, by smearing them with a tarred stick. They could then be used only as grease for wheels, or for the smearing of sheep. With bread purposely made dear, with the import of cattle and of flesh meat prohibited, and with lard and butter wilfully reduced from articles of food to grease for wheels, there is no difficulty in accounting for the frequent murmurs of discontent, and for the starvation among the poorer classes in every part of the Kingdom. Soup kitchens were opened almost every winter, and coals and clothing gratuitously distributed in many places; but such palliatives were regarded with derision by all who understood the true causes of the evil. Such help was scorned, and a cry for justice was raised; scarcity was said to be created by Act of Parliament, in order to be mitigated by philanthropy."—H. Ashworth, *Recollections of Richard Cobden, ch.* 1.

Also in D. Ricardo, *On Protection to Agriculture* (*Works, pp.* 459-498).—J. E. T. Rogers, *The Economic Interpretation of History, ch.* 17-18.

(United States): A. D. 1816-1824.— The beginning of the protective policy (the "American System").— "The return of peace at the beginning of 1815 brought the manufacturers face to face with a serious danger. War had been their harvest time. Favored by double duties and abnormal conditions their industry had attained a marvelous though not always safe development. . . . By limitation, the double duties were to expire one year after the conclusion of peace, and unless Congress intervened promptly and effectually their individual ruin was certain. . . . As new industries sprang up, petitions were promptly laid before Congress praying for new duties, for the permanence of the war duties, and for certain prohibitions. . . . In laying before Congress the treaty of peace, February, 1815, Madison called attention to the 'unparalleled maturity' attained by manufactures, and 'anxiously recommended this source of national independence and wealth to the prompt and constant guardianship of Congress.' . . . To Dallas, Secretary of the Treasury, the manufacturers had already turned. Six days after the treaty of peace was ratified, the House, February 23, 1815, called upon Dallas to report a general tariff bill at the next session of Congress. . . . In his annual report in December, 1815, Dallas had proposed the extension of the double duties until June 30, 1816, in order to give time for the elaboration of a new tariff bill; and after some discussion Congress agreed to this plan. February 13 he transmitted his reply to the resolutions of the previous February, closing with a carefully prepared schedule of new tariff rates. This, after being worked over in the Ways and Means Committee, was embodied in a bill and introduced into the House March 12, by Lowndes of South Carolina. Debate began March 20, and continued till April 8, when the bill was finally passed by a vote of 88 to 54. April 20 it passed the Senate with some amendments, and April 27 received the approval of Madison. . . . The features of Dallas' proposed tariff were the enlarging of the ad valorem list from three groups at 12½, 15, and 20 per cent to eight groups at 7½, 15, 20, 22, 28, 30, and 33½ per cent; the increase of specific duties by about 42 per cent; and, most important of all, in the article of coarse cottons, the insertion of a minimum, by which, as far as the custom-house was concerned, no quality was to be regarded as costing less than 25 cents per square yard. Except in the case of coarse cottons the new rates on articles which it was desired to protect fell slightly below the double rates of the war. Three positions were brought out in debate — two extremes, seeking the formulation of economic reasons for and against the policy of protection, and a middle party, composed mainly of men indifferent to manufacturing as such, but accepting the establishment of manufactures as one of the chief results of the war. . . . The two extremes, however, were far from taking the positions assumed later by extreme protectionism and extreme laissez-faire. . . . Only a few articles occasioned any discussion, and these were items like sugar, cottons, and woolens, which had been reduced in the Ways and Means Committee from the rates proposed by Dallas. Dallas had fixed the duty on cottons at 33½ per cent, which was reduced to 30 per cent in Lowndes' bill. Clay moved to restore the original rate. . . . Later Webster proposed a sliding scale on cottons, the rate to be 30 per cent for two years, then 25 per cent for two more, and then 20 per cent. Clay moved to amend by making the first period three years and the second one year. . . . Lowndes assented to the motion. . . . Dallas proposed 28 per cent on woolens. The committee reduced this to 25 per cent, and following the example set in the case of cottons, Lowndes moved that after two years the rate be fixed at 20 per cent. . . . After some debate the first period was made three years, and Lowndes' amendment agreed to. The tariff of 1816 was a substantial victory for the manufacturers. . . . But . . . in its working out the tariff of 1816 proved a bitter disappointment to the manufacturing in-

terest. The causes, however, were widely varied. . . . Yet it would be easy to exaggerate the distresses of the country. The years from 1816 to 1820 especially, were years of depression and hard times, but the steady growth of the country was hardly interrupted. In the main the tariff did not fail of its legitimate object. For the most part the new manufactures were conserved. . . . More and more there was a growing impatience with the tariff of 1816, and a tendency to lay the bad times upon its shoulders. . . . March 22, 1820, Baldwin of Pennsylvania, chairman of the newly created Committee on Manufactures, introduced a tariff bill embodying the general demand of the protected interests. . . . The bill passed the House by a vote of 90 to 69; it was defeated in the Senate by one vote."— O. L. Elliott, *The Tariff Controversy*, 1789–1833 (*Leland Stanford Junior University Monographs No.* 1), *pp.* 163–211.—"The revision of the Tariff, with a view to the protection of home industry, and to the establishment of what was then called, 'The American System,' was one of the large subjects before Congress at the session of 1823–24, and was the regular commencement of the heated debates on that question which afterwards ripened into a serious difficulty between the federal government and some of the southern States. . . . Revenue the object, protection the incident, had been the rule in the earlier tariffs: now that rule was sought to be reversed, and to make protection the object of the law, and revenue the incident. . . . Mr. Clay, the leader in the proposed revision, and the champion of the American System, expressly placed the proposed augmentation of duties on this ground. . . . Mr. Webster was the leading speaker on the other side, and disputed the universality of the distress which had been described; claiming exemption from it in New England; denied the assumed cause for it where it did exist, and attributed it to over expansion and collapse of the paper system, as in Great Britain, after the long suspension of the Bank of England; denied the necessity for increased protection to manufactures, and its inadequacy, if granted, to the relief of the country where distress prevailed. . . . The bill was carried in the House, after a protracted contest of ten weeks, by the lean majority of five — 107 to 102 — only two members absent, and the voting so zealous that several members were brought in upon their sick couches. In the Senate the bill encountered a strenuous resistance. . . . The bill . . . was carried by the small majority of four votes — 25 to 21. . . . An increased protection to the products of several States, as lead in Missouri and Illinois, hemp in Kentucky, iron in Pennsylvania, wool in Ohio and New York, commanded many votes for the bill; and the impending presidential election had its influence in its favor. Two of the candidates, Messrs. Adams and Clay, were avowedly for it; General Jackson, who voted for the bill, was for it, as tending to give a home supply of the articles necessary in time of war, and as raising revenue to pay the public debt."— T. H. Benton, *Thirty Years' View*, *v.* 1, *ch.* 13.

Also in A. B. Hart, *Formation of the Union*, *sects.* 122 *and* 132 (*ch.* 11–12).—A. Walker, *Science of Wealth*, *p.* 116.— F. W. Taussig, *Tariff Hist. of the U. S.*, *pp.* 68–76.— A. S. Bolles, *Financial Hist. of the U. S.*, 1789–1860, *bk.* 3, *ch.* 3.

(United States): A. D. 1828.—The "Bill of Abominations."— New England changes front.—"In 1828 came another tariff bill, so bad and so extreme in many respects that it was called the 'bill of abominations.' It originated in the agitation of the woollen manufacturers which had started the year before, and for this bill Mr. Webster spoke and voted. He changed his ground on this important question absolutely and entirely, and made no pretence of doing anything else. The speech which he made on this occasion is a celebrated one, but it is so solely on account of the startling change of position which it announced. . . . A few lines from the speech give the marrow of the whole matter. Mr. Webster said: 'New England, sir, has not been a leader in this policy. . . . The opinion of New England up to 1824 was founded in the conviction that, on the whole, it was wisest and best, both for herself and others, that manufactures should make haste slowly. . . . When, at the commencement of the late war, duties were doubled, we were told that we should find a mitigation of the weight of taxation in the new aid and succor which would be thus afforded to our own manufacturing labor. Like arguments were urged, and prevailed, but not by the aid of New England votes, when the tariff was afterwards arranged at the close of the war in 1816. Finally, after a winter's deliberation, the act of 1824 received the sanction of both Houses of Congress and settled the policy of the country. . . . What, then, was New England to do? Was she to hold out forever against the course of the government, and see herself losing on one side and yet make no effort to sustain herself on the other? No, sir. Nothing was left to New England but to conform herself to the will of others. Nothing was left to her but to consider that the government had fixed and determined its own policy, and that policy was protection.' . . . Opinion in New England changed for good and sufficient business reasons, and Mr. Webster changed with it. Free trade had commended itself to him as an abstract principle, and he had sustained and defended it as in the interest of commercial New England. But when the weight of interest in New England shifted from free trade to protection Mr. Webster followed it."— H. C. Lodge, *Daniel Webster*, *ch.* 6.— "There was force in Webster's assertion, in reply to Hayne, that New England, after protesting against the tariff as long as she could, had conformed to a policy forced upon the country by others, and had embarked her capital in manufacturing. October 23, 1826, the Boston woollen manufacturers petitioned Congress for more protection. . . . This appeal of the woollen manufacturers brought out new demands from other quarters. Especially the wool-growers came forward. . . . May 14, 1827, the Pennsylvania Society for the Promotion of Manufactures and the Mechanic Arts called a convention of wool growers and manufacturers. The convention met at Harrisburg, July 30, 1827. It was found necessary to enlarge the scope of the convention in order to make allies of interests which would otherwise become hostile. The convention went on the plan of favoring protection on everything which asked for it. The result was that iron, steel, glass, wool, woollens, hemp, and flax were recommended for protection. Louisiana was not represented, and so sugar was left

out. It was voted to discourage the importation of foreign spirits and the distillation of spirits from foreign products, by way of protection to Western whiskey. . . . When the 20th Congress met, the tariff was the absorbing question. Popular interest had become engaged in it, and parties were to form on it, but it perplexed the politicians greatly. . . . The act which resulted from the scramble of selfish special interests was an economic monstrosity. . . . May 19, 1828, the bill became a law. The duty on wool costing less than 10 cents per pound was 15 per cent., on other wool 20 per cent. and 30 per cent. That on woollens was 40 per cent. for a year, then 45 per cent., there being four minima, 50 cents, $1.00, $2.50, $4.00. All which cost over $4.00 were to be taxed 45 per cent. for a year, then 50 per cent. . . . The process of rolling iron had not yet been introduced into this country. It was argued that rolled iron was not as good as forged, and this was made the ground for raising the tax on rolled iron from $30.00 to $37.00 per ton, while the tax on forged iron was raised from $18.00 to $22.40. Rolled iron was cheaper and was available for a great number of uses. The tax, in this case, 'countervailed' an improvement in the arts, and robbed the American people of their share in the advantage of a new industrial achievement. The tax on steel was raised from $20.00 to $30.00 per ton; that on hemp from $35.00 to $45.00 per ton; that on molasses from 5 cents to 10 cents per gallon; that on flax from nothing to $35.00 per ton. The tax on sugar, salt, and glass remained unchanged, and that on tea also, save by a differential tonnage duty. Coffee was classified and the tax reduced. The tax on wine, by a separate act, was reduced one half or more. This was the 'tariff of abominations,' so called on account of the number of especially monstrous provisions which it contained."—W. G. Sumner, *Andrew Jackson as a Public Man, ch.* 9.—"The tariff of 1828 . . . was the work of politicians and manufacturers; and was commenced for the benefit of the woollen interest, and upon a bill chiefly designed to favor that branch of manufacturing industry. But, like all other bills of the kind, it required help from other interests to get itself along."—T. H. Benton, *Thirty Years' View, v.* 1, *ch.* 34.—J. Schouler, *Hist. of the U. S., ch.* 12, *sect.* 2 (*v.* 3).

(United States): A. D. 1832.—Clay's delusive act to diminish revenue.—President Jackson, in his message of December, 1831, "invited attention to the fact that the public debt would be extinguished before the expiration of his term, and that, therefore, 'a modification of the tariff, which shall produce a reduction of the revenue to the wants of the government,' was very advisable. He added that, in justice to the interests of the merchant as well as the manufacturer, the reduction should be prospective, and that the duties should be adjusted with a view 'to the counteraction of foreign policy, so far as it may be injurious to our national interests.' This meant a revenue tariff with incidental retaliation. He had thus arrived at a sensible plan to avoid the accumulation of a surplus. Clay took the matter in hand in the Senate, or rather in Congress. . . . He recognized the necessity of reducing the revenue, but he would reduce the revenue without reducing protective duties. The 'American System' should not suffer. It must, therefore, not be done in the manner proposed by Jackson. He insisted upon confining the reduction to duties on articles not coming into competition with American products. . . . Instead of abolishing protective duties he would rather reduce the revenue by making some of them prohibitory. . . . When objection was made that this would be a defiance of the South, of the President, and of the whole administration party, he replied, as Adams reports, that 'to preserve, maintain and strengthen the American System, he would defy the South, the President and the devil.' He introduced a resolution in the Senate, 'that the existing duties upon articles imported from foreign countries, and not coming into competition with similar articles made or produced within the United States, ought to be forthwith abolished, except the duties upon wines and silks, and that those ought to be reduced; and that the Committee on Finance be instructed to report a bill accordingly.'" After long debate Clay's "tariff resolution was adopted, and in June, 1832, a bill substantially in accord with it passed both houses, known as the tariff act of 1832. It reduced or abolished the duties on many of the unprotected articles, but left the protective system without material change. As a reduction of the revenue it effected very little. . . . The reduction proposed by Clay, according to his own estimate, was not over seven millions; the reduction really effected by the new tariff law scarcely exceeded three millions. Clay had saved the American System at the expense of the very object contemplated by the measure. It was extremely short-sighted statesmanship. The surplus was as threatening as ever, and the dissatisfaction in the South grew from day to day."—C. Schurz, *Life of Henry Clay, ch.* 13 (*v.* 1).

Also in H. Clay, *Life, Cor. and Speeches* (*Colton ed.*), *v.* 5, *pp.* 416–428.

(United States): A. D. 1833.—The Southern opposition to protection.—Nullification in S. Carolina.—The compromise tariff. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1828–1833.

(Germany): A. D. 1833.—The Zollverein.—"The German Customs Union (Deutsche Zollverein) is an association of states, having for its declared object to secure freedom of trade and commerce between the contracting states, and a common interest in the customs revenue. The terms of the union are expressed in the treaty between Prussia and the other states, dated 22d March, 1833, which may be regarded as the basis of the association. The states now [1844] forming the union are Prussia, Bavaria, Wurtemberg, Saxony, Hesse-Cassel, Hesse-Darmstadt, Baden, Nassau, the Thuringian states, Frankfort, Brunswick, Lippe-Schaumburg, and Luxemburg. The population of these, with the exception of the three last mentioned states, was, in 1839, 26,858,886. Including these three states, which have since joined the union, the present population cannot be less than twenty-seven millions and a half. The German powers which have not joined the union are Austria, with twelve millions of German subjects, and Hanover, Oldenburg, Holstein, the two Mecklenburgs, and the Hanse Towns, whose united population is about three millions more. The inhabitants of Germany are, therefore, divided

in the proportions of twenty-seven and a half within, to fifteen without, the sphere of the Zollverein. The treaty provides in the thirty-eighth article, for the admission of other German states, and the thirty-ninth article for the making of treaties with foreign states, but these latter are not admissible into the union. . . . The declared principle of the league — namely, the commercial and financial union of the German states — is not only one to which no foreign power has any right to object, but is excellent in itself; and is, in fact, the establishment of free trade among the associated states. . . . But it is not merely to its avowed principle that the league owes its successful accomplishment. There are other motives which have entered largely into the causes of its existence. In the first place, it has given practical effect to that vehement desire for national unity which so generally pervades the German mind. . . . Then, it so happened that this general desire for union fell in exactly with the policy of Prussia — a power which has not failed to seize so favourable an opportunity of extending her political influence, and occupying a position which, though of nominal equality, has in reality secured her predominance among the German states. To these inducements we regret to be obliged to add another — namely, the prevalent opinion in Germany that their manufacturing industry ought to be protected against foreign competition, and that the tariff of the Zollverein ought to be used as an instrument for the exclusion of foreign manufactures from the German market. . . . Although the Congress of Vienna had established a new Germanic confederation, (Deutsche Bund) and a federative diet charged with the maintenance of peace at home and abroad, yet it was soon perceived and felt that the kind of union obtained by means of this confederation was more formal than real. . . . The late King of Prussia was one of the first to perceive, that, in order to unite Germany in reality, something more cogent than the federative diet was indispensable. He found his own power rather weakened than strengthened by the addition of the Rhenish provinces, so long as they remained separated, not only by distance, but by the customs-barriers of intervening states, from his ancient territories. He accordingly effected, in 1829, a convention with those states, by which he became the farmer of their customs-revenues, and so removed the barriers between Eastern and Western Prussia. Some years, however, previous to this, the Prussian Government had deemed it expedient to comply with the demands of the manufacturers (especially those in the Rhenish provinces) for protection against foreign goods, which, since the peace, had begun to make their appearance; and on the 26th May, 1818, a new Prussian Tariff had been issued, which was designed to afford a moderate protection to the home industry, and which may be regarded as the groundwork of the present Tariff of the Zollverein. . . . But the proceedings of Prussia were considered in a hostile light by the manufacturers of the South. They formed a counteracting association in 1819 which numbered from five to six thousand members, had its headquarters in Nuremberg, and agents in all the principal towns, and published a weekly newspaper devoted to the cause. They addressed the Diet, the German courts, and the Congress at Vienna in 1820, in favor of a general customs-union. They so far succeeded that, in 1826, the small Thuringian States, occupying the central portion of Germany, with one or two others, formed themselves into a customs-union, under the name of the Mittel-Verein; and within the two succeeding years a more important union was accomplished, consisting of Bavaria and Wurtemberg, with their small enclosed states; the Tariff of which union is stated to have been as high, or very nearly so, as that of Prussia. Thus Germany contained three separate customs-associations, with separate Tariffs, and it became obviously desirable to unite these conflicting interests. Prussia made overtures to the other unions, but was for a long time unsuccessful; they objecting principally to the high scale of Prussian duties on colonial produce. At last, however, all obstacles were removed, (principally, as Dr. List states, through the exertions of Baron von Cotta, the eminent publisher, and proprietor of the Allgemeine Zeitung,) and on the 22d of March, 1833, the treaty was signed by which, for the first time, Germany was knit together in anything like a binding national confederation. Between that date and the present, the league has been enlarged by the accession of other states; but, as we have already mentioned, Hanover and some other northern states have hitherto refused to join it. Hanover formed a distinct union with three neighbouring states, viz.: Brunswick, Lippe-Schaumburg, and Oldenburg, which assumed the title of the North-western League; but the two former having subsequently seceded from it and joined the Zollverein, the North-western League has been reduced to Hanover and Oldenburg only. The Hanse towns, Mecklenburg, and Holstein, are not yet members of any customs-union. The revenues of the Zollverein are divided among the contracting states according to the population of each state respectively."—*Edinburgh Review, Jan.*, 1844 (*v.* 79, *p.* 108).

Also in G. Krause, *The Growth of German Unity, ch.* 10.—F. List. *National System of Political Economy, bk.* 4, *ch.* 4.

(England): A. D. 1836-1839.—Beginning of the Anti-Corn-Law agitation.—"Cobden was in no sense the original projector of an organized body for throwing off the burden of the corn duties. In 1836 an Anti-Corn-Law Association had been formed in London; its principal members were the parliamentary radicals, Grote, Molesworth, Joseph Hume, and Mr. Roebuck. But this group, notwithstanding their acuteness, their logical penetration, and the soundness of their ideas, were in that, as in so many other matters, stricken with impotence. Their gifts of reasoning were admirable, but they had no gifts for popular organization. . . . It was not until a body of men in Manchester were moved to take the matter in hand, that any serious attempt was made to inform and arouse the country. The price of wheat had risen to seventy-seven shillings in the August of 1838; there was every prospect of a wet harvesting; the revenue was declining; deficit was becoming a familiar word; pauperism was increasing; and the manufacturing population of Lancashire were finding it impossible to support themselves, because the landlords, and the legislation of a generation of landlords before them, insisted on keeping the first necessity of life at an artificially high rate.

. . . In October, 1838, a band of seven men met at a hotel in Manchester, and formed a new Anti-Corn Law Association. They were speedily joined by others, including Cobden, who from this moment began to take a prominent part in all counsel and action. That critical moment had arrived, which comes in the history of every successful movement, when a section arises within the party, which refuses from that day forward either to postpone or to compromise. The feeling among the older men was to stop short in their demands at some modification of the existing duty. . . . The more energetic members protested against these faltering voices. . . . The meeting was adjourned, to the great chagrin of the President, and when the members assembled a week later, Cobden drew from his pocket a draft petition which he and his allies had prepared in the interval, and which after a discussion of many hours was adopted by an almost unanimous vote. The preamble laid all the stress on the alleged facts of foreign competition, in words which never fail to be heard in times of bad trade. It recited how the existing laws prevented the British manufacturer from exchanging the produce of his labour for the corn of other countries, and so enabled his foreign rivals to purchase their food at one half of the price at which it was sold in the English market; and finally the prayer of the petition called for the repeal of all laws relating to the importation of foreign corn and other foreign articles of subsistence, and implored the House to carry out to the fullest extent, both as affects manufactures and agriculture, the true and peaceful principles of free-trade. In the following month, January, 1839, the Anti-Corn-Law Association showed that it was in earnest in the intention to agitate, by proceeding to raise a subscription of an effective sum of money. Cobden threw out one of those expressions which catch men's minds in moments when they are already ripe for action. 'Let us,' he said, 'invest part of our property, in order to save the rest from confiscation.' Within a month £6,000 had been raised, the first instalment of many scores of thousands still to come. A great banquet was given to some of the parliamentary supporters of Free Trade; more money was subscribed, convictions became clearer and purpose waxed more resolute. On the day after the banquet, at a meeting of delegates from other towns, Cobden brought forward a scheme for united action among the various associations throughout the country. This was the germ of what ultimately became the League."—J. Morley, *Life of Richard Cobden, ch.* 6 (*v.* 1).

Also in W. Robertson, *Life and Times of John Bright, ch.* 8 *and* 11-14.

(England): A. D. 1842.—Peel's modification of the Corn Laws.—His sliding-scale.—His Tariff reductions.—The first great step towards Free-Trade.—The Whig administration under Lord Melbourne gave way in August, in 1841, to one formed by Sir Robert Peel. On the opening of the session in February, 1842, "The Queen's Speech recommended Parliament to consider the state of the laws affecting the importation of corn and other commodities. It announced the beginning of a revolution which few persons in England thought possible, although it was to be completed in little more than ten years. On the 9th of February Peel moved that the House should resolve itself into a Committee to consider the Corn Laws. His speech, which lasted nearly three hours, was necessarily dull, and his proposal was equally offensive to the country gentlemen and to the Anti-Corn Law League. It amounted merely to an improvement of the sliding-scale which had been devised by the Duke of Wellington's Cabinet [See above: A. D. 1815–1828], and was based on the axiom that the British farmer, taking one year with another, could not make a profit by growing corn if foreign corn were admitted at a price of less than 70s. a quarter. By a calculation of prices extending over a long term of years, Peel had satisfied himself that a price of 56s. a quarter would remunerate the British farmer. He proposed to modify the sliding-scale accordingly. . . . Peel retained the minimum duty of 1s. when corn was selling at 73s. the quarter; he fixed a maximum duty of 20s. when corn was selling at from 50s. to 51s. the quarter, and he so altered the graduation in the increase of duty as to diminish the inducement to hold grain back when it became dear. . . . So general was the dissatisfaction with Peel's Corn Law that Russell ventured once more to place before the House his alternative of a fixed 8s. duty. He was defeated by a majority of upwards of 120 votes. Two days later Mr. Villiers made his annual motion for the total repeal of the Corn Laws, and was beaten by more than four votes to one. The murmurs of Peel's own supporters were easily overborne, and the Bill was carried through the House of Commons after a month spent in debates. As soon as it had passed, and the estimates for the army and navy had been voted, Peel produced what was really his Budget, nominally Mr. Goulburn's. . . . In every one of the last five years there had been a deficit. . . . Peel therefore resolved 'to impose an income tax." He also raised the duty on Irish spirits and on exports of coal, besides making some changes in the stamp duties. "With these and with the income tax he calculated that he would have a surplus of £1,900,000. Peel was thus able to propose a reduction of the tariff upon uniform and comprehensive principles. He proposed to limit import duties to a maximum of 5 per cent. upon the value of raw materials, of 12 per cent. upon the value of goods partly manufactured, and of 20 per cent. upon the value of goods wholly manufactured. Out of the 1,200 articles then comprised in the tariff, 750 were more or less affected by the application of these rules, yet so trivial was the revenue raised from most of them that the total loss was computed at only £270,000 a year. Peel reduced the duty on coffee; he reduced the duty on foreign and almost entirely abolished the duty on Canadian timber. Cattle and pigs, meat of all descriptions, cheese and butter, which had hitherto been subject to a prohibitory duty, he proposed to admit at a comparatively low rate. He also diminished the duty upon stage coaches. So extensive a change in our system of national finance had never before been effected at one stroke. . . . Immense was the excitement caused by the statement of the Budget. . . . Every part of Peel's scheme was debated with the utmost energy. . . . He procured the ratification of all his measures subject to some slight amendments, and at the cost of a whole session spent

in discussing them. Little or nothing else was accomplished by Parliament in this year. Peel had returned to power as the Champion of protection. His first great achievement was the extension of the freedom of trade."—F. G. Montague, *Life of Sir Robert Peel, ch.* 8.—"Notwithstanding the objections which free traders might raise, the Budget of 1842 proved the first great advance in the direction of free trade. It did not remove the shackles under which trade was struggling, but it relaxed the fastenings and lightened the load."—S. Walpole, *Hist. of Eng. from* 1815, *ch.* 18 (*v.* 4).

Also in: S. Walpole, *Life of Sir Robert Peel, v.* 3, *ch.* 5.—J. Morley, *Life of Richard Cobden, v.* 1, *ch.* 11.

(United States): A. D. 1842.—An Act to provide a necessary increase of revenue, with incidental protection.—"There had been a lull in tariff legislation for ten years. The free-trade party had been ascendant; and amendment of the law, save in the slight ways mentioned, had been impossible. During the decade, a financial tornado had swept over the country; the United-States bank had ceased to be; the experiment of keeping the government deposits with the State banks had been tried, and had failed; the government had kept them several years without authority, but finally a bill had been passed which authorized keeping them in that manner. The time had now nearly come for reducing the duties [by the gradual scaling down provided for in the Compromise tariff act of 1833] to their lowest point. Manufactures were drying up at the root. A material augmentation of the national revenue from some source had become necessary. . . . Whatever difference of opinion existed respecting the necessity of additional protection to manufacturers, some expedient, it was universally conceded, must be adopted to increase the public revenue. As no one favored direct taxation, a revision of the tariff was the only mode of enriching the treasury. . . . The committee on manufactures did not report to the House until the last of March, 1842. . . . The leading provisions of the bill reported by the committee were the following: 1. A general ad valorem duty of 30 per cent, with few exceptions, where the duty was on that principle. 2. A discrimination was made for the security of certain interests requiring it by specific duties, in some instances below, in others above, the rate of the general ad valorem duty. 3. As a general principle, the duty on the articles subject to discrimination was made at the rate at which it was in 1840, after the deduction of four-tenths of the excess on 20 per cent by the Act of 1833. . . . The subject was discussed at great length by the House, although the time was drawing near for making the last reduction under the compromise law of [1833]. Something must be done. Accordingly, Fillmore, chairman of the committee of ways and means, reported a bill to extend the existing tariff laws until the 1st day of August, 1842, which was immediately passed by the House; but the Senate amended the bill by adding a proviso that nothing therein contained should suspend the operation of the Distribution law,—a law passed at the extra session of the preceding year, distributing the proceeds of the sales of the public lands among the States. . . . In the debate on this bill the proviso became a prominent topic of discussion. The distribution Act contained a proviso, that, if at any time the duties under the compromise tariff should be raised, the distribution should cease, and be suspended until the cause of the suspension were removed. . . . Those who were in favor of high protective duties desired the removal of the proviso of the distribution Act in order that the tariff might be raised without interfering with distribution. The House having rejected an amendment proposing to strike out the proviso which prohibited the suspension of the distribution law, the bill was passed by the House, and afterward by the Senate, but vetoed by the President. Another tariff bill was introduced by Mr. Fillmore, drawn by the Secretary of the Treasury,—to which, however, the committee added a proviso that the . . . proceeds of the public lands should be distributed, notwithstanding the increase of duties,—which passed both Houses after a short debate. This contained a revision of a considerable number of duties, and was also vetoed by the President. Impelled by the necessity of providing additional revenue, a bill was rapidly pushed through Congress, similar to that previously passed, with the omission of the proviso requiring distribution, and further modified by admitting free of duty tea and coffee growing east of the Cape of Good Hope, imported in American vessels. This bill was approved by the President. A separate bill was then passed, repealing the proviso of the distribution Act, and allowing the distribution to take place, notwithstanding the increase of duties; but the bill was retained by the President and defeated. Thus ended a long and bitter controversy, in which public sentiment expanded, and hardened against the chief Executive of the nation. . . . That tariff remained without change during the next four years."—A. S. Bolles, *Financial Hist. of the U. S.*, 1789–1860, *bk.* 3, *ch.* 6.

(England): A. D. 1845-1846.—The Repeal of the Corn Laws.—Dissolution of the League.—"The Anti-Corn-Law agitation was one of those movements which, being founded on right principles, and in harmony with the interest of the masses, was sure to gather fresh strength by any event affecting the supply of food. It was popular to attempt to reverse a policy which aimed almost exclusively to benefit one class of society. . . . The economic theorists had the mass of the people with them. Their gatherings were becoming more and more enthusiastic. And even amidst Conservative landowners there were not a few enlightened and liberal minds who had already, silently at least, espoused the new ideas. No change certainly could be expected to be made so long as bread was cheap and labour abundant. But when a deficient harvest and a blight in the potato crop crippled the resources of the people and raised grain to famine prices, the voice of the League acquired greater power and influence. Hitherto they had received hundreds of pounds. Now, thousands were sent in to support the agitation. A quarter of a million was readily contributed. Nor were the contributors Lancashire mill-owners exclusively. Among them were merchants and bankers, men of heart and men of mind, the poor labourer and the peer of the realm. The fervid oratory of Bright, the demonstrative and argumentative reasoning of Cobden, the more popular appeals of Fox, Rawlins, and other platform speakers, filled the newspaper press, and were eagerly read. And when

Parliament dissolved in August 1845, even Sir Robert Peel showed some slight symptoms of a conviction that the days of the corn laws were numbered. Every day, in truth, brought home to his mind a stronger need for action, and as the ravages of the potato disease progressed, he saw that all further resistance would be absolutely dangerous. A cabinet council was held on October 31 of that year to consult as to what was to be done, and at an adjourned meeting on November 5 Sir Robert Peel intimated his intention to issue an order in council remitting the duty on grain in bond to one shilling, and opening the ports for the admission of all species of grain at a smaller rate of duty until a day to be named in the order; to call Parliament together on the 27th inst., in order to ask for an indemnity, and a sanction of the order by law; and to submit to Parliament immediately after the recess a modification of the existing law, including the admission at a nominal duty of Indian corn and of British colonial corn. A serious difference of opinion, however, was found to exist in the cabinet on the question brought before them, the only ministers supporting such measures being the Earl of Aberdeen, Sir James Graham, and Mr. Sidney Herbert. Nor was it easy to induce the other members to listen to reason. And though at a subsequent meeting, held on November 28, Sir Robert Peel so far secured a majority in his favour, it was evident that the cabinet was too divided to justify him in bringing forward his measures, and he decided upon resigning office. His resolution to that effect having been communicated to the Queen, her Majesty summoned Lord John Russell to form a cabinet, and, to smooth his path, Sir Robert Peel, with characteristic frankness, sent a memorandum to her Majesty embodying a promise to give him his support. But Lord John Russell failed in his efforts, and the Queen had no alternative but to recall Sir Robert Peel, and give him full power to carry out his measures. It was under such circumstances that Parliament was called for January 22, 1846, and on January 27 the Government plan was propounded before a crowded House. It was not an immediate repeal of the corn laws that Sir Robert Peel recommended. He proposed a temporary protection for three years, till February 1, 1849, imposing a scale during that time ranging from 4s. when the price of wheat should be 50s. per quarter and upward, and 10s. when the price should be under 48s. per quarter, providing, however, that after that period all grain should be admitted at the uniform duty of 1s. per quarter. The measure, as might have been expected, was received in a very different manner by the political parties in both Houses of Parliament. There was treason in the Conservative camp, it was said, and keen and bitter was the opposition offered to the chief of the party. For twelve nights speaker after speaker indulged in personal recriminations. They recalled to Sir Robert Peel's memory the speeches he had made in defence of the corn laws. And as to his assertion that he had changed his mind, they denied his right to do so. . . . The passing of the measure was, however, more than certain, and after a debate of twelve nights' duration on Mr. Miles's amendment, the Government obtained a majority of 97, 337 having voted for the motion and 240 against it. And from that evening the corn law may be said to have expired. Not a day too soon, certainly, when we consider the straitened resources of the country as regards the first article of food, caused not only by the bad crop of grain, but by the serious loss of the potato crop, especially in Ireland."—L. Levi, *Hist. of British Commerce, pt.* 4, *ch.* 4.—"On the 2nd of July the League was 'conditionally dissolved,' by the unanimous vote of a great meeting of the leaders at Manchester. . . . Mr. Cobden here joyfully closed his seven years' task, which he had prosecuted at the expense of health, fortune, domestic comfort, and the sacrifice of his own tastes in every way. . . . Mr. Cobden had sacrificed at least £20,000 in the cause. The country now, at the call of the other chief Leaguers, presented him with above £80,000 — not only for the purpose of acknowledging his sacrifices, but also to set him free for life for the political service of his country."—H. Martineau, *Hist. of the Thirty Years' Peace, bk.* 6, *ch.* 15 (*v.* 4).

Also in: W. C. Taylor, *Life and Times of Sir Robert Peel, v.* 3, *ch.* 8-10.—J. Morley, *Life of Richard Cobden, v.* 1, *ch.* 15-16.—M. M. Trumbull, *The Free Trade Struggle in England.*—A. Bisset, *Notes on the Anti-Corn Law Struggle.*—*Debate upon the Corn Laws in Session* 1846.

(United States): A. D. 1846-1861.—Lowered duties and the disputed effects.—"In 1846 was passed what we will call the 'Walker tariff,' from Robert J. Walker, then Secretary of the Treasury. It reduced the duties on imports down to about the standard of the 'Compromise' of 1833. It discriminated, however, as the Compromise did not, between goods that could be produced at home and those that could not. It approached, in short, more nearly than any other, in its principles and details, to the Hamilton tariff, although the general rate of duties was higher. From that time up to 1857 there was a regular and large increase in the amount of dutiable goods imported, bringing in a larger revenue to the government. The surplus in the treasury accumulated, and large sums were expended by the government in buying up its own bonds at a high premium, for the sake of emptying the treasury. Under these circumstances the 'tariff of 1857' was passed, decidedly lowering the rates of duties and largely increasing the free list. The financial crisis of that year diminished the imports, and the revenue fell off $22,000,000. It rallied, however, the next two years, but owing to the large increase of the free list, not quite up to the old point."—A. L. Perry, *Elements of Pol. Economy, p.* 464.—"The free-traders consider the tariff of 1846 to be a conclusive proof of the beneficial effect of low duties. They challenge a comparison of the years of its operation, between 1846 and 1857, with any other equal period in the history of the country. Manufacturing, they say, was not forced by a hot-house process to produce high-priced goods for popular consumption, but was gradually encouraged and developed on a healthful and self-sustaining basis, not to be shaken as a reed in the wind by every change in the financial world. Commerce, as they point out, made great advances, and our carrying trade grew so rapidly that in ten years from the day the tariff of 1846 was passed our tonnage exceeded the tonnage of England. The free-traders refer with especial emphasis to what they term the symmetrical development of all the great interests of the country under this

liberal tariff. Manufactures were not stimulated at the expense of the commercial interest. Both were developed in harmony, while agriculture, the indispensable basis of all, was never more flourishing. The farmers and planters at no other period of our history were in receipt of such good prices, steadily paid to them in gold coin, for their surplus product, which they could send to the domestic market over our own railways and to the foreign market in our own ships. Assertions as to the progress of manufactures in the period under discussion are denied by the protectionists. While admitting the general correctness of the free-trader's statements as to the prosperous condition of the country, they call attention to the fact that directly after the enactment of the tariff of 1846 the great famine occurred in Ireland, followed in the ensuing years by short crops in Europe. The prosperity which came to the American agriculturist was therefore from causes beyond the sea and not at home,— causes which were transient, indeed almost accidental. Moreover an exceptional condition of affairs existed in the United States in consequence of our large acquisition of territory from Mexico at the close of the war and the subsequent and almost immediate discovery of gold in California. A new and extended field of trade was thus opened in which we had the monopoly, and an enormous surplus of money was speedily created from the products of the rich mines on the Pacific coast. At the same time Europe was in convulsion from the revolutions of 1848, and production was materially hindered over a large part of the Continent. This disturbance had scarcely subsided when three leading nations of Europe, England, France, and Russia, engaged in the wasteful and expensive war of the Crimea. The struggle began in 1853 and ended in 1856, and during those years it increased consumption and decreased production abroad, and totally closed the grain-fields of Russia from any competition with the United States. The protectionists therefore hold that the boasted prosperity of the country under the tariff of 1846 was abnormal in origin and in character. . . . The protectionists maintain that from 1846 to 1857 the United States would have enjoyed prosperity under any form of tariff, but that the moment the exceptional conditions in Europe and in America came to an end, the country was plunged headlong into a disaster [the financial crisis of 1857] from which the conservative force of a protective tariff would in large part have saved it. . . . The free-traders, as an answer to this arraignment of their tariff policy, seek to charge responsibility for the financial disasters to the hasty and inconsiderate changes made in the tariff in 1857, for which both parties were in large degree if not indeed equally answerable." —J. G. Blaine, *Twenty Years of Congress, v.* 1, *ch.* 9.

(England): A. D. 1846-1879.—Total abandonment of Protection and Navigation Laws. —The perfected tariff of Free Trade.—"With the fall of the principle of the protection in corn may be said to have practically fallen the principle of protection in this country altogether. That principle was a little complicated in regard to the sugar duties and to the navigation laws. The sugar produced in the West Indian colonies was allowed to enter this country at rates of duty much lower than those imposed upon the sugar grown in foreign lands. The abolition of slavery in our colonies had made labour there somewhat costly and difficult to obtain continuously, and the impression was that if the duties on foreign sugar were reduced, it would tend to enable those countries which still maintained the slave trade to compete at great advantage with the sugar grown in our colonies by that free labour to establish which England had but just paid so large a pecuniary fine. Therefore, the question of Free Trade became involved with that of free labour; at least, so it seemed to the eyes of many a man who was not inclined to support the protective principle in itself. When it was put to him, whether he was willing to push the Free Trade principle so far as to allow countries growing sugar by slave labour to drive our free grown sugar out of the market, he was often inclined to give way before this mode of putting the question, and to imagine that there really was a collision between Free Trade and free labour. Therefore a certain sentimental plea came in to aid the Protectionists in regard to the sugar duties. Many of the old anti-slavery party found themselves deceived by this fallacy, and inclined to join the agitation against the reduction of the duty on foreign sugar. On the other hand, it was made tolerably clear that the labour was not so scarce or so dear in the colonies as had been represented, and that colonial sugar grown by free labour really suffered from no inconvenience except the fact that it was still manufactured on the most crude, old fashioned, and uneconomical methods. Besides, the time had gone by when the majority of the English people could be convinced that a lesson on the beauty of freedom was to be conveyed to foreign sugar-growers and slave-owners by the means of a tax upon the products of their plantations. Therefore, after a long and somewhat eager struggle, the principle of Free Trade was allowed to prevail in regard to sugar. The duties on sugar were made equal. The growth of the sugar plantations was admitted on the same terms into this country, without any reference either to the soil from which it had sprung or to the conditions under which it was grown."—J. McCarthy, *The Epoch of Reform, ch.* 12.—"The contest on the Navigation Laws [finally repealed in 1849—see NAVIGATION LAWS: A. D. 1849] was the last pitched battle fought by the Protectionist party. Their resistance grew fainter and fainter, and a few occasional skirmishes just reminded the world that such a party still existed. Three years afterwards their leaders came into power. In February, 1852, the Earl of Derby became Prime Minister, and Mr. Disraeli Chancellor of the Exchequer and leader of the House of Commons. The Free-traders, alarmed at the possibility of some attempt to reverse the policy of commercial freedom which had been adopted, took the earliest opportunity of questioning those Ministers in Parliament on the subject. The discreet reply was that the Government did not intend to propose any return to the policy of protection during the present Session, nor at any future time, unless a great majority of members favourable to that policy should be returned to Parliament. But far from this proving to be the case, the general election which immediately ensued reinstated a Liberal Government, and the work of stripping off the few rags of protection that still

hung on went rapidly forward. On the 18th of April, 1853, Mr. Gladstone, as Chancellor of the Exchequer, made his financial statement in an able and luminous speech. Such was the admirable order in which he marshalled his topics, and the transparent lucidity with which he treated them, that although his address occupied five hours in the delivery, and although it bristled with figures and statistics, he never for a moment lost the attention or fatigued the minds of his hearers. Mr. Gladstone's financial scheme included, among other reforms, the reduction or total remission of imposts on 133 articles. In this way, our tariff underwent rapid simplification. Each subsequent year was marked by a similar elimination of protective impediments to free commercial intercourse with other countries. In 1860, butter, cheese, &c., were admitted duty free; in 1869, the small nominal duty that had been left on corn was abolished; in 1874, sugar was relieved from the remnant of duty that had survived from previous reductions. It would be superfluous, as well as tedious, to enter upon a detailed reference to the various minor reforms through which we advanced towards, and finally reached, our present free-trade tariff. In fact, all the great battles had been fought and won by the close of the year 1849, and the struggle was then virtually over. . . . Is our present tariff one from which every shred and vestige of protection have been discarded? Is it truly and thoroughly a free-trade tariff? That these questions must be answered in the affirmative it is easy to prove in the most conclusive manner. We raise about £20,000,000 of our annual revenue by means of customs' duties on the foreign commodities which we import, and this fact is sometimes adduced by the advocates for protection, without any explanation, leaving their readers to infer that ours is not, as it really is, a free-trade tariff. That such an inference is totally erroneous will presently be made manifest beyond all question. We now levy import duties on only fifteen articles. Subjoined is a list of them, and to each is appended the amount of duty levied on it during the financial year ending 1st of April, 1879. Not produced in England: Tobacco, £8,589,681; Tea, 4,169,233; Wine, 1,469,710; Dried Fruit, 509,234; Coffee, 212,002; Chicory, 66,739; Chocolate and Cocoa, 44,671; Total, £15,061,270. Produced also in England: Spirits, £5,336,058; Plate (Silver and Gold), 5,853; Beer, 3,814; Vinegar, 671; Playing Cards, 522; Pickles, 17; Malt, 6; Spruce, 3; Total, £5,346,944. Total of both £20,408,214. It will be seen by the above figures that £15,000,000, or three-fourths of the total sum levied, is levied on articles which we do not and cannot produce in England. It is clear, therefore, that this portion of the import duties cannot by any possibility be said to afford the slightest 'protection to native industry.' Every shilling's worth which we consume of those articles comes from abroad, and every shilling extra that the consumer pays for them in consequence of the duty goes to the revenue. So much for that portion of the £20,400,000 import duties. As to the £5,336,000 levied on foreign spirits, it consists of import duties which are only the exact counterpart of the excise duties, levied internally on the produce of the British distillers. The foreign article is placed on precisely the same footing as the native article. Both have to pay the same duty of about 10s. per gallon on spirits of the same strength. It would of course be an absurd stultification to admit foreign spirits duty-free while the English producer was burdened with a tax of 10s. per gallon; but by making the excise duty and the customs' duty precisely the same, equality is established, and no protection or preference whatever is enjoyed by the native distiller. The excise duty levied in the aforesaid year ending April, 1879, on spirits the produce of British distilleries, was no less than £14,855,000. The trifling amounts raised on plate, beer, vinegar, &c., are explained in the same way. They also act as a mere counterpoise to the excise duties levied on the British producers of the same articles, and thus afford to the latter no protection whatever against foreign competition. It is evident, therefore, that our tariff does not retain within it one solitary shred of protection."—A. Mongredien, *Hist. of the Free Trade Movement in Eng., ch.* 13.

Also in: H. Hall, *Hist. of the Customs Revenue of Eng.*—S. Dowell, *Hist. of Taxation and Taxes in Eng.*

(France): A. D. 1853-1860.—Moderation of Protective duties.—The Cobden-Chevalier Commercial Treaty.—After the fall of Napoleon and the restoration of the Bourbons in France, the protective system was pushed to so great an extreme that it became in some instances avowedly prohibitive. "The first serious attempt to alter this very severe restrictive system was reserved for the Second Empire. The English reforms of Peel proved the possibility of removing most of the barriers to commerce that legislation had set up, and consequently Napoleon III. entered with moderation on the work of revision. Between 1853 and 1855 the duties on coal, iron, steel, and wool were lowered, as also those on cattle, corn, and various raw materials, the requirements for ship-building being allowed in free. The legislative body was, however, with difficulty brought to consent to these measures. A more extensive proposal—made in 1856—to remove all prohibitions on imports, while retaining protective duties of 30% on woollen and 35% on cotton goods, had to be withdrawn, in consequence of the strong opposition that it excited. The interest of the consumers was in the popular opinion entirely subordinate to that of the iron-masters, cotton-spinners, and agriculturists—one of the many instances which shows that the long continuance of high duties does not facilitate the introduction of free competition. It was under such discouraging circumstances that the famous Commercial Treaty of 1860 with England was negotiated. This important measure (the work of Chevalier and Cobden, but owing a good deal of its success to the efforts of the Emperor and M. Rouher), though only a finishing step in English tariff reform, inaugurated a new era in France."—C. F. Bastable, *The Commerce of Nations, ch.* 8.—"By the treaty of commerce of 1860, France engaged to abolish all prohibitions, and to admit certain articles of British produce and manufacture at duties not exceeding 30 per cent. ad valorem, to be further reduced to duties not exceeding 25 per cent. from the 1st October, 1864. Britain, on the other hand, bound herself to abolish the duties on French silks and other manufactured goods, and to reduce the duties on French wines and brandies. As regards coals, France engaged to

reduce the import duty, and both contracting parties engaged not to prohibit exportation of coal, and to levy no duty upon such exports. Whilst both contracting parties engaged to confer on the other any favour, privilege, or reduction in the tariff of duties on imports on the articles mentioned in the treaty which the said power might concede to any third power; and also not to enforce, one against another, any prohibition of importation or exportation which should not at the same time be applicable to all other nations. The sum and substance of the treaty was, that France engaged to act more liberally for the future than she had done for the past, and England made another step in the way of liberalising her tariff, and placing all her manufactures under the wholesome and invigorating influence of free competition. Nor was the treaty allowed to remain limited to France and England, for forthwith after its conclusion both France and England entered into similar treaties with other nations. And inasmuch as under existing treaties other nations were bound to give to England as good treatment as they gave to the most favoured nations, the restrictions theretofore in existence in countries not originally parties to the French treaty were everywhere greatly reduced, and thereby its benefits extended rapidly over the greater part of Europe."—L. Levi, *Statistical Results of the Recent Treaties of Commerce* (*Journal of the Statistical Soc., v.* 40, 1877), *p.* 3.

(Germany): A. D. 1853-1892.—Progress towards Free Trade arrested by Prince Bismarck.—Protection measures of 1878-1887.—"Up to the revolutionary period of 1848–50, the policy of the German Zollverein or Custom's Union was a pronounced protectionism. The general liberalization, so to speak, of political life in Western Europe through the events of the years mentioned and the larger sympathy they engendered between nations produced, however, a strong movement in Germany and German-Austria in favor of greater freedom of commercial exchange between these two countries. It resulted in the conclusion, for the term of twelve years, of the treaty of 1853 between the Zollverein and Austria, as the first of the international compacts for the promotion of commercial intercourse that formed so prominent a feature of European history during the following twenty years. The treaty was a first, but long step towards free exchange, providing, as it did, for uniform duties on imports from other countries, for a considerable free list and for largely reduced duties between the contracting countries. It also contained stipulations for its renewal on the basis of entire free trade. . . . A very influential association was formed, with free trade as the avowed ulterior object. Its leaders, who were also the champions of political liberalism, represented intellects of the highest order. They included the well-known economists Prince Smith, Mittermaier, Rau, Faucher, Michaelis, Wirth, Schulze and Braun. An 'Economic Congress' was held annually, the proceedings of which attracted the greatest attention, and exercised a growing influence upon the policy of the governments composing the Zollverein. . . . The beneficial results of the treaty of 1853 were so obvious and instantaneous that the Zollverein and Austria would have no doubt sought to bring about improved commercial relations with other nations by the same means, but for the disturbance of the peace of Europe by the Crimean war, and the conflict of 1859 between France, Italy and Austria. The bitter feelings, caused by the latter war against the two first named countries wherever the German tongue was spoken, rendered the negotiation of commercial treaties with them out of the question for a time. The great achievement of Richard Cobden and Michel Chevalier, the famous treaty of 1860 between Great Britain and France, changed this reluctance at once into eagerness to secure the same advantages that those two countries had insured to each other. The enlightened and far-seeing despot occupying the throne of France, being once won over to the cause of free exchange by Cobden's ardor and persistence and clear and convincing arguments, against the views of the majority of his ministers and with probably 90 per cent. of his subjects strongly opposed to the abandonment of protectionism, determined, with the zeal of a new convert, to make the most of his new departure. He was very willing, therefore, to meet the advances of the Zollverein, so that in the spring of 1862, after a whole year's negotiation, a formal treaty was consummated between it and the French Empire. It was a very broad measure. . . . It comprised a copyright and trade-mark convention, provisions for liberal modifications of the respective navigation laws and a commercial treaty proper. The latter provided for the free admission of raw materials, for the abolition of transit and export duties and for equalizing import duties as nearly as possible, and also contained a 'most favored nation' clause. . . . In pursuance of the terms of the treaty of 1853 with Austria, negotiations had been commenced early in the sixties with reference to its renewal upon the basis of the removal of all custom-barriers between the two countries. Austria was naturally against the conclusion of a treaty between the Zollverein and France with herself left out, and opposed its consummation with all the means at her command. . . . After long negotiations, accompanied by much excitement in Germany, a compromise was reached in 1864, under which the Zollverein was renewed for twelve years, that is till 1877, and the French treaty ratified on condition that a new treaty should be made with Austria. This was done in 1865, but the new convention did not provide for the complete commercial union, contemplated under that of 1853. It was only a compact between two independent nations, but on more liberal lines than the old treaty, and certainly constituting a yet nearer approach to free trade. . . . In other directions the Zollverein lost no time in following the example of Napoleon by entering successively in 1865 and 1866 into commercial treaties with Belgium, Italy, Great Britain and Switzerland, which were simple conventions, by which the contracting parties granted to each other the position of the most favored nation, or formal tariff regulating treaties after the model of that between the Zollverein and France. These additional treaties were no more than the latter the work of Bismarck. . . . The general upheaval in Germany arising from the war between Prussia and Austria and her North and South-German Allies, while temporarily delaying the farther progress of tariff reform, subsequently accelerated its forward march. . . . A special treaty for the reform of the constitution, so to

speak, of the Zollverein was concluded in July, 1867, between the North-German Federation, the new political constellation Prussia had formed out of all Germany north of the Main, after destroying the old Diet, and Bavaria, Wuertemberg, Baden and Hesse, under the provisions of which the tariff and revenue policy of all Germany was to be managed by the 'Zollparlament,' consisting of an upper house, made up of representatives of the governments, and of a lower house of representatives of the people elected by universal suffrage on a population basis. Thus tariff reform was actually the chain that bound up, as it were, the material interests of all Germans outside of Austria for the first time, as those of one nation. Negotiations for a new commercial treaty with the dual monarchy of Austria-Hungary — into which Austria had changed in consequence of the events of 1866 — commenced immediately after the restoration of peace, and were brought to a satisfactory conclusion in March, 1868. The treaty was to run nine years, and provided for still lower duties than under the old treaty, the principal reductions being on all agricultural products, wines and iron. . . . The Franco-German war put an end to the treaty of 1862 between France and the Zollverein. As a substitute for the commercial part of it, article II of the treaty of peace of 1871 provided simply that France and Germany should be bound for an indefinite period to allow each other the most favorable tariff rates either of them had granted or might grant to Great Britain, Belgium, Holland, Switzerland, Austria-Hungary and Russia. . . . A large majority of the members of the first Reichstag [under the newly created Empire] favored further legislation in the direction of free trade, and the work of tariff reform was vigorously taken in hand, as soon as the constitution and the essential organic laws of the Empire had been framed. . . . In the session of 1873 the National Liberals brought in a motion asking the Government to present measures for the abolition of all duties on raw and manufactured iron, salt and other articles. The Government responded very readily. . . . Prince Bismarck was no less pronounced for a strict revenue tariff than any of the other government speakers. Up to the end of 1875, there was not the slightest indication of a change of views on his part upon this general subject. . . . The climax of the free trade movement in Germany can be said to have been reached about the time last stated. But a few months later, suspicious signs of a new inspiration on the part of the Prince became manifest. Rumors of dissensions between him and Minister Delbrück began to circulate, and gradually gained strength. In May, 1876, all Germany was startled by the announcement that the latter and his principal co-workers had resigned. Soon it was known that their retirement was due to a disagreement with the Prince over tariff reform matters. A crisis had evidently set in that was a great puzzle at first to everybody. Gradually it became clear that the cause of it was really a sudden abandonment of the past policy by the Prince. The new course, upon which the mighty helmsman was starting the ship of state, was signalized in various ways, but the full extent of his change of front was disclosed only in a communication addressed by him to the Federal Council, under date of December 15, 1878. It was a most extraordinary document. It condemned boldly all that had been done by the government under his own eyes and with his full consent in relation to tariff reform ever since the Franco-German treaty of 1862. . . . As the principal reason for the new departure, he assigned the necessity of reforming the public finances in order to increase the revenues of the Government. The will of the Chancellor had become the law for the federal council, and, accordingly, the tariff-committee began the work of devising a general protective tariff in hot haste. It was submitted to the Reichstag by the Prince in May, 1879. . . . Thus Germany was started on the downward plain of protectionism, on which it continued for twelve years. Beyond all question, the Chancellor was solely responsible for it. . . . The tariff bill of 1879 met with vigorous opposition under the lead of ex-Minister Delbrück, but was passed by the large majority of 217 to 117 — showing the readiness with which the 'bon plaisir' of the master had made converts to his new faith. It was a sweeping measure, establishing large duties on cereals, iron, lumber and petroleum, increasing existing duties on textile goods, coffee, wines, rice, tea, and a great number of other minor articles and also on cattle. The protectionist current came to a temporary stop from 1880-'83, inasmuch as in the new Reichstag, elected in 1881, the protection and anti-protection parties were so evenly balanced that the Government failed to carry its proposals for still higher duties. The elections of 1884, in which the Government brought every influence to bear against the opposition, resulted, however, in the return of a protectionist majority. Accordingly, there followed in 1885 a new screwing up of duties, tripling those on grain, doubling those on lumber, and raising most others. In 1887 the duties on grain were even again increased. But now the insatiateness of protection and especially the duties put on the necessaries of life produced a strong reaction, as evidenced by the largely increased membership of the opposition parties in the present Reichstag. . . . The Imperial Government, shortly after the retirement of Prince Bismarck had untied its hands, entered upon negotiations with Austria-Hungary, Italy, Switzerland and Belgium, which resulted in . . . reciprocity treaties."— H. Villard, *German Tariff Policy* (*Yale Rev., May*, 1892).

Also in: W. H. Dawson, *Bismarck and State Socialism.*

(United States and Canada): A. D. 1854-1866.— The Reciprocity Treaty.— The Treaty commonly known in America as the Canadian Reciprocity Treaty of 1854, between the governments of Great Britain and the United States, was concluded on the 5th of June, 1854, and ratifications were exchanged on the 9th of September following. The negotiators were the Earl of Elgin and Kincardine, on the part of the British Government, and William L. Marcy, Secretary of State of the United States, acting for the latter. By the first article of the treaty it was agreed that, "in addition to the liberty secured to the United States fishermen by the . . . convention of October 20, 1818, of taking, curing, and drying fish on certain coasts of the British North American Colonies therein defined, the inhabitants of the United States shall have, in common with the subjects of Her Britannic

Majesty, the liberty to take fish of every kind, except shell-fish, on the sea-coasts and shores, and in the bays, harbors, and creeks of Canada, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward's Island, and of the several islands thereunto adjacent, without being restricted to any distance from the shore, with permission to land upon the coasts and shores of those colonies and the islands thereof, and also upon the Magdalen Islands, for the purpose of drying their nets and curing their fish; provided that, in so doing, they do not interfere with the rights of private property, or with British fishermen, in the peaceable use of any part of the said coast in their occupancy for the same purpose. It is understood that the above-mentioned liberty applies solely to the sea-fishery, and that the salmon and shad fisheries, and all fisheries in rivers and the mouths of rivers, are hereby reserved exclusively for British fishermen." The same article provided for the appointment of commissioners and an arbitrator or umpire to settle any disputes that might arise "as to the places to which the reservation of exclusive right to British fishermen contained in this article, and that of fishermen of the United States contained in the next succeeding article, apply." By the second article of the treaty British subjects received privileges on the eastern sea-coasts and shores of the United States north of the 36th parallel of north latitude, identical with those given by the first article to citizens of the United States on the coasts and shores mentioned above. Article 3 was as follows: "It is agreed that the articles enumerated in the schedule hereunto annexed, being the growth and produce of the aforesaid British colonies or of the United States, shall be admitted into each country respectively free of duty: Schedule: Grain, flour, and breadstuffs, of all kinds. Animals of all kinds. Fresh, smoked, and salted meats. Cotton-wool, seeds, and vegetables. Undried fruits, dried fruits. Fish of all kinds. Products of fish, and of all other creatures living in the water. Poultry, eggs. Hides, furs, skins, or tails, undressed. Stone or marble, in its crude or unwrought state. Slate. Butter, cheese, tallow. Lard, horns, manures. Ores of metals, of all kinds. Coal. Pitch, tar, turpentine, ashes. Timber and lumber of all kinds, round, hewed, and sawed, unmanufactured in whole or in part. Firewood. Plants, shrubs, and trees. Pelts, wool. Fish-oil. Rice, broom-corn, and bark. Gypsum, ground or unground. Hewn, or wrought, or unwrought burr or grindstones. Dye-stuffs. Flax, hemp, and tow, unmanufactured. Unmanufactured tobacco. Rags." Article 4 secured to the citizens and inhabitants of the United States the right to navigate the River St. Lawrence and the canals in Canada between the ocean and the great lakes, subject to the same tolls and charges that might be exacted from Her Majesty's subjects, but the British Government retained the right to suspend this privilege, on due notice given, in which case the Government of the United States might suspend the operations of Article 3. Reciprocally, British subjects were given the right to navigate Lake Michigan, and the Government of the United States engaged itself to urge the State governments to open the several State canals to British subjects on terms of equality. It was further agreed that no export or other duty should be levied on lumber or timber floated down the river St. John to the sea, "when the same is shipped to the United States from the province of New Brunswick." Article 5 provided that the treaty should take effect whenever the necessary laws were passed by the Imperial Parliament, the Provincial Parliaments, and the Congress of the United States, and that it should "remain in force for ten years from the date at which it may come into operation, and further until the expiration of twelve months after either of the high contracting parties shall give notice to the other of its wish to terminate the same." Article 6 extended the provisions of the treaty to the island of Newfoundland, so far as applicable, provided the Imperial Parliament, the Parliament of Newfoundland and the Congress of the United States should embrace the island in their laws for carrying the treaty into effect; but not otherwise. — *Treaties and Conventions between the United States and other Powers, ed. of* 1889, *pp.* 448–452. —The Treaty was abrogated in 1866, the United States having given the required notice in 1865. —F. E. Haynes, *The Reciprocity Treaty with Canada of* 1854 (*Am. Economic Assn. Pubs., v.* 7, *no.* 6).

(United States): A. D. 1861-1864. — The Morrill Tariff and the War Tariffs.—"In 1861 the Morrill tariff act began a change toward a higher range of duties and a stronger application of protection. The Morrill act is often spoken of as if it were the basis of the present protective system. But this is by no means the case. The tariff act of 1861 was passed by the House of Representatives in the session of 1859–60, the session preceding the election of President Lincoln. It was passed, undoubtedly, with the intention of attracting to the Republican party, at the approaching Presidential election, votes in Pennsylvania and other States that had protectionist leanings. In the Senate the tariff bill was not taken up in the same session in which it was passed in the House. Its consideration was postponed, and it was not until the next session — that of 1860–61 — that it received the assent of the Senate and became law. It is clear that the Morrill tariff was carried in the House before any serious expectation of war was entertained; and it was accepted by the Senate in the session of 1861 without material change. It therefore forms no part of the financial legislation of the war, which gave rise in time to a series of measures that entirely superseded the Morrill tariff. Indeed, Mr. Morrill and the other supporters of the act of 1861 declared that their intention was simply to restore the rates of 1846. The important change which they proposed to make from the provisions of the tariff of 1846 was to substitute specific for ad-valorem duties. . . . The specific duties . . . established were in many cases considerably above the ad-valorem duties of 1846. The most important direct changes made by the act of 1861 were in the increased duties on iron and on wool, by which it was hoped to attach to the Republican party Pennsylvania and some of the Western States. Most of the manufacturing States at this time still stood aloof from the movement toward higher rates. . . . Mr. Rice, of Massachusetts, said in 1860: 'The manufacturer asks no additional protection. He has learned, among other things, that the greatest evil, next to a ruinous competition from foreign sources, is an excessive protec-

tion, which stimulates a like ruinous and irresponsible competition at home' (Congress. Globe, 1859–60, p. 1867). Mr. Sherman said: . . . 'The manufacturers have asked over and over again to be let alone. The tariff of 1857 is the manufacturers' bill; but the present bill is more beneficial to the agricultural interest than the tariff of 1857.' (Ibid., p. 2053. C. F. Hunter's speech, Ibid., p. 3010.) In later years Mr. Morrill himself said that the tariff of 1861 'was not asked for, and but coldly welcomed, by manufacturers, who always and justly fear instability.' (Congr. Globe, 1869–70, p. 3295.) . . . Hardly had the Morrill tariff been passed when Fort Sumter was fired on. The Civil War began. The need of additional revenue for carrying on the great struggle was immediately felt; and as early as the extra session of the summer of 1861, additional customs duties were imposed. In the next regular session, in December, 1861, a still further increase of duties was made. From that time till 1865 no session, indeed hardly a month of any session, passed in which some increase of duties on imports was not made. . . . The great acts of 1862 and 1864 are typical of the whole course of the war measures; and the latter is of particular importance, because it became the foundation of the existing tariff system. . . . The three revenue acts of June 30, 1864, practically form one measure, and that probably the greatest measure of taxation which the world has seen. The first of the acts provided for an enormous extension of the internal-tax system; the second for a corresponding increase of the duties on imports; the third authorized a loan of $400,000,000. . . . Like the tariff act of 1862, that of 1864 was introduced, explained, amended, and passed under the management of Mr. Morrill, who was chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means. That gentleman again stated, as he had done in 1862, that the passage of the tariff act was rendered necessary in order to put domestic producers in the same situation, so far as foreign competition was concerned, as if the internal taxes had not been raised. This was one great object of the new tariff. . . . But it explains only in part the measure which in fact was proposed and passed. The tariff of 1864 was a characteristic result of that veritable furor of taxation which had become fixed in the minds of the men who were then managing the national finances. Mr. Morrill, and those who with him made our revenue laws, seem to have had but one principle: to tax every possible article indiscriminately, and to tax it at the highest rates that any one had the courage to suggest. They carried this method out to its fullest extent in the tariff act of 1864, as well as in the tax act of that year. At the same time these statesmen were protectionists. . . . Every domestic producer who came before Congress got what he wanted in the way of duties. Protection ran riot; and this, moreover, not merely for the time being. The whole tone of the public mind toward the question of import duties became distorted. . . . The average rate on dutiable commodities, which had been 37.2 per cent. under the act of 1862, became 47.06 per cent. under that of 1864. . . . In regard to the duties as they stood before 1883, it is literally true, in regard to almost all protected articles, that the tariff act of 1864 remained in force for twenty years without reductions."—F. W. Taussig, *Tariff History of the U. S., pp.* 158–169, *with foot-note.*—Under the Morrill Tariff, which went into effect April 1, 1861, the imposts which had averaged about 19 per cent. on dutiable articles were raised to 36 per cent.—J. G. Blaine, *Twenty Years of Congress, v.* 1, *p.* 400.

(Australia): A. D. 1862-1892.—Contrasted policy of Victoria and New South Wales.—Both New South Wales and Victoria "are young countries, and are inhabited by men of the same race, speech, and training: capital and labour oscillate freely between them: both use substantially the same methods and forms of government: while against the larger territory of New South Wales may be set the superior climate and easier development of its southern neighbour. Whatever may be the balance of the natural advantages, whether of climate or population, is on the side of Victoria, whose compact, fertile, and well watered territory gained for it, on its first discovery, the well-deserved title of Australia Felix. The striking and ultimate point of difference between the two countries is their fiscal policy. Since 1866 Victoria has lived under a system of gradually increasing Protection, while the policy of New South Wales has been, in the main, one of Free Trade. According to all Protectionist theory Victoria should be prosperous and New South Wales distressed; there should be variety and growth in the one country, stagnation in the other. At least the progress of Victoria ought to have been more rapid than that of New South Wales, because she has added to the natural advantages which she already enjoyed, the artificial benefits which are claimed for a Protective tariff. If, in fact, neither of these conclusions is correct, and, while both countries have been phenomenally prosperous, New South Wales has prospered the most, one of two conclusions is inevitable — namely, either that certain special influences have caused the more rapid progress of New South Wales which were not felt in Victoria, or that Protection has retarded instead of assisted the development of Victoria's natural superiority. Writers of all schools admit that activity in certain departments of national life is a fair indication of prosperity and progress. It is, for instance, generally allowed that an increase in population, a development of agricultural and manufacturing industry, a growth of foreign commerce, an increase in shipping, or an improvement in the public revenue, are all signs of health and well-being; and that a concurrence of such symptoms over a lengthened period indicates an increase in material wealth. Accepting these tests of progress, our comparison proceeds thus: first, we examine the position of the two Colonies as regards population, foreign commerce, shipping, agriculture, manufactures, and revenue, at the time when both of them adhered to Free Trade; from which we find that, according to all these indications of prosperity, Victoria was then very much the better off: In 1866 she outnumbered New South Wales in population by 200,000 souls: her foreign commerce was larger by £8,300,000: she had a greater area of land under cultivation: her manufactures were well established, while those of New South Wales were few and insignificant: she was ahead in shipping, and her revenue was greater by one-third. Passing next to the years which follow 1866, we observe that New South Wales gradually bettered her position in every province of national activity, and

that, as the fetters of Protection became tighter, Victoria receded in the race. She gave way first in the department of foreign commerce, next in population, shipping, and revenue, until, in 1887, she maintained her old superiority in agriculture alone. From this accumulation of facts—and not from any one of them we infer that the rate of progress in New South Wales under Free Trade has been greater than that of Victoria under Protection."—B. R. Wise, *Industrial Freedom, app.* 3.

Europe): A. D. 1871-1892.—Protectionist reaction on the Continent.—High Tariff in France.—"The Franco-German War (1870-1) and the overthrow of Napoleon III. at once arrested the free-trade policy, which had little support in the national mind, and was hardly understood outside the small circle of French economists. The need of fresh revenue was imperative, and M. Thiers, the most prominent of French statesmen, was notoriously protectionist in his leanings. Pure revenue duties on colonial and Eastern commodities were first tried: the sugar duty was increased 80%, that on coffee was trebled; tea, cocoa, wines and spirits, were all subjected to greatly increased charges. As the yield thus obtained did not suffice, proposals for the taxation of raw materials were brought forward but rejected by the legislature in 1871, when M. Thiers tendered his resignation. To avoid this result the measure was passed, not however to come into operation until compensating productive duties had been placed on imported manufactures. The existing commercial treaties were a further obstacle to changes in policy, and accordingly negotiations were opened with England and Belgium, in order that the new duties might be applied to their products. As was justifiable under the circumstances, the former country required that if imported raw products were to be taxed, the like articles produced in France should pay an equivalent tax, and therefore, as the shortest way of escape, the French Government gave notice for the termination of the treaties (in the technical language of international law 'denounced' them), and new conventions were agreed on; but as this arrangement was just as unsatisfactory in the opinion of the French Chambers, the old treaties were in 1873 restored to force until 1877, and thus the larger part of the raw materials escaped the new taxation. The protectionist tendency was, too, manifested in the departure from the open system introduced in 1866 in respect to shipping. A law of 1872 imposed differential duties on goods imported in foreign vessels. . . . The advance of the sentiment in favour of a return to the restrictive system was even more decidedly indicated in 1881. Bounties were then granted for the encouragement of French shipping, and extra taxes imposed on indirect imports of non-European and some European goods. In 1889 the carrying trade between France and Algiers was reserved for native ships. The revision of the general tariff was a more serious task, undertaken with a view to influencing the new treaties that the termination of the old engagements made necessary. The tariff of 1881 (to come into force in 1882) made several increases and substituted many specific for ad valorem duties. Raw materials escaped taxation; half-manufactured articles were placed under moderate duties. The minimal corn duties were diminished by a fraction, but the duties on live stock and fresh meat were considerably increased. . . . A new 'conventional tariff' speedily followed in a series of fresh treaties with European countries. . . . The duties on whole or partially-manufactured goods remained substantially unchanged by the new treaties, which do not, in fact, vary so much from the general tariff as was previously the case. The number of articles included in the conventions had been reduced, and all countries outside Europe came under the general code. The reaction against the liberal policy of 1860 was thus as yet very slight, and did not seriously affect manufactures. The agricultural depression was the primary cause of the legislation of 1885, which placed a duty of 3 francs per quintal on wheat, 7 francs on flour, 2 francs on rye and barley, and one franc on oats, with additional duties on indirect importation. Cattle, sheep, and pigs came under increases of from 50% to 100%. . . . Not satisfied with their partial success, the advocates of high duties have made further efforts. Maize, hitherto free, as being chiefly used by farmers for feeding purposes, is now liable to duty, and the tariff proposed in the present year (1891) raises the rates on most articles from an average of 10% to 15% to one of 30% and 40%. . . . Germany did not quite as speedily come under the influence of the economic reaction as France. . . . Italian commercial policy also altered for the worse. From the formation of the kingdom till 1875, as the various commercial treaties and the general tariff of 1861 show, it was liberal and tending towards freedom. About the latter date the forces that we have indicated above as operating generally throughout Europe, commenced to affect Italy. The public expenditure had largely increased, and additional revenue was urgently required. Agriculture was so depressed that, though the country is pre-eminently agricultural, alarm was excited by the supposed danger of foreign competition. The result was that on the general revision of duties in 1877 much higher rates were imposed on the principal imports. . . . Depression both in agriculture and elaborative industries continued and strengthened the protectionist party, who succeeded in securing the abandonment of all the commercial treaties, and the enactment of a new tariff in 1887. . . . The first effect of the new system of high taxation with no conventional privileges was to lead to a war of tariffs between France and Italy. . . . Austria may be added to the list of countries in which the protectionist reaction has been effectively shown. . . . In Russia the revival (or perhaps it would be more correct to say continued existence) of protection is decisively marked. . . . Spain and Portugal had long been strongholds of protectionist ideas. . . . Holland and Belgium have as yet [1891] adhered to the system of moderate duties."—C. F. Bastable, *The Commerce of Nations, ch.* 9.—A new tariff system was elaborated by the French Chambers, with infinite labor and discussion, during the year 1891, and adopted early in the following year, being known as the "Loi du 11 Janvier, 1892." This tariff makes a great advance in duties on most imports, with a concession of lower rates to nations according reciprocal favors to French productions. Raw materials in general are admitted free of duties. The commercial treaties of France are undergoing modification.

[illegible]

the doctrine which was hateful to their fathers as an economic heresy. The majority of the Democrats in the House, however, made strenuous efforts to accomplish something in the way of reducing duties most complained of. Their first undertaking was led by Mr. Morrison of Illinois, who introduced a bill which "proposed an average reduction of 20 per cent., but with so many exceptions that it was estimated the average reduction on dutiable articles would be about 17 per cent. The rates under the Morrill Act of 1861 were to form the minimum limit. An extensive addition to the free list was proposed, including the following articles: ores of iron, copper, lead, and nickel, coal, lumber, wood, hay, bristles, lime, sponges, indigo, coal tar and dyewoods." In the Committee of Ways and Means the bill underwent considerable changes, the articles in the free list being reduced to salt, coal, lumber and wood. It was reported to the House March 11, and remained under debate until May 6, when it was killed by a motion to strike out the enacting clause, on which 118 Republicans and 41 Democrats voted aye, against 4 Republicans and 151 Democrats voting nay. The 4 Republicans supporting the bill were all from Minnesota; of the 41 Democrats opposing it 12 were from Pennsylvania, 10 from Ohio, 6 from New York, 4 from California and 3 from New Jersey. "The Morrison 'horizontal bill' having been thus killed, Mr. Hewett, a New York Democrat, and a member of the Ways and Means Committee, on May 12 introduced a new tariff bill, providing for a reduction of 10 to 20 per cent. on a considerable number of articles and placing several others on the free list." The bill was reported favorably to the House, but action upon it was not reached before the adjournment. During the same session, a bill to restore the duties of 1867 on raw wool was defeated in the House; an amendment to the shipping bill, permitting a free importation of iron and steel steamships for employment in the foreign trade, passed the House and was defeated in the Senate; and a bill reducing the duty on works of art from 20 to 10 per cent. was defeated in the House. In the next Congress, the Forty-ninth, Mr. Morrison led a new undertaking to diminish the protective duties which were producing an enormous surplus of revenue. The bill which he introduced (February 15, 1886) received radical changes in the Ways and Means Committee, "inasmuch as it was clearly seen that the opposition from the metal and coal interests was sufficiently strong to destroy all chance of consideration in the House. Accordingly, it was found preferable to make the duties on wool and woolens the special point for assault." But the bill modified on this new line,—lowering duties on woolens to 35 per cent. ad valorem, and placing wool in the free list, with lumber, wood, fish, salt, flax, hemp and jute,—was refused consideration by a vote of 157 to 140 in the House, on the 17th of June. Again there were 35 members of his own party arrayed against Mr. Morrison. At the second session of the same Congress, December 18, 1886, Mr. Morrison repeated his attempt with no better success.—O. H. Perry, *Proposed Tariff Legislation since* 1883 (*Quarterly Journal of Economics, October*, 1887).—The assembling of the 50th Congress, on the 6th of December, 1887, was signalized by a message from President Cleveland which produced an extraordinary effect, decisively lifting the tariff question into precedence over all other issues in national politics, and compelling the Democratic Party to array its lines distinctly and unequivocally against the upholders of "protection" as an economic policy. He emphasized the "paramount importance of the subject" impressively by passing by every other matter of public concern, and devoting his message exclusively to a consideration of the "'state of the Union' as shown in the present condition of our Treasury and our general fiscal situation." The condition of the Treasury to which the President called attention was one of unexampled plethora. "On the 30th day of June, 1885, the excess of revenues over public expenditures, after complying with the annual requirement of the Sinking-Fund Act, was $17,859,735.84; during the year ended June 30, 1886, such excess amounted to $49,405,545.20; and during the year ended June 30, 1887, it reached the sum of $55,567,849.54." "Our scheme of taxation," said the President, "by means of which this needless surplus is taken from the people and put into the public treasury, consists of a tariff or duty levied upon importations from abroad, and internal-revenue taxes levied upon the consumption of tobacco and spirituous and malt liquors. It must be conceded that none of the things subjected to internal-revenue taxation are, strictly speaking, necessaries; there appears to be no just complaint of this taxation by the consumers of these articles, and there seems to be nothing so well able to bear the burden without hardship to any portion of the people. But our present tariff laws, the vicious, inequitable, and illogical source of unnecessary taxation, ought to be at once revised and amended. These laws, as their primary and plain effect, raise the price to consumers of all articles imported and subject to duty, by precisely the sum paid for such duties. Thus the amount of the duty measures the tax paid by those who purchase for use these imported articles. Many of these things, however, are raised or manufactured in our own country, and the duties now levied upon foreign goods and products are called protection to these home manufactures, because they render it possible for those of our people who are manufacturers to make these taxed articles and sell them for a price equal to that demanded for the imported goods that have paid customs duty. So it happens that while comparatively a few use the imported articles, millions of our people, who never use and never saw any of the foreign products, purchase and use things of the same kind made in this country, and pay therefor nearly or quite the same enhanced price which the duty adds to the imported articles. Those who buy imports pay the duty charged thereon into the public treasury, but the majority of our citizens, who buy domestic articles of the same class, pay a sum at least approximately equal to this duty to the home manufacturer. . . . The difficulty attending a wise and fair revision of our tariff-laws is not underestimated. It will require on the part of Congress great labor and care, and especially a broad and national contemplation of the subject, and a patriotic disregard of such local and selfish claims as are unreasonable and reckless of the welfare of the entire country. Under our present laws more than 4,000 articles are subject to duty. Many of these do not in

any way compete with our own manufactures, and many are hardly worth attention as subjects of revenue. A considerable reduction can be made in the aggregate by adding them to the free list. The taxation of luxuries presents no features of hardship; but the necessaries of life used and consumed by all the people, the duty upon which adds to the cost of living in every home, should be greatly cheapened. The radical reduction of the duties imposed upon raw material used in manufactures, or its free importation, is of course an important factor in any effort to reduce the price of these necessaries. . . . It is not apparent how such a change can have any injurious effect upon our manufacturers. On the contrary, it would appear to give them a better chance in foreign markets with the manufacturers of other countries, who cheapen their wares by free material. Thus our people might have an opportunity of extending their sales beyond the limits of home consumption — saving them from the depression, interruption in business, and loss caused by a glutted domestic market, and affording their employés more certain and steady labor, with its resulting quiet and contentment. The question thus imperatively presented for solution should be approached in a spirit higher than partisanship. . . . But the obligation to declared party policy and principle is not wanting to urge prompt and effective action. Both of the great political parties now represented in the Government have, by repeated and authoritative declarations, condemned the condition of our laws which permits the collection from the people of unnecessary revenue, and have, in the most solemn manner, promised its correction. . . . Our progress toward a wise conclusion will not be improved by dwelling upon the theories of protection and free trade. This savors too much of bandying epithets. It is a condition which confronts us — not a theory. Relief from this condition may involve a slight reduction of the advantages which we award our home productions, but the entire withdrawal of such advantages should not be contemplated. The question of free trade is absolutely irrelevant."—The President's emphatic utterance rallied his party and inspired a more united effort in the House to modify and simplify the tariff. Under the chairmanship of Mr. Mills, of Texas, a bill was framed by the Committee of Ways and Means and reported to the House on the 2d of April, 1888. "We have gone as far as we could," said the Committee in reporting the bill, "and done what we could, in the present condition of things, to place our manufactures upon a firm and unshaken foundation, where they would have advantages over all the manufacturers of the world. Our manufacturers, having the advantage of all others in the intelligence, skill, and productive capacity of their labor, need only to be placed on the same footing with their rivals in having their materials at the same cost in the open markets of the world. In starting on this policy, we have transferred many articles from the dutiable to the free list. The revenues now received on these articles amount to $22,189,595.48. Three-fourths of this amount is collected on articles that enter into manufactures, of which wool and tin-plates are the most important. . . . The repeal of all duties on wool enables us to reduce the duties on the manufactures of wool $12,332,211.65. The largest reduction we have made is in the woolen schedule, and this reduction was only made possible by placing wool on the free list. There is no greater reason for a duty on wool than there is for a duty on any other raw material. A duty on wool makes it necessary to impose a higher duty on the goods made from wool, and the consumer has to pay a double tax. If we leave wool untaxed the consumer has to pay a tax only on the manufactured goods. . . . In the woolen schedule we have substituted ad valorem for specific duties. The specific duty is the favorite of those who are to be benefited by high rates, who are protected against competition, and protected in combinations against the consumer of their products. There is a persistent pressure by manufacturers for the specific duty, because it conceals from the people the amount of taxes they are compelled to pay to the manufacturer. The specific duty always discriminates in favor of the costly article and against the cheaper one. . . . This discrimination is peculiarly oppressive in woolen and cotton goods, which are necessaries of life to all classes of people." The ad valorem duty on woolen goods proposed by the committee in accordance with these views, ranged from 30 to 45 per cent., existing rates being reckoned as equivalent to about from 40 to 90 per cent. ad valorem. Duties on cottons were fixed at 35 to 40 per cent. On steel rails the bill proposed a reduction from $17 per ton to $11. It lowered the duty on pig-iron to $6 per ton. It diminished the tariff on common earthenware from 60 to 35 per cent.; on china and decorated earthenware from 60 to 45 per cent.; on window-glass from 93 and 106 to 62 and 68 per cent. It put tin plates on the free list, along with hemp, flax, lumber, timber, salt, and other materials of manufacture and articles in common use. These were the more important modifications contemplated in what became known as "the Mills Bill." After vigorous debate, it was passed by the Democrats of the House with a nearness to unanimity which showed a remarkable change in the sentiment of their party on the subject. Only four Democratic representatives were found voting in opposition to the measure. In the Senate, where the Republicans were in the majority, the measure was wrecked, as a matter of course. The protectionists of that body substituted a bill which revised the tariff in the contrary direction, generally raising duties instead of lowering them. Thus the issue was made in the elections of 1888.

(United States): A. D. 1890.—The McKinley Act.—"In the campaign of 1888 the tariff question was the issue squarely presented. . . . The victory of the Republicans . . . and the election of President Harrison were the results. . . . The election was won by a narrow margin, and was affected by certain factors which stood apart from the main issue. The independent voters had been disappointed with some phases of President Cleveland's administration of the civil service, and many who had voted for him in 1884 did not do so in 1888. . . . On the whole, however, the Republicans held their own, and even made gains, throughout the country, on the tariff issue; and they might fairly consider the result a popular verdict in favor of the system of protection. But their opposition to the policy of lower duties, emphasized by President Cleveland, had led them not only to champion the existing system, but to advocate its

further extension, by an increase of duties in various directions. . . . Accordingly when the Congress then elected met for the session of 1889–90, the Republican majority in the House proceeded to pass a measure which finally became the tariff act of 1890. This measure may fairly be said to be the direct result of Mr. Cleveland's tariff message of 1887. The Republicans, in resisting the doctrine of that message, were led by logical necessity to the opposite doctrine of higher duties. . . . Notwithstanding grave misgivings on the part of some of their leaders, especially those from the northwest, the act known popularly as the McKinley bill was pushed through."—F. W. Taussig, *Tariff History of the U. S., ch.* 5.—The bill was reported to the House of Representatives by the Chairman of its Committee on Ways and Means, Mr. McKinley, on the 16th of April, 1890. "We have not been so much concerned," said the majority of the Committee in their report, "about the prices of the articles we consume as we have been to encourage a system of home production which shall give fair remuneration to domestic producers and fair wages to American workmen, and by increased production and home competition insure fair prices to consumers. . . . The aim has been to impose duties upon such foreign products as compete with our own, whether of the soil or the shop, and to enlarge the free list wherever this can be done without injury to any American industry, or wherever an existing home industry can be helped without detriment to another industry which is equally worthy of the protecting care of the Government. . . . We have recommended no duty above the point of difference between the normal cost of production here, including labor, and the cost of like production in the countries which seek our markets, nor have we hesitated to give this quantum of duty even though it involved an increase over present rates and showed an advance of percentages and ad valorem equivalents." On the changes proposed to be made in the rates of duty on wool and on the manufactures of wool—the subject of most debate in the whole measure—the majority reported as follows: "By the census of 1880, in every county in the United States except 34, sheep were raised. In 1883 the number of sheep in the United States was over 50,000,000, and the number of persons owning flocks was in excess of a million. This large number of flock-masters was, to a considerable extent, withdrawn from the business of raising grain and other farm products, to which they must return if wool-growing cannot be profitably pursued. The enormous growth of this industry was stimulated by the wool tariff of 1867, and was in a prosperous condition prior to the act of 1883. Since then the industry has diminished in alarming proportions, and the business has neither been satisfactory nor profitable. . . . By the proposed bill the duties on first and second class wools are made at 11 and 12 cents a pound, as against 10 and 12 under existing law. On third-class wool, costing 12 cents or less, the duty is raised from 2½ cents a pound to 3½ cents, and upon wool of the third class, costing above 12 cents, the duty recommended is an advance from 5 to 8 cents per pound. . . . There seems to be no doubt that with the protection afforded by the increased duties recommended in the bill the farmers of the United States will be able at an early day to supply substantially all of the home demand, and the great benefit such production will be to the agricultural interests of the country cannot be estimated. The production of 600,000,000 pounds of wool would require about 100,000,000 sheep, or an addition of more than 100 per cent to the present number. . . . The increase in the duty on clothing wool and substitutes for wool to protect the wool growers of this country, and the well-understood fact that the tariff of 1883, and the construction given to the worsted clause, reduced the duties on many grades of woollen goods to a point that invited increasing importations, to the serious injury of our woollen manufacturers and wool growers, necessitate raising the duties on woollen yarn, cloth and dress goods to a point which will insure the holding of our home market for these manufactures to a much greater extent than is now possible. The necessity of this increase is apparent in view of the fact already stated that during the last fiscal year there were imports of manufactures of wool of the foreign value of $52,681,482, as shown by the undervalued invoices, and the real value in our market of nearly $90,000,000—fully one-fourth of our entire home consumption—equivalent to an import of at least 160,000,000 pounds of wool in the form of manufactured goods. In revising the woollen-goods schedule so as to afford adequate protection to our woollen manufacturers and wool growers we have continued the system of compound duties which have proved to be so essential in any tariff which protects wool, providing first for a specific compensatory pound or square yard duty, equivalent to the duty which would be paid on the wool if imported, for the benefit of the wool grower, and an ad valorem duty of from 30 to 50 per cent, according to the proportion of labor required in the manufacture of the several classes of goods, as a protection to the manufacturer against foreign competition, and 10 per cent additional upon ready made clothing for the protection of the clothing manufacturers. . . . In computing the equivalent ad valorem duty on manufactures of woollens, the combinations of both the specific duty, which is simply compensatory for the duty on the wool used, of which the wool grower receives the benefit, and the duty which protects the manufacturers, makes the average resultant rate of the woollen-goods schedule proposed 91.78 per cent."—*Report of the Committee on Ways and Means.*—"Substantially as reported from the Committee on Ways and Means, it [the McKinley Bill] passed the House, after two weeks' debate, May 21 [1890]. The vote was a strictly party one, except that two Republicans voted in the negative. June 19 the bill was reported from the Senate Committee on Finance with a very large number of amendments, mainly in the way of a lessening of rates. After debating the project during nearly the whole of August and a week in September, the Senate passed it by a strict party vote, September 10. The differences between the houses then went to a conference committee. The bill as reported by this committee, September 26, was adopted by the House and Senate on the 27th and 30th respectively and approved by the President October 1. On the final vote three Republicans in each house declined to follow their party. The law went into effect October 6. Prominent features of the new

schedules are as follows: steel rails reduced one-tenth of a cent per lb.; tin plates increased from one cent to two and two-tenths cents per lb., with the proviso that they shall be put on the free list at the end of six years if by that time the domestic product shall not have reached an aggregate equal to one-third of the importations; unmanufactured copper substantially reduced; bar, block and pig tin, hitherto on the free list, receives a duty of four cents per lb. to take effect July 1, 1893, provided that it be restored to the free list if by July 1, 1895, the mines of the United States shall not have produced in one year 5,000 tons; a bounty of one and three-fourths and two cents per lb. upon beet, sorghum, cane or maple sugar produced in the United States between 1891 and 1905; all imports of sugar free up to number 16, Dutch standard, in color and all above that one-half cent per lb. (formerly from three to three and a half cents), with one-tenth cent additional if imported from a country that pays an export bounty; a heavy increase on cigar wrappers and cigars; a general and heavy increase on agricultural products, e. g. on beans, eggs, hay, hops, vegetables and straw; a heavy increase on woolen goods, with a new classification of raw wool designed to give more protection; paintings and statuary reduced from 30 to 15 per cent. The following (among other) additions are made to the free list: beeswax, books and pamphlets printed exclusively in languages other than English, blue clay, coal tar, currants and dates, jute butts and various textile and fibrous grasses, needles, nickel ore, flower and grass seeds and crude sulphur. . . . Among the 464 points of difference between the two houses which the conference committee had to adjust, some of the more important were as follows: paintings and statuary, made free by the House and kept at the old rate by the Senate, were fixed at half the old rate; binding twine, made free by the Senate in favor of Western grain-raisers but taxed by the House to protect Eastern manufacturers, fixed at half the House rate; the limit of free sugar fixed at number 16, as voted by the House, instead of number 13, as passed by the Senate, thus including in the free list the lower grades of refined as well as all raw sugar. The question of reciprocity with American nations was injected into the tariff discussion by Secretary Blaine in June. In transmitting to Congress the recommendation of the International American Conference for improved commercial relations, the secretary dilated upon the importance of securing the markets of central and South America for our products, and suggested as a more speedy way than treaties of reciprocity an amendment to the pending tariff bill authorizing the President to open our ports to the free entry of the products of any American nation which should in turn admit free of taxation our leading agricultural and manufactured products. In July Mr. Blaine took up the idea again in a public correspondence with Senator Frye, criticizing severely the removal of the tariff on sugar, as that on coffee had been removed before, without exacting trade concessions in return. He complained that there was not a section or a line in the bill as it came from the House that would open the market for another bushel of wheat or another barrel of pork. The Senate Finance Committee acted upon the suggestion of the secretary by introducing an amendment to the bill authorizing and directing the President to suspend by proclamation the free introduction of sugar, molasses, coffee, tea and hides from any country which should impose on products of the United States exactions which in view of the free introduction of sugar etc. he should deem reciprocally unequal and unreasonable. The rates at which the President is to demand duties upon the commodities named are duly fixed. This reciprocity provision passed the Senate and the conference committee and became part of the law."—*Political Science Quarterly: Record of Events, Dec.*, 1890.

(United States): A. D. 1894.—The Wilson Act.—Protected interests and the Senate.— Two years after the embodiment of the extremest doctrines of protection in the McKinley Act, the tariff question was submitted again to the people, as the dominant issue between the Republican and Democratic parties, in the presidential and congressional elections of 1892. The verdict of 1888 was then reversed, and tariff reform carried the day. Mr. Cleveland was again elected President, with a Democratic majority in both houses of Congress apparently placed there to sustain his policy. A serious financial situation was manifesting itself in the country at the time he resumed the presidential office, produced by the operation of the silver-purchase law of 1890 (see MONEY AND BANKING: A. D. 1848–1893), and by the extravagance of congressional appropriations, depleting the treasury. It became necessary, therefore, to give attention, first, to the repeal of the mischievous silver law, which was accomplished, November 1, 1893, at a special session of Congress called by the President. That cleared the way for the more serious work of tariff-revision, which was taken up under discouraging circumstances of general depression and extensive collapse in business, throughout the country. "The Democratic members of the House committee on ways and means began during the special session the preparation of a tariff bill. The outcome of their labors was the Wilson Bill, which was laid before the whole committee and made public November 27. On the previous day the sugar schedule was given out, in order to terminate the manipulation of the stock market through false reports as to the committee's conclusions. The characteristic features of the bill, as described in the statement of Chairman Wilson which accompanied it, were as follows: First, the adoption, wherever practicable, of ad valorem instead of specific duties; second, 'the freeing from taxes of those great materials of industry that lie at the basis of production.' Specific duties were held to be objectionable, first, as concealing the true weight of taxation, and second, as bearing unjustly on consumers of commoner articles. Free raw materials were held necessary to the stimulation of industry and the extension of foreign trade. The schedules, as reported, showed in addition to a very extensive increase in the free list, reductions in rates, as compared with the McKinley Bill, on all but a small number of items. The important additions to the free list included iron ore, lumber, coal and wool. Raw sugar was left free, as in the existing law, but the rate on refined sugar was reduced from one-half to one-fourth of a cent per pound, and the bounty was repealed one-eighth per annum until extin-

guished. Some amendments were made in the administrative provisions of the tariff law, designed to soften, as the committee said, features of the McKinley Bill 'that would treat the business of importing as an outlawry, not entitled to the protection of the government.' It was estimated that the reduction of revenue effected would be about $50,000,000, and the committee set to work on an internal revenue bill to make good this deficiency. On January 8 Mr. Wilson brought up the bill in the House, and debate began under a rule calling for a vote on the 29th. During the consideration in committee a number of changes were made in the schedules, the most important being in respect to sugar, where the duty was taken off refined sugars, and the repeal of the bounty was made immediate instead of gradual. A clause was inserted, also, specifically repealing the reciprocity provision of the McKinley Act. The greatest general interest was excited, however, by the progress of the internal revenue bill, the chief feature of which was a proposition for an income tax. The bill, after formulation by the Democratic members of the ways and means committee, was brought before the full committee January 22. Besides the income tax, the measure provided for a stamp duty on playing cards, and raised the excise on distilled spirits to one dollar per gallon. As to incomes, the committee's bill . . . imposed a tax of two per cent on all incomes so far as they were in excess of $4,000, after allowing deductions for taxes, losses not covered by insurance and bad debts. Declarations of income were required from all persons having over $3,500, under heavy penalties for neglect, refusal or fraud in the matter. As to corporations, the same rate was levied on all interest on bonds and on all dividends and all surplus income above dividends, excepting premiums returned to policy holders by mutual life insurance companies, interest to depositors in savings banks, and dividends of building loan associations. . . . The income-tax measure was immediately and very vigorously antagonized by a considerable number of Eastern Democrats, headed by the New York Congressmen. It was adopted by the ways and means committee mainly through Southern and Western votes. On the 24th of January it was reported to the House. A Democratic caucus on the following day resolved by a small majority, against the wish of Mr. Wilson, to attach the measure to the Tariff Bill. Accordingly, the rule regulating the debate was modified to allow discussion of the amendment. The final votes were then taken on February 1. The internal revenue bill was added to the Wilson Bill by 182 to 50, 44 Democrats voting in the minority and most of the Republicans not voting. The measure as amended was then adopted by 204 to 140, 16 Democrats and one Populist going with the Republicans in the negative. In the hands of the Senate finance committee the bill underwent a thorough revision, differences of opinion in the Democratic majority leading to a careful discussion of the measure in a party caucus. The measure as amended was laid before the full committee March 8, and was introduced in the Senate on the 20th. Changes in details were very numerous. The most important consisted in taking sugar, iron ore and coal off the free list and subjecting each to a small duty. Debate on the bill was opened April 2. It was soon discovered, however, that many Democratic senators were seriously dissatisfied with the schedules affecting the industries of their respective states, and at the end of April there was a lull in the debate while the factions of the majority adjusted their differences. A scheme of changes was finally agreed to in caucus on May 3, and laid before the Senate by the finance committee on the 8th. The most important features were a new sugar schedule which had given great trouble, and very numerous changes from ad valorem to specific duties, with a net increase in rates."— *Political Science Quarterly: Record of Political Events, June,* 1894.

—Very soon after the tariff bill appeared in the Senate, it became apparent that the more powerful protected "interests," and conspicuously the "sugar trust" had acquired control, by some means, of several Democratic senators, who were acting obviously in agreement to prevent an honest fulfillment of the pledges of their party, and especially as concerned the free opening of the country to raw materials. Public opinion of the conduct of the senators in question may be judged from the expressions of so dignified an organ of the business world as the "Banker's Magazine," which said in its issue of July, 1894: "Indifference has largely supplanted the hopes of the friends of tariff reform, as well as the fears of the honest advocates of high protection; and disgust, on the part of the people, has taken the place of trust in our Government, at the exposures of the corruption of the Senate by the most unconscionable and greedy Trusts in existence. Hence the indifference of everybody but the Trusts, and their Senatorial attorneys and dummies with 'retainers' or Trust stocks in their pockets; as it is taken for granted that no interests, but those rich and characterless enough to buy 'protection' will be looked after. . . . Nothing will be regarded as finally settled . . . if the Tariff Bill, as emasculated by the Senate, becomes a law; and it may as well be killed by the House, if the Senate refuse to recede; or, vetoed by the President, if it goes to him in its present shape; and let the existing status continue, until the country can get rid of its purchasable Senators and fill their disgraced seats with honest men who cannot be bought up like cattle at so much per head. This is the growing sentiment of business men generally."— H. A. Pierce, *A Review of Finance and Business* (*Banker's Magazine, July,* 1894).—First in committee, and still more in the Senate after the committee had reported, the bill was radically changed in character from that which the House sent up. The profits of the sugar trust were still protected, and coal and iron ore were dropped back from the free list into the schedules of dutiable commodities. According to estimates made, the average rate of duty in the Wilson Bill as it passed the House was 35.52 per cent., and in the bill which passed the Senate it was 37 per cent., as against 49.58 per cent. in the McKinley law. Hence, the general effect of the revision in the Senate, even as manipulated by the senators suspected of corrupt motives, was an extensive lowering of duties. Some very important additions to the free list made by the Wilson Bill were left untouched by the senators — such as wool, lumber and salt. In view of the extent

of the gains acquired, the supporters of tariff-reform in the House, after prolonged attempts in conference committee to break the strength of the combination against free sugar, free coal and free iron ore, were reluctantly prevailed upon to accept the Senate bill. It had passed the Senate on the 3d of July. The struggle in conference committee lasted until the 13th of August, when the House passed the Senate bill unchanged. The President declined to give his signature to the act, but allowed it to become a law. Immediately after the passage of the bill, the House adopted special enactments admitting raw sugar, coal, iron ore, and barbed wire, free of duty; but these bills were not acted on in the Senate.

TARLETON, Colonel, in the War of the American Revolution. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1780 (FEBRUARY—AUGUST); and 1780–1781.

TARPEIAN ROCK, The. See CAPITOLINE HILL.

TARQUIN THE PROUD, The expulsion of. See ROME: B. C. 510.

TARRACONENSIS. See SPAIN: B. C. 218–25.

TARRAGONA: A. D. 1641.—Occupation by the French.—Surrender to the Spaniards. See SPAIN: A. D. 1640–1642.

A. D. 1644.—Siege by the French. See SPAIN: A. D. 1644–1646.

TARSUS. See CILICIA.

TARTAN.—The title of the chief commander—under the king—of the Assyrian armies.

TARTAR DYNASTY OF CHINA, The. See CHINA: A. D. 1294–1882.

TARTARS, OR TATARS.—"The Chinese used the name in a general sense, to include the greater part of their northern neighbours, and it was in imitation of them, probably, that the Europeans applied the name to the various nomade hordes who controlled Central Asia after the Mongol invasion. But the name properly belonged, and is applied by Raschid and other Mongol historians, to certain tribes living in the north-eastern corner of Mongolia, who, as I believe, were partially, at least, of the Tungusic race, and whose descendants are probably to be found among the Solons of Northern Manchuria."—H. H. Howorth, *Hist. of the Mongols, pt.* 1, *p.* 25.—"The name of Tartars, or Tatars, has been variously applied. It was long customary among geographical writers to give this title to the Kalmucs and Mongoles, and even to use it as a distinguishing name for those races of men who resemble the Kalmucs in features, and who have been supposed, whether correctly or not, to be allied to them in descent. Later authors, more accurate in the application of terms, have declared this to be an improper use of the name of Tartar, and by them the appellation has been given exclusively to the tribes of the Great Turkish race, and chiefly to the northern division of it, viz. to the hordes spread through the Russian empire and independent Tartary. . . . Whatever may be the true origin of the name of Tartar, custom has appropriated it to the race of men extensively spread through northern Asia, of whom the Ottoman Turks are a branch. It would, perhaps, be more strictly correct to call all these nations Turks, but the customary appellation may be retained when its meaning is determined."—J. C. Prichard, *Researches into the Physical History of the Races of Mankind, ch.* 5, *sect.* 1 (*v.* 2).—"The populations in question [the remnants, in southern Russia and Siberia, of the great Mongol empire of the Kiptchak], belong to one of three great groups, stocks, or families—the Turk, the Mongol, or the Tungus. When we speak of a Tartar, he belongs to the first, whenever we speak of a Kalmuk, he belongs to the second, of these divisions. It is necessary to insist upon this; because, whatever may be the laxity with which the term Tartar is used, it is, in Russian ethnology at least, a misnomer when applied to a Mongol. It is still worse to call a Turk a Kalmuk."—R. G. Latham, *The Nationalities of Europe, v.* 1, *ch.* 23.—"Tartars (more correctly Tatars, but Tartars is the form generally current), a name given to nearly three million inhabitants of the Russian empire, chiefly Moslem and of Turkish origin. The majority—in European Russia—are remnants of the Mongol invasion of the 13th century, while those who inhabit Siberia are survivals of the once much more numerous Turkish population of the Ural-Altaic region, mixed to some extent with Finnish and Samoyedic stems, as also with Mongols. . . . The ethnographical features of the present Tartar inhabitants of European Russia, as well as their language, show that they contain no admixture (or very little) of Mongolian blood, but belong to the Turkish branch of the Ural-Altaic stock, necessitating the conclusion that only Batu, his warriors, and a limited number of his followers were Mongolians, while the great bulk of the 13th-century invaders were Turks."—P. A. Kropotkine, *Art. "Tartars" Encyclopædia Brit.*

ALSO IN: H. H. Howorth, *Hist. of the Mongols, pt.* 2, *div.* 1, *p.* 37.—See TURKS; and MONGOLS.

TARTESSUS.—"The territory round Gades, Carteia, and the other Phenician settlements in this district [southwestern Spain] was known to the Greeks in the sixth century B. C. by the name of Tartessus, and regarded by them somewhat in the same light as Mexico and Peru appeared to the Spaniards of the sixteenth century."—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece, pt.* 2, *ch.* 18.—This was the rich region known afterwards to the Romans as Bætica, as Turdetania, and in modern times as Andalusia.—E. H. Bunbury, *Hist. of Ancient Geog., ch.* 21, *sect.* 2.

ALSO IN: J. Kenrick, *Phoenicia, ch.* 4, *sect.* 3.

TARUMI, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: CARIBS AND THEIR KINDRED.

TARUSATES, The. See AQUITAINE: THE ANCIENT TRIBES.

TASHKEND, OR TASHKENT, Russian capture of (1865). See RUSSIA: A. D. 1859–1876.

TASMANIA: Discovery and naming. See AUSTRALIA: A. D. 1601–1800.

TATARS. See TARTARS.

TAUBERBISCHOFSHEIM, Battle of. See GERMANY: A. D. 1866.

TAUNTON: A. D. 1685.—The Welcome to Monmouth.—The Maids of Taunton and their flag.—"When Monmouth marched into Taunton [A. D. 1685] it was an eminently prosperous place. . . . The townsmen had long

leaned towards Presbyterian divinity and Whig politics. In the great civil war, Taunton had, through all vicissitudes, adhered to the Parliament, had been twice closely besieged by Goring, and had been twice defended with heroic valour by Robert Blake, afterwards the renowned Admiral of the Commonwealth. Whole streets had been burned down by the mortars and grenades of the Cavaliers. . . . The children of the men who, forty years before, had manned the ramparts of Taunton against the Royalists, now welcomed Monmouth with transports of joy and affection. Every door and window was adorned with wreaths of flowers. No man appeared in the streets without wearing in his hat a green bough, the badge of the popular cause. Damsels of the best families in the town wove colours for the insurgents. One flag in particular was embroidered gorgeously with emblems of royal dignity, and was offered to Monmouth by a train of young girls." After the suppression of Monmouth's rebellion, and while the "bloody Assizes" of Jeffreys were in progress, these little girls were hunted out and imprisoned, and the queen's maids of honor were permitted to extort money from their parents for the buying of their pardon and release.—Lord Macaulay, *Hist. of Eng., ch.* 5.—See, also, ENGLAND: A. D. 1685 (MAY—JULY).

TAURICA, TAURIC CHERSONESE.—The ancient Greek name of the Crimea, derived from the Tauri, a savage people who once inhabited it; "perhaps," says Grote, "a remnant of the expelled Cimmerians." See BOSPHORUS, THE CITY, &c.; and CIMMERIANS.

TAURIS, Naval battle near.—In the Roman civil war between Cæsar and his antagonists an important naval battle was fought, B. C. 47, near the little island of Tauris, on the Illyrian coast. Vatinius, who commanded on the Cæsarian side, defeated Octavius, and drove him out of the Adriatic.—G. Long, *Decline of the Roman Republic, v.* 5, *ch.* 21.

TAVORA PLOT, The. See JESUITS: A. D. 1757–1773.

TAWACONIES, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: PAWNEE (CADDOAN) FAMILY.

TAXIARCH.—PHYLARCH.—"The tribe appears to have been the only military classification known to Athens, and the taxiarch the only tribe officer for infantry, as the phylarch was for cavalry, under the general-in-chief."—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece, pt.* 2, *ch.* 8.

ALSO IN: G. F. Schömann, *Antiq. of Greece: The State, pt.* 3, *ch.* 3.

TAYLOR, General Zachary, The Mexican campaign of. See MEXICO: A. D. 1846–1847. **....Presidential election and administration. —Death.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1848.

TCHERNAYA, Battle of the (1855). See RUSSIA: A. D. 1854–1856.

TCHINOVNIKS.—To keep the vast and complex bureaucratic machine of Russia in motion "it is necessary to have a large and well-drilled army of officials. These are drawn chiefly from the ranks of the noblesse and the clergy, and form a peculiar social class called Tchinovniks, or men with 'Tchins.' As the Tchin plays an important part in Russia, not only in the official world, but also to some extent in social life, it may be well to explain its significance. All officers, civil and military, are, according to a scheme invented by Peter the Great, arranged in fourteen classes or ranks, and to each class or rank a particular name is attached. . . . As a general rule a man must begin at or near the bottom of the official ladder, and he must remain on each step a certain specified time. The step on which he is for the moment standing, or, in other words, the official rank or Tchin which he possesses, determines what offices he is competent to hold. Thus rank or Tchin is a necessary condition for receiving an appointment, but it does not designate any actual office, and the names of the different ranks are extremely apt to mislead a foreigner."—D. M. Wallace, *Russia, ch.* 13.

TCHOUPRIA, Battle of (1804). See BALKAN AND DANUBIAN STATES: 14–19TH CENTURIES (SERVIA).

TEA: Introduction into Europe.—"The Dutch East India Company were the first to introduce it into Europe, and a small quantity came to England from Holland in 1666. The East India Company thereafter ordered their agent at Bantam to send home small quantities, which they wished to introduce as presents, but its price was 60s. per lb., and it was little thought of. Twenty years elapsed before the Company first decided on importing tea, but by degrees it came into general use. In 1712 the imports of tea were only 156,000 lbs.; in 1750 they reached 2,300,000 lbs.; in 1800, 24,000,000 lbs.; in 1830, 30,500,000 lbs., and in 1870, 141,000,000 lbs."—L. Levi, *Hist. of British Commerce, p.* 239.

TEA-PARTY, The Boston. See BOSTON: A. D. 1773.

TEA-ROOM PARTY, The. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1865–1868.

TEARLESS BATTLE, The (B. C. 368). See GREECE: B. C. 371–362.

TECPANECAS, The. See MEXICO: A. D. 1325–1502.

TECTOSAGES. See VOLCÆ.

TECUMSEH, and his Indian League. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1811; and 1812–1813 HARRISON'S NORTHWESTERN CAMPAIGN.

TECUNA, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: GUCK OR COCO GROUP.

TEGYRA, Battle of.—The first important victory won by the Thebans (B. C. 375), in the war which broke the power of Sparta. It was fought in Lokrian territory.—C. Thirlwall, *Hist. of Greece, ch.* 38.

TEHUEL-CHE, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: PATAGONIANS.

TEKKE TURCOMANS, Russian subjugation of. See RUSSIA: A. D. 1869–1881.

TEL EL AMARNA TABLETS, The. See EGYPT: ABOUT B. C. 1500–1400.

TEL EL KEBIR, Battle of (1882). See EGYPT: A. D. 1882–1883.

TELAMON, Battle of (B. C. 225). See ROME: B. C. 295–191.

TELINGAS, The. See TURANIAN RACES.

TELL, William, The Legend of. See SWITZERLAND: THE THREE FOREST CANTONS.

TELMELCHES, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: PAMPAS TRIBES.

TEMENIDÆ, The.—"The history of the Macedonian kingdom is the history of its royal race. The members of this royal house called themselves Temenidæ; i. e. they venerated as their original ancestor the same Temenus who was accounted the founder of the Heraclide dy-

nasty in Peloponnesian Argos."—E. Curtius, *Hist. of Greece, bk.* 7, *ch.* 1 (*v.* 5).

TEMENITES.—One of the suburbs of the ancient city of Syracuse was so-called from the ground sacred to Apollo Temenites which it contained. It afterwards became a part of the city called Neapolis.

TEMESVAR, Battle of (1849). See AUSTRIA: A. D. 1848–1849.

Siege and capture of (1716). See HUNGARY: A. D. 1699–1718.

TEMPE, Vale of. See THESSALY.

TEMPERANCE MOVEMENTS. — Organized movements of temperance reform appear to have had their origin in America. The first known Temperance Society is said to have been formed among the farmers of Litchfield county, Connecticut, in 1789; the next appeared in Saratoga county, New York, in 1808 and 1809. In 1813 a Massachusetts Society for the Suppression of Intemperance was formed. In 1829 the movement was nationalized by the organization of the American Temperance Society. In that year, too, it was taken up in Ireland and Scotland, by societies formed at New Ross, in the former, and at Glasgow, in the latter. The first English society of like kind is reported to have taken form at Bradford, in 1830; but a British and Foreign Temperance Society was organized for general agitation of the subject as early as 1831. In America, the first national temperance convention was held at Philadelphia in 1833. A movement for the absolute suppression of the traffic in ardent spirits was begun in Maine, with Neal Dow among its leaders, as early as 1837. It succeeded after fourteen years in accomplishing its purpose, by the passage of the famous Maine Law, in June, 1851. Stringent legislation to restrain the traffic had already been secured in several other states; but really effective prohibition may be said to have been brought to trial first by the Maine Law. Meantime, many widespread temperance organizations had arisen—the Order of Rechabites in England, in 1835; the Societies of the Washingtonians, for the reclamation of drunkards, at Baltimore, in 1840; the Band of Hope among children, instituted at Leeds, England, in 1847; the Order of Sons of Temperance, formed in New York, in 1842; the Good Templars, in 1851. In 1838, Father Mathew entered on his great temperance mission in Ireland. In 1842, John B. Gough began his career as a temperance lecturer. In 1853, the United Kingdom Alliance, for the suppression of the liquor traffic, was formed in Great Britain. In December, 1873, the Women's Temperance Crusade, by meetings for prayer in saloons, was started in Ohio, and spread through many states. In the same year, the Blue Ribbon temperance mission of Francis Murphy was begun. In 1874, the Woman's National Christian Temperance Union was organized, at a convention held in Cleveland, Ohio.—*Centennial Temperance Volume.*

ALSO IN: D. Burns, *Temperance History*, 2 *v.*

TEMPLARS: A. D. 1118.—The Founding of the Order.—In 1118, nine knights, of whom Hugh de Payens was the principal, took a vow, in the presence of Baldwin I., King of Jerusalem, to be both monks and soldiers, devoting themselves to the protection of the pilgrims who visited the Holy Land. They were given part of the king's palace for residence, and the open space between the palace and the Temple—whence they took the name of Templars. In 1128 Hugh de Payens and others visited Europe and awakened great interest in the Order. "The Templars appeared before the council of Troyes, and gave an account of their order and its objects, which were highly approved of by the fathers. The celebrated Bernard, abbot of Clairvaux, took a lively interest in its welfare, and made some improvements in its rule. A white mantle was assigned as their habit, to which Pope Eugenius some years afterwards added a plain red cross on the left breast; their banner was formed of the black and white striped cloth named Bausćant, which word became their battle-cry, and it bore the humble inscription, 'Not unto us, O Lord, but unto thy name be glory!' Hugh de Payens returned to Syria at the head of three hundred knights of the noblest houses of the West, who had become members of the order."—T. Keightley, *The Crusaders, ch.* 2.

ALSO IN: J. A. Froude, *The Spanish Story of the Armada and other Essays, ch.* 4.

A. D. 1185-1313.—The Order in England and elsewhere.—"The Knights Templars first established the chief house of their order in England, without Holborn Bars [London] on the south side of the street, where Southampton House formerly stood; . . .but when the order had greatly increased in numbers, power, and wealth, and had somewhat departed from its original purity and simplicity, we find that the superior and the knights resident in London began to look abroad for a more extensive and commodious place of habitation. They purchased a large space of ground, extending from the White Friars westward to Essex House without Temple Bar, and commenced the erection of a convent on a scale of grandeur commensurate with the dignity and importance of the chief house of the great religio-military society of the Temple in Britain. It was called the New Temple, to distinguish it from the original establishment at Holborn, which came thenceforth to be known by the name of the Old Temple. . . [In 1185] Geoffrey, the superior of the order in England, caused an inquisition to be made of the lands of the Templars, . . . and the amount of all kinds of property possessed by the Templars in England at that period is astonishing. . . . The annual income of the order in Europe has been roughly estimated at six millions sterling! According to Matthew Paris, the Templars possessed nine thousand manors or lordships in Christendom, besides a large revenue and immense riches arising from the constant charitable bequests and donations of sums of money from pious persons. . . . The Templars, in addition to their amazing wealth, enjoyed vast privileges and immunities."—C. G. Addison, *The Knights Templars, ch.* 3.—When the order of the Templars was suppressed and its property confiscated, the convent and church of the Temple in London were granted by the king, first, in 1313, to Aymer de Valence, Earl of Pembroke; afterwards, successively, to the Duke of Lancaster and to Hugh le Despenser. "The Temple then came for a short time into the hands of the Knights Hospitallers, and during the reign of

Edward III. it seems to have been occupied by the lawyers, as tenants under the Hospitallers. When that order was dissolved by Henry VIII., the property passed into the hands of the Crown, the lawyers still holding possession as tenants. This continued till the reign of James I., when a petition was drawn up and presented to the king asking him to assign the property to the legal body in permanence. This was accordingly done by letters patent, in A. D. 1609, and the Benchers of the Inner and Middle Temple received possession of the buildings, on consideration of a small annual payment to the Crown."—F. C. Woodhouse, *Military Religious Orders, pt. 2, ch. 7.*—"Many of the old retainers of the Temple became servants of the new lawyers, who had ousted their masters. . . . The dining in pairs, the expulsion from hall for misconduct, and the locking out of chambers were old customs also kept up. The judges of Common Pleas retained the title of knight, and the Fratres Servientes of the Templars arose again in the character of learned serjeants-at-law, the coif of the modern serjeant being the linen coif of the old Freres Serjens of the Temple."—W. Thornbury, *Old and New London, v. 1, ch. 14.*

Also in: C. G. Addison, *The Knights Templars, ch. 7.*

A. D. 1299.—Their last campaign in Palestine. See Crusades: A. D. 1299.

A. D. 1307-1314.—The prosecution and destruction of the order.—"When the Holy Land fell completely into Mahomedan hands on the loss of Acre in 1291 [see Jerusalem: A. D. 1291] they [the Templars] abandoned the hopeless task and settled in Cyprus. By the end of the thirteenth century they had almost all returned to Europe. They were peculiarly strong and wealthy in France — the strength and wealth were alike dangerous to them. In Paris they built their fortress, the Temple, over against the King's palace of the Louvre; and in that stronghold the King himself had once to take refuge from the angry Parisian mob, exasperated by his heavy extortions. During the life and death struggle with the Papacy, the order had not taken the side of the Church against the sovereign; for their wealth had held them down. Philip [Philip IV], however, knew no gratitude, and they were doomed. A powerful and secret society endangered the safety of the state: their wealth was a sore temptation: there was no lack of rumours. Dark tales came out respecting the habits of the order; tales exaggerated and blackened by the diseased imagination of the age. Popular proverbs, those ominous straws of public opinion, were heard in different lands, hinting at dark vices and crimes. Doubtless the vows of the order, imposed on unruly natures, led to grievous sins against the first laws of moral life. And there was more than this: there were strange rumours of horrible infidelity and blasphemy; and men were prepared to believe everything. So no one seemed to be amazed when, in October, 1307, the King made a sudden coup d'état, arrested all the Templars in France on the same day, and seized their goods. The Temple at Paris with the Grand Master fell into his hands. Their property was presently placed in the custody of the Pope's nuncios in France; the knights were kept in dark and dismal prisons. Their trial was long and tedious. Two hundred and thirty-one knights were examined, with all the brutality that examination then meant; the Pope also took the depositions of more than seventy. From these examinations what can we learn? All means were used: some were tortured, others threatened, others tempted with promises of immunity. They made confession accordingly; and the ghastly catalogue of their professed ill-doings may be read in the history of the trial. Who shall say what truth there was in it all? Probably little or none. Many confessed and then recanted their confession. The golden image with eyes of glowing carbuncle which they worshipped; the trampling and spitting on the crucifix; the names of Galla and Baphomet; the hideous practices of the initiation;—all these things pass before us, in the dim uncertainty, like some horrible procession of the vices in hell. What the truth was will never be known. . . . The knights made a dignified defence in these last moments of their history; they did not flinch either at the terrible prospect before them, or through memory of the tortures which they had undergone. Public opinion, in and out of France, began to stir against the barbarous treatment they had received; they were no longer proud and wealthy princes, but suffering martyrs, showing bravery and a firm front against the cruelties of the King and his lawyers. Marigni, Philip's minister and friend, and the King himself, were embarrassed by the number and firmness of their victims, by the sight of Europe looking aghast, by the murmurs of the people. Marigni suggested that men who had confessed and recanted might be treated as relapsed heretics, such being the law of the Inquisition, (what irony was here!) and accordingly in 1310 an enclosure was made at Paris, within which fifty-nine Templars perished miserably by fire. Others were burnt later at Senlis. . . . The King and Pope worked on the feeble Council, until in March 1312 the abolition of the order was formally decreed; and its chief property, its lands and buildings, were given over to the Knights of St. John, to be used for the recovery of the Holy Land; 'which thing,' says the Supplementor to William of Nangis, 'came not to pass, but rather the endowment did but make them worse than before.' The chief part of the spoil, as might be well believed, never left the King's hands. One more tragedy, and then all was over. The four heads of the order were still at Paris, prisoners —Jacques de Molai, Grand Master; Guy of Auvergne, the Master of Normandy, and two more. The Pope had reserved their fate in his own hands, and sent a commission to Paris, who were enjoined once more to hear the confession of these dignitaries, and then to condemn them to perpetual captivity. But at the last moment the Grand Master and Guy publicly retracted their forced confessions, and declared themselves and the order guiltless of all the abominable charges laid against them. Philip was filled with devouring rage. Without further trial or judgment he ordered them to be led that night to the island in the Seine; there they were fastened to the stake and burnt."—G. W. Kitchin, *Hist. of France, v. 1, bk. 3, ch. 10, sect. 3.*—In England, a similar prosecution of the Templars, instigated by the pope, was commenced in January, 1308, when the chiefs of the order were seized and imprisoned and subjected to examination with torture. The result was the dissolution of the order and the confiscation of its property;

but none of the knights were executed, though some died in prison from the effects of their barbarous treatment. "The property of the Templars in England was placed under the charge of a commission at the time that proceedings were commenced against them, and the king very soon treated it as if it were his own, giving away manors and convents at his pleasure. A great part of the possessions of the Order was subsequently made over to the Hospitallers. . . . Some of the surviving Templars retired to monasteries, others returned to the world, and assumed secular habits, for which they incurred the censures of the Pope. . . . In Spain, Portugal, and Germany, proceedings were taken against the Order; their property was confiscated, and in some cases torture was used; but it is remarkable that it was only in France, and those places where Philip's influence was powerful, that any Templar was actually put to death."—F. C. Woodhouse, *Military Religious Orders, pt.* 2, *ch.* 6–7 *and* 5.

Also in: C. G. Addison, *The Knights Templars, ch.* 7.—J. Michelet, *Hist. of France, bk.* 5, *ch.* 3.—H. H. Milman, *Hist. of Latin Christianity, bk.* 12, *ch.* 1–2 (*v.* 5).

TEMPLE, The (London). See Templars: A. D. 1185–1313.

TEMPLE OF CONCORD AT ROME, The.—After the long contest in Rome over the Licinian Laws, which were adopted B. C. 367, M. Furius Camillus—the great Camillus—being made Dictator for the fifth time, in his eightieth year, brought about peace between the patricians and plebeians, in commemoration of which he vowed a temple to Concord. "Before he could dedicate it, the old hero died. The temple, however, was built according to his design; its site, now one of the best known among those of ancient Rome, can still be traced with great certainty at the north-western angle of the Forum, immediately under the Capitoline. The building was restored with great magnificence by the Emperor Tiberius; and it deserved to be so, for it commemorated one of the greatest events of Roman history."—H. G. Liddell, *Hist. of Rome, bk.* 2, *ch.* 15 (*v.* 1).

TEMPLE OF DIANA. See Ephesus.

TEMPLE OF JANUS, The.—"The Temple of Janus was one of the earliest buildings of Rome, founded, according to Livy (i. 19.) by Numa. It stood near the Curia, on the north-east side of the Forum, at the verge of a district called the Argiletum. . . . [It was] a small 'ædicula' or shrine, which towards the end of the Republic, or perhaps earlier, was of bronze. It is shown with much minuteness on a First Brass of Nero as a small cella, without columns, but with richly ornamented frieze and cornice. Its doors were closed on those rare occasions when Rome was at peace with all the world. From the time of its traditional founder, Numa, to that of Livy, it was only twice shut—once after the first Punic War, and secondly after the victory of Augustus at Actium. . . . It contained a very ancient statue, probably by an Etruscan artist, of the doublefaced Janus Bifrons, or Geminus. . . . The Temple of Janus gave its name to this part of the edge of the Forum, and from the numerous shops of the argentarii or bankers and money-lenders which were there, the word Janus came to mean the usurers' quarter."—J. H. Middleton, *Ancient Rome in* 1885, *ch.* 5.—The Temple of Janus was closed, once more, by Vespasian, after the destruction of Jerusalem and the ending of the war in Judea, A. D. 71. "It had stood open since the German wars of the first princeps [Augustus]; or, according to the computation of the christian Orosius, from the birth of Christ to the overthrow of the Jewish people: for the senate had refused to sanction Nero's caprice in closing it on his precarious accommodation with Parthia. Never before had this solemn act addressed the feelings of the citizens so directly. . . . The Peace of Vespasian was celebrated by a new bevy of poets and historians not less loudly than the Peace of Augustus. A new era of happiness and prosperity was not less passionately predicted."—C. Merivale, *Hist. of the Romans, ch.* 60.

TEMPLE OF SOLOMON, The.—"As soon as David had given to his people the boon of a unique capital, nothing could be more natural than the wish to add sacredness to the glory of the capital by making it the centre of the national worship. According to the Chronicles, David . . . had made unheard-of preparations to build a house for God. But it had been decreed unfit that the sanctuary should be built by a man whose hands were red with the blood of many wars, and he had received the promise that the great work should be accomplished by his son. Into that work Solomon threw himself with hearty zeal in the month Zif of the fourth year of his reign, when his kingdom was consolidated. . . . He inherited the friendship which David had enjoyed, with Hiram, King of Tyre. . . . The friendliest overtures passed between the two kings in letters, to which Josephus appeals as still extant. A commercial treaty was made by which Solomon engaged to furnish the Tyrian king with annual revenues of wheat, barley, and oil, and Hiram put at Solomon's disposal the skilled labour of an army of Sidonian wood-cutters and artisans. . . . Some writers have tried to minimise Solomon's work as a builder, and have spoken of the Temple as an exceedingly insignificant structure which would not stand a moment's comparison with the smallest and humblest of our own cathedrals. Insignificant in size it certainly was, but we must not forget its costly splendour, the remote age in which the work was achieved, and the truly stupendous constructions which the design required. Mount Moriah was selected as a site hallowed by the tradition of Abraham's sacrifice, and more recently by David's vision of the Angel of the Pestilence with his drawn sword on the threshing-floor of the Jebusite Prince Araunah. But to utilise this doubly consecrated area involved almost superhuman difficulties, which would have been avoided if the loftier but less suitable height of the Mount of Olives could have been chosen. The rugged summit had to be enlarged to a space of 500 yards square, and this level was supported by Cyclopean walls, which have long been the wonder of the world. . . . The caverns, quarries, water storages, and subterranean conduits hewn out of the solid rock, over which Jerusalem is built, could only have been constructed at the cost of immeasurable toil. . . . It was perhaps from his Egyptian father-in-law that Solomon, to his own cost, learnt the secret of forced labour which alone rendered such undertakings possible. . . . Four classes were

subject to it. 1. The lightest labour was required from the native freeborn Israelites (ezrach). They were not regarded as bondsmen, . . . yet 30,000 of these were required in relays of 10,000 to work, one month in every three, in the forest of Lebanon. 2. There were the strangers, or resident aliens (Gerim), such as the Phœnicians and Giblites, who were Hiram's subjects and worked for pay. 3. There were three classes of slaves — those taken in war, or sold for debt, or home-born. 4. Lowest and most wretched of all, there were the vassal Canaanites (Toshabim), from whom were drawn those 70,000 burden-bearers, and 80,000 quarry-men, the Helots of Palestine, who were placed under the charge of 3,600 Israelite officers. The blotches of smoke are still visible on the walls and roofs of the subterranean quarries where these poor serfs, in the dim torchlight and suffocating air, 'laboured without reward, perished without pity, and suffered without redress.' The sad narrative reveals to us, and modern research confirms, that the purple of Solomon had a very seamy side, and that an abyss of misery heaved and moaned under the glittering surface of his splendour. . . . Apart from the lavish costliness of its materials the actual Temple was architecturally a poor and commonplace structure. It was quite small —only 90 feet long, 35 feet broad, and 45 feet high. It was meant for the symbolic habitation of God, not for the worship of great congregations. . . . Of the external aspect of the building in Solomon's day we know nothing. We cannot even tell whether it had one level roof, or whether the Holy of Holies was like a lower chancel at the end of it; nor whether the roof was flat or, as the Rabbis say, ridged; nor whether the outer surface of the three-storied chambers which surrounded it was of stone, or planked with cedar, or overlaid with plinths of gold and silver; nor whether, in any case, it was ornamented with carvings or left blank; nor whether the cornices only were decorated with open flowers like the Assyrian rosettes. Nor do we know with certainty whether it was supported within by pillars or not. . . . It required the toil of 300,000 men for twenty years to build one of the pyramids. It took two hundred years to build and four hundred to embellish the great Temple of Artemis of the Ephesians. It took more than five centuries to give to Westminster Abbey its present form. Solomon's Temple only took seven and a half years to build; but . . . its objects were wholly different from those of the great shrines which we have mentioned. . . . Needing but little repair, it stood for more than four centuries. Succeeded as it was by the Temples of Zerubbabel and of Herod, it carried down till seventy years after the Christian era the memory of the Tabernacle in the wilderness, of which it preserved the general outline, though it exactly doubled all the proportions and admitted many innovations."— F. W. Farrar, *The First Book of Kings, ch.* 14 (*Expositor's Bible*).

TEN, The Council of. See Venice: A. D. 1032–1319.

TEN THOUSAND, The Retreat of the. See Persia: B. C. 401–400.

TEN TRIBES OF ISRAEL, The. See Jews: The Kingdoms of Israel and Judah.

TEN YEARS WAR, The.— The long conflict between Athens and her confederated enemies, Sparta at the head, which is usually called the Peloponnesian War, was divided into two periods by the Peace of Nicias. The war in the first period, covering a decade, was known as the Ten Years War; though the Peloponnesians called it the Attic War.— E. Curtius, *Hist. of Greece, bk.* 4, *ch.* 2.—See Athens: B. C. 421.

TENANT RIGHT, The Ulster.—The Tenant League. See Ireland: A. D. 1848–1852.

TENCHEBRAY, Battle of (1106). See England: A. D. 1087–1135.

TENCTHERI, The. See Usipetes.

TENEDOS. See Troja; and Asia Minor: The Greek Colonies.

TENEZ, The. See American Aborigines: Zapotecs, etc.

TENNESSEE: The aboriginal inhabitants. See American Aborigines: Shawanese, and Cherokees.

A. D. 1629. — Embraced in the Carolina grant to Sir Robert Heath. See America: A. D. 1629.

A. D. 1663. — Embraced in the Carolina grant to Monk, Shaftesbury and others. See North Carolina: A. D. 1663–1670.

A. D. 1748.—First English exploration from Virginia. See Ohio (Valley): A. D. 1748–1754.

A. D. 1768.—The Treaty with the Six Nations at Fort Stanwix.—Pretended cession of country south of the Ohio. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1765–1768.

A. D. 1769-1772.—The first settlers in the eastern valley.—The Watauga commonwealth and its constitution.—"Soon after the successful ending of the last colonial struggle with France, and the conquest of Canada, the British king issued a proclamation forbidding the English colonists from trespassing on Indian grounds, or moving west of the mountains [see Northwest Territory of the U. S.: A. D. 1763]. But in 1768, at the treaty of Fort Stanwix, the Six Nations agreed to surrender to the English all the lands lying between the Ohio and the Tennessee [see United States of Am.: A. D. 1765-1768]; and this treaty was at once seized upon by the backwoodsmen as offering an excuse for settling beyond the mountains. However, the Iroquois had ceded lands to which they had no more right than a score or more other Indian tribes. . . . The great hunting-grounds between the Ohio and the Tennessee formed a debatable land, claimed by every tribe that could hold its own against its rivals. The eastern part of what is now Tennessee consists of a great hill-strewn, forest-clad valley, running from northeast to southwest, bounded on one side by the Cumberland, and on the other by the Great Smoky and Unaka Mountains; the latter separating it from North Carolina. In this valley arise and end the Clinch, the Holston, the Watauga, the Nolichucky, the French Broad, and the other streams, whose combined volume makes the Tennessee River. The upper end of the valley lies in southwestern Virginia, the headwaters of some of the rivers being well within that State; and though the province was really part of North Carolina, it was separated therefrom by high mountain chains, while from Virginia it was easy to follow the watercourses down the valley. Thus, as elsewhere among the mountains forming the western frontier, the first

movements of population went parallel with, rather than across, the ranges. As in western Virginia the first settlers came, for the most part, from Pennsylvania, so, in turn, in what was then western North Carolina, and is now eastern Tennessee, the first settlers came mainly from Virginia, and, indeed, in great part, from this same Pennsylvanian stock. Of course, in each case there was also a very considerable movement directly westward. They were a sturdy race, enterprising and intelligent, fond of the strong excitement inherent in the adventurous frontier life. Their untamed and turbulent passions, and the lawless freedom of their lives, made them a population very productive of wild, headstrong characters; yet, as a whole, they were a God-fearing race, as was but natural in those who sprang from the loins of the Irish Calvinists. Their preachers, all Presbyterians, followed close behind the first settlers and shared their toil and dangers. . . . In 1769, the year that Boon first went to Kentucky, the first permanent settlers came to the banks of the Watauga, the settlement being merely an enlargement of the Virginia settlement, which had for a short time existed on the head-waters of the Holston, especially near Wolf Hills. At first the settlers thought they were still in the domain of Virginia, for at that time the line marking her southern boundary had not been run so far west. . . . But in 1771, one of the new-comers, who was a practical surveyor, ran out the Virginia boundary line some distance to the westward, and discovered that the Watauga settlement came within the limits of North Carolina. Hitherto the settlers had supposed that they themselves were governed by the Virginian law, and that their rights as against the Indians were guaranteed by the Virginian government; but this discovery threw them back upon their own resources. They suddenly found themselves obliged to organize a civil government. . . . About the time that the Watauga commonwealth was founded, the troubles in North Carolina came to a head. Open war ensued between the adherents of the royal governor, Tryon, on the one hand, and the Regulators, as the insurgents styled themselves, on the other, the struggle ending with the overthrow of the Regulators at the battle of Alamance [see NORTH CAROLINA: A. D. 1766–1771]. As a consequence of these troubles, many people from the back counties of North Carolina crossed the mountains, and took up their abode among the pioneers on the Watauga and upper Holston; the beautiful valley of the Nolichucky soon receiving its share of this stream of immigration. Among the first comers were many members of the class of desperate adventurers always to be found hanging round the outskirts of frontier civilization. . . . But the bulk of the settlers were men of sterling worth; fit to be the pioneer fathers of a mighty and beautiful state. . . . Such were the settlers of the Watauga, the founders of the commonwealth that grew into the State of Tennessee, who early in 1772 decided that they must form some kind of government that would put down wrong-doing and work equity between man and man. Two of their number already towered head and shoulders above the rest in importance and merit especial mention; for they were destined for the next thirty years to play the chief parts in the history of that portion of the Southwest which largely through their own efforts became the State of Tennessee. These two men, neither of them yet thirty years of age, were John Sevier and James Robertson. . . . With their characteristic capacity for combination, so striking as existing together with the equally characteristic capacity for individual self-help, the settlers determined to organize a government of their own. They promptly put their resolution into effect early in the spring of 1772, Robertson being apparently the leader in the movement. They decided to adopt written articles of agreement, by which their conduct should be governed; and these were known as the Articles of the Watauga Association. They formed a written constitution, the first ever adopted west of the mountains, or by a community composed of American-born freemen. It is this fact of the early independence and self-government of the settlers along the head-waters of the Tennessee that gives to their history its peculiar importance. They were the first men of American birth to establish a free and independent community on the continent. . . . The first step taken by the Watauga settlers, when they had determined to organize, was to meet in general convention, holding a kind of folk-thing, akin to the New England town-meeting. They then elected a representative assembly, a small parliament or 'witanagemot,' which met at Robertson's station. Apparently the freemen of each little fort or palisaded village, each block-house that was the centre of a group of detached cabins and clearings, sent a member to this first frontier legislature. It consisted of thirteen representatives, who proceeded to elect from their number five—among them Sevier and Robertson—to form a committee or court, which should carry on the actual business of government, and should exercise both judicial and executive functions. This court had a clerk and a sheriff, or executive officer, who respectively recorded and enforced their decrees. . . . In fact, the dwellers, in this little outlying frontier commonwealth, exercised the rights of full statehood for a number of years; establishing in true American style a purely democratic government with representative institutions."— T. Roosevelt, *The Winning of the West, v.* 1, *ch.* 7.

ALSO IN: E. Kirke (pseud. J. R. Gilmore), *The Rear-Guard of the Revolution, ch.* 2–6.—J. Phelan, *Hist. of Tennessee, ch.* 1–3.

A. D. 1776-1784. — Annexation to North Carolina.—Cession by that state to the Congress of the Confederation.—Consequent revolt.—Repeal of the act of cession.—"The Watauga people had hopes, when the articles of association were adopted, of being able eventually to form an independent government, governed as the older colonies were governed, by royal governors. When the disagreements between the colonies and the mother country arose, they modified their views to the new order of things, and regarded themselves as a distinct though as yet inchoate state. But their weakness . . . rendered the protection of some more powerful state necessary for their welfare. . . . They petitioned North Carolina for annexation in 1776. Their petition was granted. . . . The provincial congress of North Carolina met at Halifax in November, 1776, and [Robertson, Sevier and two others] were delegates from Washington District, Watauga settlement. . . . After

the annexation of the Washington District the old form of government was allowed to stand until the spring of 1777. . . . In November of this year, 1777, the District of Washington became Washington County. . . . From 1777 until the disturbances of eight years later, the history of Tennessee was a part of the history of North Carolina. . . . The part played by the inhabitants of Tennessee in the war for independence was active, and in one instance [at King's Mountain] decisive. Their operations were chiefly of a desultory, guerrilla kind, under the leadership of Sevier . . . and Shelby." Sevier was also the leader in wars with the Indians, which were carried on with unsparing fierceness on both sides. "In the April session of 1784, the General Assembly of North Carolina, in accordance with the recommendation of Congress itself, as well as with the dictates of a far-seeing and enlightened statesmanship, imitated the example of Virginia and New York [see UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1781–1786], and ceded to the United States all the territory which is now the State of Tennessee. This of course included all the settlements. The condition of the cession was its acceptance by Congress within two years. Until Congress should have accepted the ceded territory, the jurisdiction of North Carolina over it was to remain in every respect the same as heretofore. . . . When the question of cession was first broached, it was accepted by the four representatives of the western counties at Hillsboro, as well as by those who proposed it, as the natural and legitimate solution of a complex problem. No one apparently dreamed of opposition on the part of the settlers themselves. . . . There is no reason to think that the Watauga people had any objection to the cession. . . . The objection was against the manner of the cession and its conditions. . . . The main cause of complaint was that North Carolina had left them without any form of government for two years. . . . A storm of indignation swept through the entire settlement. . . . The people regarded themselves without government, and, true to the traditions of their race, they sought the solution of the difficulty in their own resources. . . . It is one of the noteworthy facts in the history of institutions that the possessors of English tradition always begin with the first primal germ of local self-government at hand, be it court leet, court of quarter sessions, township, county, school district, or military company, and build upward. The Watauga people had nothing so convenient as the militia companies, and they began with them as representing a more minutely varied constituency than the county court. Each company elected two representatives, and the representatives so elected in each county formed themselves into a committee, and the three committees of Washington, Sullivan, and Greene counties met as a kind of impromptu or temporary legislature, and decided to call a general convention to be elected by the people of the different counties. This convention met on the 23d of August, 1784, at Jonesboro. John Sevier was elected president, and Landon Carter secretary. . . . It is supposed that the convention which met at Jonesboro adopted the resolution to form a 'separate and distinct State, independent of the State of North Carolina.' . . . Provision was made for the calling of a future convention in which representation was to be according to companies. . . . The meeting adjourned, having fairly inaugurated the contest with North Carolina, which still claimed jurisdiction." Soon afterward the legislature of North Carolina repealed the act of cession, and "for a time it was supposed that this would terminate the agitation in favor of a new State." —J. Phelan, *Hist. of Tennessee, ch.* 5–10.

ALSO IN: J. R. Gilmore, *John Sevier as a Commonwealth Builder, ch.* 2.—J. G. M. Ramsey, *Annals of Tennessee, ch.* 3.

A. D. 1780.—The Battle of King's Mountain. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1780–1781.

A. D. 1785.—The organization of the State of Franklin.—"Toward the close of May [1785] the western lands being again under discussion [in Congress], a resolution was carried urging North Carolina to reconsider her act of the previous November, and once more cede to Congress her possessions beyond the mountains. Had the request been granted, there can be no doubt the measure would have speedily brought peace and quiet to that distracted region. But North Carolina was too intent on bringing her rebellious subjects to terms to think for a moment of bestowing them with their lands and goods on Congress. Indeed, when the news of the request was carried into the district some months later, the malcontents expressed much surprise. They could not, they said, understand why Congress should apply to North Carolina; North Carolina had nothing to do with them. The parent State had, by her act of 1784, given them away. Congress did not take them under its protection. They belonged, therefore, to nobody, and while in this condition had called a convention, had framed a constitution, had formed a new State, had chosen for it a name, and elected a Legislature which was actually in session at the time the act of the 23d of May was passed. . . . Much of what they stated was strictly true. The delegates to the second convention had assembled early in 1785. These had given the State the name of Franklin, and had drawn up a constitution which they submitted to the people. It was expected that the men of the district would consider it carefully, and select delegates to a third convention, which should have full power to ratify or reject. The place fixed upon for the meeting of the convention was Greenville. But as there was then no printing-press nearer than Charleston or Richmond, and as much time must elapse before the constitution could become known to all, the delegates were not to convene till the 14th of November. Meanwhile the Legislature was to organize. Elections were held without delay; members were chosen after the manner in which the settlers had long been accustomed to elect representatives to the Assembly of the parent State, and these, meeting at Jonesboro, conducted their business with so much dispatch that on the last day of March they adjourned. Many acts were passed by them. But one alone excited general comment, and was the cause of unbounded merriment across the mountains. A list of articles at that time scarce to be met with in the State of Franklin would be a long one. But there would be no article in the list less plentiful than money. . . . When, therefore, the Legislature came to determine what should be the legal currency of the State, it most wisely contented itself with fixing the value of

such articles as had, from time immemorial, been used as money. One pound of sugar, the law said, should pass for a shilling-piece; the skin of a raccoon or a fox for a shilling and threepence. A gallon of rye whiskey, it was thought, was worth twice that sum, while a gallon of peach-brandy or a yard of good nine hundred flax linen was each to pass for a three-shilling piece. Some difficulty was met with in selecting articles that could be easily carried from place to place and expressive of large values. It was, however, finally determined that a clean beaver-skin, an otter- or a deer-skin, should each of them be the representative of six shillings. In this kind of money, the law further prescribed, the salary of every officer of the State, from the Governor down to the hangman, was to be paid. When this act became known in the East the wits were greatly amused. . . . In the belief that the new money could not be counterfeited they were much mistaken. Many bundles of what seemed to be otter-skins were soon passing about, which, on being opened, were found to be skins of raccoons with tails of otters sewed to them. . . . The name of the State has often been asserted to be Frankland, the land of the Franks, or Freemen. . . . But letters are extant from high officials of the State to Benjamin Franklin declaring that it was named after him."—J. B. McMaster, *Hist. of the People of the U. S., v.* 1, *ch.* 3, *with foot-note.*

Also in: J. G. M. Ramsey, *Annals of Tennessee, ch.* 4.

A. D. 1785-1796.—The troubled history and the fall of the state of Franklin.—The rise of the state of Tennessee.— On receiving news of the organization of the independent state of Franklin, Governor Martin, of North Carolina, issued a proclamation which was skilfully addressed to the cooler judgment of the mountaineers and which "was not without its effect." But, although the adherents of North Carolina "gradually gained ground in the new commonwealth, a majority still clung to Sevier, and refused to recognize any government but the one they themselves had organized. In this opposition of parties, disorders sprang up which presently degenerated into lawlessness. Both governments claimed jurisdiction, and both sought to exercise it. The consequence was that both became inefficient. Party quarrels ensued; old friends became enemies; Tipton and his followers openly supported the claims of North Carolina; Sevier sought to maintain his authority as the executive officer of Franklin. This antagonistic spirit led to the commission of various outrages. . . . But in the midst of these inglorious quarrels, Governor Sevier did not neglect to defend from Indian aggressions the state over which he had been called to preside. . . . He was far less successful, however, in giving peace to the distracted state of Franklin. The continuance of intestine dissensions, and the nice balance of parties which took place in 1787, induced the people to refuse to pay taxes either to North Carolina or to the local government, until the supremacy of one or the other should be more generally acknowledged. In this state of affairs, with his government tottering to its downfall, Sevier earnestly appealed to North Carolina for a ratification of the independence of the state of Franklin, and to Franklin himself, and the governors of Georgia and Virginia, for counsel and assistance. Disappointed on all sides, he finally rested for support upon his immediate friends, conscious of the rectitude of his own intentions. . . . But the people were already weary of a feud which threatened, at every fresh outbreak, to end in bloodshed. In 1787 the last legislature of the state of Franklin held its session at Greenville. . . . The conciliatory measures of North Carolina presently disarmed the malecontents of all further arguments for opposing the reunion; and in February, 1788, the state of Franklin ceased to exist." Fierce conflicts between Sevier and Tipton and their hotter partisans still continued for some time; until, in October, Sevier was arrested for high treason and imprisoned at Morgantown. He escaped soon after, through the aid of his sons, was elected to the North Carolina senate, and was permitted to qualify for the seat on renewing his oath of allegiance. "His services were remembered and his faults forgotten." Meantime, settlements on the Cumberland, founded in 1779 by James Robertson, had prospered and grown strong, and Nashville, the chief among them, assumed its name in 1784, "in commemoration of the patriotic services of Colonel Francis Nash," of North Carolina, who fell in the battle of Germantown. In 1790, after ratifying the Federal Constitution, North Carolina, re-enacted the cession of her western territory, coinciding with the present state of Tennessee, to the United States, stipulating "that no regulation made or to be made by Congress shall tend to the emancipation of slaves." The "Territory southwest of the Ohio" was then organized, with William Blount for governor. Six years later (January, 1796), the population of the Territory having been ascertained by a census to be 67,000 free white inhabitants and 10,000 slaves, a constitution was adopted, the State of Tennessee was formed, with John Sevier for Governor, and, after some opposition in Congress, it was formally admitted to its place and rank as one of the United States of America. Its first Representative in the House was Andrew Jackson.— W. H. Carpenter, *Hist. of Tennessee, ch.* 13–17.

Also in: J. R. Gilmore, *John Sevier as a Commonwealth-Builder, ch.* 4–12.

A. D. 1785-1800.—The question of the Free Navigation of the Mississippi.— Discontent of the settlers and intrigues among them. See Louisiana: A. D. 1785–1800.

A. D. 1813-1814. — The Creek War. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1813–1814 (August — April).

A. D. 1861 (January—May).— The mode in which the state was dragged into Rebellion.— "The Legislature of Tennessee met on the 6th of January. On the 12th, a bill for the calling of a state convention [with the object of following the lead, in secession, which South Carolina had taken on the 20th of December — See United States of Am.: A. D. 1860 (October — December)] was passed. It was passed subject to the approval of the voters. The election took place on the 8th day of February. The people voted against holding a convention by 67,360, to 54,156. In disregard of this vote of the people, however, the legislature, on May 1st, passed a joint resolution authorizing the governor to enter into a military league with the Confederate States. The league was formed. The Governor,

Isham G. Harris, sent a message to the legislature, announcing the fact. He stated its terms. . . . It stipulated that until the state should become a member of the Confederacy, 'the whole military force and military operations, offensive and defensive, of said state, in the impending conflict with the United States, shall be under the chief control and direction of the President of the Confederate States.' It was also agreed that the state would, as soon as it should join the Confederacy, turn over all public property it might acquire from the United States. The legislature ratified the league by decided majorities of both branches. These final proceedings took place on the 7th day of May. On the preceding day, the legislature put forth a declaration of independence. It was submitted to the votes of the people for ratification. This document waives the right of secession, as follows: 'We, the people of the State of Tennessee, waiving an expression of opinion as to the abstract doctrine of secession, but asserting the right, as a free and independent people,' declare that all the laws and ordinances by which Tennessee became a member of the Federal Union, 'are hereby abrogated.' The vote for separation was declared by the governor to be 104,019 for, and 47,238 against that measure. It thus appears that the Legislature of Tennessee, in declaring the separation of the state from the Federal Union, placed its action upon the ground of a revolutionary right, which all admit to be inalienable, if the cause be just."—S. S. Cox, *Three Decades of Federal Legislation, ch.* 6.

Also in: F. Moore, ed., *Rebellion Record, v.* 1, *doc.* 201–205.—O. J. Victor, *Hist. of the Southern Rebellion, div.* 4, *ch.* 11 (*v.* 2).

A. D. 1861 (April).—Governor Harris' reply to President Lincoln's call for troops. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1861 (April).

A. D. 1861 (June).—The loyalty of East Tennessee and its resistance to Secession.—"For separation and representation at Richmond, East Tennessee gave [at the election, June 8, when the question of secession was nominally submitted to the people, the state having been already delivered by its governor and legislature to the Confederacy] 14,700 votes; and half of that number were Rebel troops, having no authority under the Constitution to vote at any election. For 'no separation' and 'no representation,'—the straight-out Union vote,—East Tennessee gave 33,000, or 18,300 of a majority, with at least 5,000 quiet citizens deterred from coming out by threats of violence, and by the presence of drunken troops at the polls to insult them. . . . By . . . fraud and villainy, . . . the great State of Tennessee was carried out of the Union. The loyal people of East Tennessee, to their great honor, had no lot or part in the work."—W. G. Brownlow, *Sketches of the Rise, Progress and Decline of Secession, pp.* 222–223.—"Finding themselves powerless before the tyranny inaugurated, the Unionists of East Tennessee resolved, as a last resort, to hold a Convention at Greenville, to consult as to the best course to pursue. This Convention met June 17th. The attendance was very large—thirty-one counties having delegates present on the first day. Judge Nelson presided. After a four days' session it adopted a Declaration of Grievances and Resolutions," declaring that "we prefer to remain attached to the Government of our fathers. The Constitution of the United States has done us no wrong. The Congress of the United States has passed no law to oppress us. . . . The secession cause has thus far been sustained by deception and falsehood." The Convention protested on behalf of East Tennessee against being dragged into rebellion, and appointed commissioners to pursue measures looking to the formation of a separate state. "Vain protest! It was not long before those Unionists and protestants against wrong were flying for their lives, and were hunted down like wild beasts."—O. J. Victor, *Hist. of the Southern Rebellion, div.* 5, *ch.* 5 (*v.* 2).

Also in: T. W. Humes, *The Loyal Mountaineers of Tennessee, ch.* 6–11.—W. Rule, *Loyalists of Tenn. in the late War* (*Sketches of War Hist., Ohio Commandery, L. L. v.* 2).

A. D. 1862 (February).—The breaking of the Rebel line of defense at Fort Henry and Fort Donelson. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1862 (January—February: Kentucky—Tennessee).

A. D. 1862 (March).—Andrew Johnson appointed military governor. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1862 (March—June).

A. D. 1862 (April).—The continued advance of the Union armies.—Battle of Shiloh, or Pittsburg Landing. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1862 (February—April: Tennessee).

A. D. 1862 (April—May).—The Union advance upon Corinth, Mississippi. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1862 (April—May: Tennessee—Mississippi).

A. D. 1862 (June).—Evacuation of Fort Pillow and surrender of Memphis by the Confederates. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1862 (June: On the Mississippi).

A. D. 1862 (June—October).—The Buell-Bragg campaign.—Chattanooga secured by the Confederates. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1862 (June—October: Tennessee—Kentucky).

A. D. 1862-1863 (December—January).—Bragg and Rosecrans.—The Battle of Stone River, or Murfreesborough. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1862–1863 (December—January: Tennessee).

A. D. 1863 (February—April).—Engagements at Dover and Franklin. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1863 (February—April: Tennessee).

A. D. 1863 (June—July).—The Tullahoma campaign of Rosecrans. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1863 (June—July: Tennessee).

A. D. 1863 (August—September).—Burnside in east Tennessee. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1863 (August—September: Tennessee) Burnside's deliverance.

A. D. 1863 (August—September).—The Chickamauga campaign and battle.—The Union army at Chattanooga. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1863 (August—September: Tennessee) Rosecrans' advance.

A. D. 1863 (October—November).—The Siege and the Battles of Chattanooga.—Lookout Mountain.—Missionary Ridge. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1863 (October—November: Tennessee).

A. D. 1863 (October—December).—Siege of Knoxville. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1863 (October—December: Tennessee).

A. D. 1863-1864 (December—April).—Winter operations.—Withdrawal of Longstreet from east Tennessee. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1863–1864 (DECEMBER—APRIL: TENNESSEE—MISSISSIPPI).

A. D. 1864 (April).—The Fort Pillow Massacre. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1864 (APRIL: TENNESSEE).

A. D. 1864 (September — October). — Forrest's raid. — The capture of Athens. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1864 (SEPTEMBER—OCTOBER: GEORGIA).

A. D. 1864 (November). — Hood's invasion and destruction.—The Battles of Franklin and Nashville. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1864 (NOVEMBER: TENNESSEE), and (DECEMBER: TENNESSEE).

A. D. 1865.—President Johnson's recognition of the reconstructed State Government. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1865 (MAY—JULY).

A. D. 1865-1866.— Reconstruction.— Abolition of Slavery.—Restoration of the State to its "former, proper, practical relation to the Union."— In the early part of 1865, Andrew Johnson, though Vice-President-elect, was "still discharging the functions of military governor of Tennessee. A popular convention originating from his recommendation and assembling under his auspices, was organized at Nashville on the 9th day of January, 1865. Membership of the body was limited to those who 'give an active support to the Union cause, who have never voluntarily borne arms against the Government, who have never voluntarily given aid and comfort to the enemy.'. . . Tennessee, as Johnson bluntly maintained, could only be organized and controlled as a State in the Union by that portion of her citizens who acknowledged their allegiance to the Government of the Union. Under this theory of procedure the popular convention proposed an amendment to the State constitution, 'forever abolishing and prohibiting slavery in the State,' and further declaring that 'the Legislature shall make no law recognizing the right of property in man.' The convention took several other important steps, annulling in whole and in detail all the legislation which under Confederate rule had made the State a guilty participant in the rebellion. Thus was swept away the ordinance of Secession, and the State debt created in aid of the war against the Union. All these proceedings were submitted to popular vote on the 22d of February, and were ratified by an affirmative vote of 25,293 against a negative vote of 48. The total vote of the State at the Presidential election of 1860 was 145,333. Mr. Lincoln's requirement of one-tenth of that number was abundantly complied with by the vote on the questions submitted to the popular decision. . . . Under this new order of things, William G. Brownlow, better known to the world by his soubriquet of 'Parson' Brownlow, was chosen governor without opposition on the 4th day of March, 1865, the day of Mr. Lincoln's second inauguration. The new Legislature met at Nashville a month later, on the 3d of April, and on the 5th ratified the Thirteenth Amendment; thus adding the abolition of slavery by National authority to that already decreed by the State. The Legislature completed its work by electing two consistent Union men, David T. Patterson and Joseph S. Fowler, to the United States Senate. The framework of the new Government was thus completed and in operation before the death of Mr. Lincoln."— J. G. Blaine, *Twenty Years of Congress, v. 2, ch. 3.*— After the organization of a loyal government in Tennessee, more than a year passed before the restoration of the State to its constitutional relations with the United States, by the admission of its Senators and Representatives to Congress. Tennessee was the first, however, among the seceded States to obtain that recognition, by being the first to ratify the Fourteenth Constitutional Amendment. "Immediately on the reception of the circular of the Secretary of State containing the proposed amendment, Governor Brownlow issued a proclamation summoning the Legislature of Tennessee to assemble at Nashville on the 4th of July [1866]. . . . Every effort was made to prevent the assembling of the required number [to constitute a quorum]. The powerful influence of the President himself was thrown in opposition to ratification." By arresting recalcitrant members, and by "the expedient of considering the members who were under arrest and confined in a committee room as present in their places," the quorum was assumed to have been made up and the amendment was ratified. "Immediately after the news was received in Washington, Mr. Bingham, in the House of Representatives, moved to reconsider a motion by which a joint resolution relating to the restoration of Tennessee had been referred to the Committee on Reconstruction," and, this motion being adopted, he introduced a substitute which declared, "That the State of Tennessee is hereby restored to her former, proper, practical relation to the Union, and again entitled to be represented by Senators and Representatives in Congress, duly elected and qualified, upon their taking the oaths of office required by existing laws." On the following day this joint resolution passed the House, and a day later (July 21st), it was adopted by the Senate.— W. H. Barnes, *Hist. of the 39th Cong., ch. 20.*

ALSO IN: Ira P. Jones, *Reconstruction in Tennessee (Why the Solid South? ch. 7).*

A. D. 1866-1871.—The Ku Klux Klan. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1866–1871.

TENNIS-COURT OATH, The. See FRANCE: A. D. 1789 (JUNE).

TENOCHTITLAN.— The native name of the city of Mexico. See MEXICO: A. D. 1325–1502.

TENPET, The. See MAGIANS.

TENURE-OF-OFFICE BILL, The. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1866–1867 (DECEMBER—MARCH).

TEOTIHUACAN, Pyramids at. See MEXICO, ANCIENT: THE TOLTEC EMPIRE, &C.

TEQUESTA, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: TIMUQUANAN FAMILY.

TERENTILIAN LAW, The. See ROME: B. C. 451–449.

TERMILI, The. See LYCIANS.

TEROUENNE: Siege and capture by the English (1513). See FRANCE: A. D. 1513–1515.

TERRA FIRMA. See TIERRA FIRME.

TERROR, The Reign of.— As commonly used, this phrase describes the fearful state of things that prevailed in France during a period of the French Revolution which ended with

the fall of Robespierre, July 27 (Ninth Thermidor), 1794. The beginning of the period so called is usually placed at the date of the coup d'état, May 31—June 2, 1793, which overthrew the Girondists and gave unrestrained power into the hands of the Terrorists of the Mountain. The Reign of Terror was not however fully organized as a deliberately merciless system, and made, according to the demand of the Paris Commune, "the order of the day," until the following September. In another view, the Reign of Terror may be said to have begun with the creation of the terrible Revolutionary Tribunal, March, 1793. See FRANCE: A. D. 1793 (FEBRUARY—APRIL), to 1794 (JULY).

TERTIARII, The. See BEGUINES, ETC.

TESCHEN, Treaty of (1779). See BAVARIA: A. D. 1777–1779.

TESHER.—The name which the Egyptians gave to the Arabian desert, signifying red earth. See EGYPT: ITS NAMES.

TESSERA HOSPITALIS. See HOSPES.

TEST ACT, and its Repeal. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1672–1673, and 1827–1828 REMOVAL OF DISABILITIES.

TESTRI, Battle of (A. D. 687). See FRANKS: A. D. 511–752.

TESTS, Religious, in the English Universities: Abolished. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1871.

TETONS, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: SIOUAN FAMILY.

TETRARCH.—As originally used, this official title, from the Greek, signified the governor of one fourth part of a country or province. Later, the Romans applied it to many tributary princes, in Syria and elsewhere, to whom they wished to give a rank inferior to that of the tributary kings.

TETZEL, and the sale of Indulgences. See PAPACY: A. D. 1517 TETZEL.

TEUKRIANS, The.—"The elegiac poet Kallinus, in the middle of the seventh century B. C., was the first who mentioned the Teukrians; he treated them as immigrants from Krête, though other authors represented them as indigenous, or as having come from Attica. However the fact may stand as to their origin, we may gather that, in the time of Kallinus, they were still the great occupants of the Troad [northwestern Asia Minor]. Gradually the south and west coasts, as well as the interior of this region, became penetrated by successive colonies of Æolic Greeks. . . . The name Teukrians gradually vanished out of present use and came to belong only to the legends of the past."—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece, pt.* 2, *ch.* 14.

TEUTECAS, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: ZAPOTECS, ETC.

TEUTONES.—TEUTONIC.—"In the way of evidence of there being Teutones amongst the Germans, over and above the associate mention of their names with that of the Cimbri [see CIMBRI], there is but little. They are not so mentioned either by Tacitus or Strabo. . . . Arguments have been taken from . . . the supposed connection of the present word 'Deut-sch' = 'German,' with the classical word 'Teut-ones.' . . . The reasoning . . . runs thus: The syllable in question is common to the word 'Teut-ones,' 'Teut-onicus,' 'Theod-iscas,' 'teud-uiscus,' 'teut-iscus,' 'tût-iske,' 'dût-iske,' 'tiut-sche,' 'deut-sch'; whilst the word Deut-sch means German. As the 'Teut-ones' were Germans, so were the Cimbri also. Now this line of argument is set aside by the circumstance that the syllable 'Teut-' in Teut-ones and Teut-onicus as the names of the confederates of the Cimbri, is wholly unconnected with the 'Teut-' in 'theod-iscus' and Deut-sch. This is fully shown by Grimm in his dissertation on the words German and Dutch. In its oldest form the latter word meant 'popular,' 'national,' 'vernacular'; it was an adjective applied to the 'vulgar tongue,' or the vernacular German, in opposition to the Latin. In the tenth century the secondary form 'Teut-onicus' came in vogue even with German writers. Whether this arose out of imitation of the Latin form 'Romanice,' or out of the idea of an historical connection with the Teutones of the classics, is immaterial. It is clear that the present word 'Deut-sch' proves nothing respecting the Teutones. Perhaps, however, as early as the time of Martial the word 'Teutonicus' was used in a general sense, denoting the Germans in general. Certain it is that, before his time, it meant the particular people conquered by Marius, irrespective of origin or locality."—R. G. Latham, *The Germany of Tacitus, app.* 3.

TEUTONIC KNIGHTS OF THE HOSPITAL: The founding of the order.—"It is not possible to find the exact date of the foundation of the Teutonic Order, but it was probably about A. D. 1190 that it received its full organization as one of the recognized Religious Military Orders. Its actual commencement, like that of the other Orders, was obscure and humble. About 1128 or 1129, a wealthy German, who had taken part in the siege and capture of Jerusalem, settled there with his wife, intending to spend the remainder of his life in the practice of religion and in visiting the holy places. His attention and interest were soon excited by the misfortunes of his poorer countrymen, who came in great numbers as pilgrims to Jerusalem. Many fell sick, and endured great miseries and hardships. Moved with compassion, he received some of the more distressing cases into his own house. But he soon found that the work grew beyond this, and he built a hospital, with a chapel dedicated to the Blessed Virgin. In this institution he passed the whole of his time, nursing the sick pilgrims; and to their maintenance he devoted the whole of his means." One by one, others of his countrymen joined the pious German in his benevolent work, and "banded themselves together after the pattern of the Order of St. John of Jerusalem, and united the care of the sick and poor with the profession of arms in their defence, under the title of Hospitallers of the Blessed Virgin. This little band put themselves under the direction of the Grand Prior of the Hospitallers of St. John of Jerusalem, although they did not actually join this Order, whose operations they so closely imitated. . . . It was, however, during the siege of Acre [A. D. 1189–1191] that the Teutonic Order received its final and complete organization as one of the great Military Religious Orders of Europe." At Acre, the Hospitallers of the Blessed Virgin, then driven from Jerusalem by Saladin's conquest, joined certain citizens of Bremen and Lubeck in providing a field-hospital for the wounded and sick, and in their new sphere of labor they acquired the designation of the Teutonic Knights of the Hospital of the Blessed Virgin at Jerusa-

lem. "It is said that the Order owed its constitution to Frederick, Duke of Suabia; but there is much obscurity, and little authentic record to determine this or to furnish particulars of the transaction. The Order seems, however, to have been confirmed by Pope Celestine III."—F. C. Woodhouse, *Military Religious Orders, pt.* 3, *ch.* 1.

Conquest of Prussia. See PRUSSIA: 13TH CENTURY; and LIVONIA.

Subjection to Poland, secularization of the Order and surrender of its territories. See POLAND: A. D. 1333-1572.

A. D. 1809.—Suppression by Napoleon. See GERMANY: A. D. 1809 (JULY—DECEMBER).

TEWFIK, Khedive of Egypt, The reign of. See EGYPT: A. D. 1875-1882; and 1882-1883.

TEWKESBURY, Battle of (1471).—The final battle of the "Wars of the Roses," in which Edward IV. of England overthrew the last Lancastrian army, collected by Queen Margaret of Anjou and her adherents; fought May 4, 1471. Three weeks previously, at Barnet, he had defeated and slain the Earl of Warwick. At Tewkesbury Queen Margaret was taken prisoner, her young son disappeared, how or when is uncertain, and her husband, the deposed King Henry VI., died mysteriously a few days afterwards in his prison in the tower. It was the end of the Lancastrian struggle. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1455-1471.

TEXAS: The aboriginal inhabitants and the name.—Amongst the small tribes found early in the 19th century existing west of the Mississippi on Red River and south of it, and believed to be natives of that region, were the Caddoes, "the Nandakoes, the Inies or Tachies, who have given their name to the province of Texas, and the Nabedaches, . . . [who] speak dialects of the Caddo language." Also, the Natchitoches, the Yatassees, the Adaize, the Appelousas, etc.—A. Gallatin, *Synopsis of the Indian Tribes* (*Archæologia Americana, v.* 2), *introd., sect.* 3.

ALSO IN: *President's Message, Feb.* 19, 1806, *with accompanying doc's.*—See, also, AMERICAN ABORIGINES: APACHE GROUP.

A. D. 1685-1687.—La Salle's shipwrecked colony. See CANADA: A. D. 1669-1687.

A. D. 1819-1835.—Relinquishment of American claims to Spain.—Condition as a Mexican province.—Encouragement of immigration from the United States and Europe.—"By the treaty of 1819 with Spain for the cession of the Floridas, the United States relinquished all claim to the western portion of Louisiana lying south of Red River and west of the Sabine [see FLORIDA: A. D. 1819-1821; and LOUISIANA: A. D. 1798-1803]. After the final ratification of that treaty by both governments, and the cession and delivery of the Floridas to the United States, the Spaniards took formal possession of the country west of the Sabine, and erected it into the 'Province of Texas,' under the authority and jurisdiction of the Viceroy of Mexico. From that time the Sabine River was the western boundary of the United States, near the Gulf of Mexico. The province of Texas at this time was occupied by the native tribes of savages, interrupted only by a few Spanish settlements. . . . The whole population, including some settlements in the vicinity of the sea-coast, scarcely exceeded 5,000 souls, of whom the greater portion were the remains of old colonies formed during the Spanish dominion over the province of Louisiana. Each principal settlement, from San Antonio de Bexar to Nacogdoches, was placed under the government of a military commandant, who exercised civil and military authority within the limits of his presidio. . . . Such was the province of Texas under the Spanish monarchy until the year 1821, when Mexico became an independent nation. . . . On the 24th of October, 1824, the Mexican States adopted a Republican form of government, embracing 'a confederation of independent states,' known and designated as the 'United States of Mexico.' In this confederation the departments of Texas and Coahuila were admitted as one state, and were jointly represented in the Congress of Mexico. Soon after the establishment of independence in the United States of Mexico, the colonization and settlement of Texas became a favorite subject of national policy with the new government. To attract population for the settlement of the country, colonization laws were enacted, to encourage enterprising individuals from foreign countries to establish large colonies of emigrants within the limits of Texas. Under the provisions of these laws enterprise was awakened in the United States and in some portions of Europe. Founders of colonies, or 'Empresarios,' were induced to enter into engagements for the occupancy and settlement of large tracts of country, designated in their respective 'grants'; the extent of the grant being proportionate to the number of colonists to be introduced. The first grant was made to Moses Austin, a native of Durham, Connecticut, in 1821, and under its provisions he was required by the Mexican authorities to introduce 300 families from the United States. This enterprising man, having departed from Bexar for the introduction of his colony, died on his journey through the wilderness, leaving his plans of colonization to be prosecuted by his son, Colonel Stephen F. Austin, who possessed the talents, energy, and judgment requisite for the arduous undertaking. Having succeeded to his father's enterprise, he subsequently acquired more influence with the Mexican government than any other 'empresario' in the province. . . . But a few years had elapsed when nearly the whole area of the department of Texas had been parceled out into extensive grants for settlement by the different 'empresarios' with their colonies. . . . Emigration from the United States, as well as from Great Britain and Ireland, continued to augment the population in all the departments until the year 1834, when political troubles began to convulse the Mexican Republic." In 1835 "the whole Anglo-American population of Texas was about 20,000; of this number General Austin's colony comprised no less than 13,000, or more than half the entire population. These were chiefly emigrants from the United States. . . . The Mexicans within the limits of Texas at this period scarcely exceeded 3,000, most of whom resided in the vicinity of Bexar."—J. W. Monette, *Discovery and Settlement of the Mississippi Valley, v.* 2, *pp.* 569-572.

ALSO IN: H. Yoakum, *Hist. of Texas, v.* 1, *ch.* 15-21.

A. D. 1824-1836.—The introduction of Slavery.—Schemes of the Slave Power in the United States. — Revolutionary movement under Houston.—Independence of Mexico declared, and practically won at San Jacinto.—The American settlers in Texas "brought their slaves with them, and continued to do so notwithstanding a decree of the Mexican Congress, issued in July, 1824, which forbade the importation into Mexican territory of slaves from foreign countries, and notwithstanding the Constitution adopted the same year, which declared free all children thereafter born of slaves. About that time the slave-holders in the United States began to see in Texas an object of peculiar interest to them. The Missouri Compromise, admitting Missouri as a Slave State and opening to slavery all that part of the Louisiana purchase south of 36° 30′, seemed at first to give a great advantage to the slave power. But gradually it became apparent that the territory thus opened to slavery was, after all, too limited for the formation of many new Slave States, while the area for the building up of Free States was much larger. More territory for slavery was therefore needed to maintain the balance of power between the two sections. At the same time the Mexican government, growing alarmed at the unruly spirit of the American colony in Texas, attached Texas to Coahuila, the two to form one state. The constitution of Coahuila forbade the importation of slaves; and in 1829 the Republic of Mexico, by the decree of September 15, emancipated all the slaves within its boundaries. Then the American Slave States found themselves flanked in the southwest by a power not only not in sympathy with slavery, but threatening to become dangerous to its safety. The maintenance of slavery in Texas, and eventually the acquisition of that country, were thenceforth looked upon by the slaveholding interest in this Republic as matters of very great importance, and the annexation project was pushed forward systematically. First the American settlers in Texas refused to obey the Mexican decree of emancipation, and, in order to avoid an insurrection, the Mexican authorities permitted it to be understood that the decree did not embrace Texas. Thus one point was gained. Then the Southern press vigorously agitated the necessity of enlarging the area of slavery, while an interest in the North was created by organizing three land companies in New York, which used pretended Mexican land grants in Texas as the basis of issues of stock, promising to make people rich over-night, and thus drawing Texas within the circle of American business speculation. In 1830 President Jackson made another attempt to purchase Texas [Henry Clay, in 1827, when Secretary of State under John Quincy Adams, had already made a proposal to the Mexican government for the purchase], offering five millions, but without success. The Mexican government, scenting the coming danger, prohibited the immigration of Americans into Texas. This, however, had no effect. The American colony now received a capable and daring leader in Sam Houston of Tennessee, who had served with General Jackson in the Indian wars. He went to Texas for the distinct object of wresting that country from Mexico. There is reason for believing that President Jackson was not ignorant of his intentions. Revolutionary convulsions in Mexico gave the American colonists welcome opportunities for complaints, which led to collisions with the Mexican authorities. General Santa Anna, who by a successful revolutionary stroke had put himself at the head of the Mexican government, attempted to reduce the unruly Americans to obedience. In 1835 armed conflicts took place, in which the Americans frequently had the advantage. The Texans declared their independence from Mexico on March 2, 1836. The declaration was signed by about 60 men, among whom there were only two of Mexican nationality. The constitution of the new republic confirmed the existence of slavery under its jurisdiction, and surrounded it with all possible guaranties. Meanwhile Santa Anna advanced at the head of a Mexican army to subdue the revolutionists. Atrocious butcheries marked the progress of his soldiery. On March 6 the American garrison [250 men] of the Alamo [a mission church at San Antonio de Bexar] was massacred, and on the 27th a large number [500] of American prisoners at Goliad met a like fate. These atrocities created a great excitement in the United States. But on April 21 the Texans under Houston, about 800 strong, inflicted a crushing defeat upon Santa Anna's army of 1,500 men, at San Jacinto, taking Santa Anna himself prisoner. The captive Mexican President concluded an armistice with the victorious Texans, promising the evacuation of the country, and to procure the recognition of its independence; but this the Mexican Congress refused to ratify. The government of the United States maintained, in appearance, a neutral position. President Jackson had indeed instructed General Gaines to march his troops into Texas, if he should see reason to apprehend Indian incursions. Gaines actually crossed the boundary line, and was recalled only after the Mexican Minister at Washington had taken his passports. The organization of reinforcements for Houston, however, had been suffered to proceed on American soil without interference."—C. Schurz, *Life of Henry Clay, ch.* 17 (*v.* 2).

Also in: H. von Holst, *Const. and Pol. Hist. of the U. S., v.* 2, *ch.* 7.— H. H. Bancroft, *Hist. of the Pacific States, v.* 8 (*Mexico, v.* 5), *ch.* 7.— A. M. Williams, *Sam Houston and the War of Independence in Texas.*

A. D. 1836-1845.—Eight years of independence.— Annexation to the United States.— The question in Congress and the country.—"Santa Anna, . . . constrained in his extremity to acknowledge the independence of Texas, . . . was liberated, and the new republic established in October, 1836, with a Constitution modeled on that of the United States, and with General Houston inaugurated as its first President. The United States forthwith acknowledged its independence. In less than a year application was made to the United States government to receive the new republic into the Union, and, though this was at the time declined, it was obvious that the question was destined to play a most important part in American civil policy. The North saw in the whole movement a predetermined attempt at the extension of slavery, and in the invasive emigration, the revolt, the proclamation of independence, the temporary organization of a republic, and the application to be admitted into the Union as a state, successive steps of a conspiracy which would, through the creation of

half a dozen or more new states, give a preponderance to the slave power in the republic. Mr. Van Buren, who had declined the overtures for the annexation of Texas, was succeeded in the Presidency by General Harrison, who, dying almost immediately after his inauguration, was followed by the Vice President, Mr. Tyler, a Virginian, and a supporter of extreme Southern principles. The annexation project was now steadily pressed forward, but, owing to the difficult circumstances under which Mr. Tyler was placed, and dissensions arising in the party that had elected him, nothing decisive could be done until 1844, when Mr. Upshur, the Secretary of State, being accidentally killed by the bursting of a cannon, Mr. Calhoun succeeded him. A treaty of annexation was at once arranged, but, on being submitted to the Senate, was rejected. Undiscouraged by this result, the South at once determined to make annexation the touchstone in the coming Presidential election. . . . Mr. Van Buren and Mr. Clay, the prominent candidates of the two opposing parties for the Presidency, were compelled to make known their views previously to the meeting of the nominating Conventions," and both discountenanced annexation. Van Buren was accordingly defeated in the Democratic Convention and James K. Polk received the nomination. Clay was nominated by the Whigs, and made an attempt, in the succeeding canvass, to change his ground on the Texas question; but "his attempt only served to make the matter worse, and cost him the support of the anti-slavery party, whose votes would have elected him." Polk was chosen President; but the annexation of Texas did not wait for his inauguration. "On December 19th a joint resolution was introduced into the House of Representatives providing for annexation. Attempts were made to secure half the country for free labor, the other half being resigned to slavery. . . . This proposition was, however, defeated. . . . As the measure eventually stood, it made suitable provision for the mode in which the 'State of Texas' should be admitted into the Union, the disposal of its munitions of war, public property, unappropriated lands, debts. On the main point it was arranged that new states, not exceeding four in number, in addition to Texas proper, should subsequently be made out of its territory, those lying south of latitude 36° 30′ to be admitted with or without slavery, as their people might desire; in those north of that line, slavery to be prohibited. Mr. Tyler, on the last day of his term of office, unwilling to leave to his successor, Mr. Polk, the honor of completing this great Southern measure, dispatched a swift messenger to Texas; her assent was duly secured, and the Mexican province became a state of the Union. But the circumstances and conditions under which this had been done left a profound dissatisfaction in the North. The portion of territory ceded to freedom did not belong to Texas; her boundary did not approach within 200 miles of the Missouri Compromise line. The South had therefore secured the whole of the new acquisition; she had seized the substance, and had deluded the North with a shadow."—J. W. Draper, *Hist. of the Am. Civil War*, *v.* 1, *ch.* 22.

Also in: T. H. Benton, *Thirty Years' View*, *v.* 2, *ch.* 135, 138–142, 148.—H. H. Bancroft, *Hist. of the Pacific States*, *v.* 8, *ch.* 13.—H. Greeley, *Hist. of the Struggle for Slavery Extension*, *ch.* 10.

A. D. 1846-1848.—The Mexican War. See Mexico: A. D. 1846; 1846–1847; and 1847.

A. D. 1848.—Territory extorted from Mexico in the Treaty of Guadaloupe-Hidalgo. See Mexico: A. D. 1848.

A. D. 1850.—Sale of territory to the United States. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1850.

A. D. 1861 (February).—Secession from the Union. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1861 (January—February).

A. D. 1861 (February).—Twiggs' surrender of the Federal army, posts and stores. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1860–1861 (December—February).

A. D. 1862.—Farragut's occupation of coast towns. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1862 (May—July: On the Mississippi).

A. D. 1865 (June).—Provisional government set up under President Johnson's Plan of Reconstruction. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1865 (May—July).

A. D. 1865-1870. — Reconstruction. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1865 (May—July), and after, to 1868–1870.

TEZCUCO. See Mexico: A. D. 1325–1502.

THABORITES, The. See Mysticism.

THAI RACE, The. See Siam.

THAMANÆANS, The.—An ancient people who occupied the region in western Afghanistan which lies south and southeast of Herat, from the Haroot-rud to the Helmend.—G. Rawlinson, *Five Great Monarchies, Persia*, *ch.* 1.

THAMES, Battle of the. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1812–1813 Harrison's Northwestern Campaign.

THANAGE.—An old Celtic tenure by which certain thanes' estates were held in Scotland, and which feudalism displaced.—W. F. Skene, *Celtic Scotland*, *v.* 3, *p.* 246.

THANE, OR THEGN. See Comitatus; and Ethel; and England: A. D. 958.

THANET, The Jute Landing on. See England: A. D. 449–473.

THANKSGIVING DAY, The American: Its origin.—"The Pilgrims [at Plymouth], fond as they were of social enjoyment, had since landing known no day of rest except the sacred day of worship. Now [in 1621, the year after their landing from the Mayflower] that the summer was past and the harvest ended, they determined to have a period of recreation, combined with thanksgiving for their many mercies. The Governor thereupon sent out four huntsmen, who in one day secured enough game to supply the Colony for nearly a week. Hospitality was extended to Massasoit, who accepted and brought ninety people with him. The guests remained three days, during which they captured five deer to add to the larder of their hosts. The motley company indulged in a round of amusements, and the Colonists entertained their visitors with military tactics and evolutions. Without doubt, religious services opened each day; for the Pilgrims were cheerful Christians, who carried religion into all their affairs. Thus heartily and royally was inaugurated the great New England festival of Thanksgiving. For two centuries it continued to be a peculiarity of the Eastern States; but it has now become national, its annual return finding a welcome along the Lake shore and the Gulf, and from the Atlantic to the

Pacific. . . . In 1623 a public day of Thanksgiving is noticed; and one is mentioned in a letter of 1632. . . . I do not doubt that such a religious festival was held after every harvest, and that it was so much a matter of course that the records did not mention it any more than they did the great training-day, with its sermon and holiday features."—J. A. Goodwin, *The Pilgrim Republic, pp.* 179–180, *and foot-note.*

THANN, OR THAUN, Battle of (1638). See GERMANY: A. D. 1634–1639.....**Battle of (1809).** See GERMANY: A. D. 1809 (JANUARY—JUNE).

THAPSACUS.—Thapsacus "was situated just above the modern town of Rakka, at the only point in the central course of the Euphrates where that river is fordable (though even here only at certain seasons of the year), for which reason it continued to be used alike by the Persian, Greek and Roman armies during a long period. It was also a commercial route of importance in ancient times."—E. H. Bunbury, *Hist. of Ancient Geog., ch.* 10, *sect.* 2 (*v.* 1).—See, also, APAMEA.

THAPSUS, The Battle of (B. C. 46). See ROME: B. C. 47–46.

THAPSUS: The Tyrian colony. See CARTHAGE, THE DOMINION OF.

THASOS.—THASIAN MINES.—Thasos, an island off the coast of Thrace, in the northern part of the Ægean Sea, was celebrated in antiquity for its gold mines, first discovered and worked by the Phœnicians. Still more valuable mines on the neighboring Thracian coast were developed and worked by the Thasians. They were subdued by the Persians and subsequently became subject to Athens. See ATHENS: B. C. 466–454.

THAUR, The Cave of Mount. See MAHOMETAN CONQUEST: A. D. 609–632.

THAUSS, Battle of (1431). See BOHEMIA: A. D. 1419–1434.

THEATINES, The.—The founders of the Order of the Theatines (1524) were "Gaetano of Thiene, a native of Vicenza, and Gian Pietro Caraffa [afterwards Pope Paul IV.]. The former had quitted a lucrative post at the Roman court in order to transplant the ideas of the Oratory of the Divine Love to his native city, Venice, and Verona, and had gradually come to concentrate his pious thoughts upon the reformation of the secular clergy of the Church. On his return to Rome, Bonifacio da Colle, a Lombard lawyer, became interested in his design, and then it was enthusiastically taken up by Caraffa, whose bishopric of Chieti, or, according to the older form, Theate, gave its name to the new order of the Theatines."—A. W. Ward, *The Counter-Reformation, p.* 28.—"To the vow of poverty they made the special addition that not only would they possess nothing, but would even abstain from begging, and await the alms that might be brought to their dwellings. . . . They did not call themselves monks, but regular clergy—they were priests with the vows of monks. Their intention was to establish a kind of seminary for the priesthood. . . . They devoted themselves rigidly to their clerical duties—to preaching, the administration of the sacraments, and the care of the sick. . . . The order of the Theatines did not indeed become a seminary for priests precisely, its numbers were never sufficient for that; but it grew to be a seminary for bishops, coming at length to be considered the order of priests peculiar to the nobility."—L. Ranke, *Hist. of the Popes, bk.* 2, *sect.* 3 (*v.* 1).

THEBAIS, The.—The southern district of Upper Egypt, taking its name from Thebes.

THEBES, Egypt.—"No city of the old world can still show so much of her former splendour as Egyptian Thebes. . . . Not one of the many temples of Thebes has wholly disappeared; some are almost complete; many of the royal and private tombs were, until the tourist came, fresh with colours as of yesterday. . . . The origin of the great city is obscure. Unlike Memphis, Thebes, her southern rival, rose to the headship by slow degrees. It was towards the close of the dark age marked by the rule of Hanes, that a new line of kings arose in the upper country, with Thebes for their capital. At first they were merely nobles; then one became a local king, and his successors won the whole dominion of Egypt. These were the sovereigns of the Eleventh Dynasty. Their date must be before Abraham, probably some centuries earlier. . . . Thebes, like the other cities of Egypt, had a civil and a religious name. The civil name was Apiu, 'the city of thrones,' which, with the article 't' or 'ta,' became Ta-Apiu, and was identified by the Greeks with the name of their own famous city, by us corruptly called Thebes. The sacred name was Nu-Amen, 'the city of Amen,' the god of Thebes; or simply Nu, 'the city,' and Nu-ā, 'the great city.' In these names we recognize the No-Amon and No of Scripture."—R. S. Poole, *Cities of Egypt, ch.* 4.—See, also, EGYPT: THE OLD EMPIRE AND THE MIDDLE EMPIRE.

THEBES, Greece: The founding of the city.—"In the fruitful plain, only traversed by low hills, which stretches from the northern declivity of Mount Cithæron to the Bœotian lakes opposite the narrowest part of the sound which separates Eubœa from the mainland, in the 'well-watered, pasture-bearing region of the Aones,' as Euripides says, lay the citadel and town of Thebes. According to Greek tradition, it was built by Cadmus the Phœnician. The Aones, who inhabited the country, are said to have amalgamated with the Phœnicians whom Cadmus brought with him, into one people. The citadel lay on a hill of moderate height between the streams Ismenus and Dirce; it bore even in historical times the name Cadmea; the ridge to the north of the town was called Phœnicium, i. e. mountain of the Phœnicians. In the story of Cadmus and Europa, Greek legend relates the Phœnician mythus of Melkarth and Astarte. In order to seek the lost goddess of the moon, Astarte, Cadmus-Melkarth, the wandering sun-god, sets forth. He finds her in the far west, in Bœotia, and here in Thebes, on the Cadmea, celebrates the holy marriage. . . . There are a few relics of the wall of the citadel of Cadmea, principally on the north side; they are great blocks, not quite regularly hewn. Of the city wall and the famous seven gates in it nothing remains; even this number seven points to the Phœnicians as well as the designations which were retained by these gates even in historical times. The Electric gate belonged to the sun-god Baal, called by the Greeks Elector; the Neitic gate, it would seem, to the god of war. . . . The gate Hypsistia was that of

Zeus Hypsistos, whose shrine stood on the Cadmea; . . . the Prœtidic gate belonged to Astarte, whose domain was the moon; the Oncæic gate in the north-west belonged to Athena Onca, who is expressly called a Phœnician goddess. . . . It is probable that the two remaining gates, the Homoloic and the Crenaic, were also dedicated to gods of this circle — to the spirits of planets. According to Greek legend, Cadmus invented the building of walls, mining, armour, and letters. Herodotus contents himself with saying that the Phœnicians who came with Cadmus taught much to the Greeks, even writing: from the Phœnicians the Ionians, in whose midst they lived, had learned letters. If even this early borrowing of writing on the part of the Greeks is incorrect, all the other particulars, — the legend of Cadmus, which extends to the Homeric poems, where the inhabitants of Thebes are called Cadmeans; the rites of the Thebans; the walls and gates, — taken together, give evidence that the Phœnicians went over from Eubœa to the continent, and here fixed one of their most important and lasting colonies upon and around the hill of Cadmea."—M. Duncker, *Hist. of Greece, bk.* 1, *ch.* 4.—See, also, Bœotia.

B. C. 509-506. — Unsuccessful war with Athens. See Athens: B. C. 509-506.

B. C. 480. — Traitorous alliance with the Persians. See Greece: B. C. 480 (Salamis).

B. C. 479.—Siege and reduction by the confederate Greeks.—Punishment for the Persian alliance. See Greece: B. C. 479 (Platæa).

B. C. 457-456.—War with Athens.—Defeat at Œnophyta.—Overthrow of the oligarchies. See Greece: B. C. 458-456.

B. C. 447-445.—Bœotian revolution.—Overthrow of Athenian influence.—Defeat of Athens at Coronea. See Greece: B. C. 449-445.

B. C. 431.—Disastrous attack on Platæa.—Opening hostilities of the Peloponnesian War. See Greece: B. C. 432-431.

B. C. 404-403.—Shelter and aid to Athenian patriots. See Athens: B. C. 404-403.

B. C. 395-387.—Confederacy against Sparta and alliance with Persia.—The Corinthian War.—Battle of Coronea.—Peace of Antalcidas. See Greece: B. C. 399-387.

B. C. 383.—The betrayal of the city to the Spartans. See Greece: B. C. 383.

B. C. 379-371.—The liberation of the city.—Rise of Epaminondas.—Overthrow of Spartan supremacy at Leuctra. See Greece: B. C. 379-371.

B. C. 378.—The Sacred Band.—"This was an institution connecting itself with earlier usages of the land. For already in the battle of Delium a band of the Three Hundred is mentioned, who fought, like the heroes of the Homeric age, associated in pairs, from their chariots in front of the main body of the soldiery. This doubtless very ancient institution was now [B. C. 378] revived and carried out in a new spirit under the guidance of Epaminondas and Gorgidas. They had quietly assembled around them a circle of youths, with whom they had presented themselves before the community on the day of the Liberation, so that they were regarded as the founders of the Sacred Band of Thebes. It was now no longer a privilege of the nobility to belong to the Three Hundred; but those among the youth of the land who were in feeling the noblest and most high-minded, and who already under the oppression of the Tyrants had been preparing themselves for the struggle for freedom, were henceforth the elect and the champions. It was their duty to stimulate the rest eagerly to follow their example of bravery and discipline; they were associated with one another by the bonds of friendship and by identity of feelings. . . . A soldier-like spirit was happily blended with ethical and political points of view, and ancient national usage with the ideas of the present and with Pythagorean principles; and it constitutes an honorable monument of the wisdom of Epaminondas."—E. Curtius, *Hist. of Greece, bk.* 6, *ch.* 1.

B. C. 370-362. — Intervention in Peloponnesus.—Successive expeditions of Epaminondas.—Invasions of Sparta.—Formation of the Arcadian Union.—Battle of Mantinea and death of Epaminondas. See Greece: B. C. 371-362.

B. C. 357-338.—The Ten Years Sacred War with the Phocians.—Intervention of Philip of Macedon.—Loss of independence and liberty. See Greece: B. C. 357-336.

B. C. 335.—Revolt.—Destruction by Alexander the Great. See Greece: B. C. 336-335.

B. C. 316.— Restoration by Cassander of Macedonia. See Greece: B. C. 321-312.

B. C. 291-290.— Siege of by Demetrius.— Thebes, with other Bœotian towns, united in a revolt against Demetrius Poliorcetes, while the latter held the throne of Macedonia, and was reduced to submission, B. C. 290, after a siege which lasted nearly a year.—C. Thirlwall, *Hist. of Greece, ch.* 60.

A. D. 1146.—Sack by the Normans of Sicily.—Abduction of silk-weavers. See Byzantine Empire: A. D. 1146.

A. D. 1205.—Included in the Latin duchy of Athens. See Athens: A. D. 1205.

A. D. 1311. — Conquest by the Catalans. See Catalan Grand Company.

THEGN, OR THANE. See Comitatus; Ethel; and England: A. D. 958.

THEIPHALI.—THEIPHALIA. See Taifalæ.

THEMES.—Administrative divisions of the Byzantine Empire. "The term thema was first applied to the Roman legion. The military districts, garrisoned by legions, were then called themata, and ultimately the word was used merely to indicate geographical administrative divisions."—G. Finlay, *Hist. of the Byzantine Empire, bk.* 1, *ch.* 1, *sect.* 1, *foot-note.*—See, also, Byzantine Empire: A. D. 717.

THEMISTOCLES, Ascendancy and fall of. See Athens: B. C. 489-480, to 477-462.

THEODORA, Empress in the East (Byzantine, or Greek), A. D. 1042, and 1054-1056.

THEODORE, King of Corsica. See Corsica: A. D. 1729-1769.....**Theodore I., Pope, A. D. 642-649**.....**Theodore II., Pope, 898**.....**Theodore or Feodore, II., Czar of Russia, 1584-1598**.....**Theodore III., Czar of Russia, 1676-1682**.....**Theodore Lascaris I., Greek Emperor of Nicæa, 1206-1222**.....**Theodore Lascaris II., Greek Emperor of Nicæa, 1255-1259.**

THEODORIC, Ostrogothic kingdom of. See Goths: A. D. 473-488; and Rome: A. D. 488-526.

THEODOSIAN CODE, The. See CORPUS JURIS CIVILIS.

THEODOSIUS I., Roman Emperor (Eastern), A. D. 378–395; (Western), 392–395; in Britain, see BRITAIN: A. D. 367–370.....**Theodosius II., Roman Emperor (Eastern), 408–450; (Western), 423–425.....Theodosius III., Roman Emperor (Eastern), 716–717.**

THEOPHILUS, Emperor in the East, (Byzantine, or Greek), A. D. 829–842.

THEORI.—The name of Theori, among the ancient Greeks, "in addition to its familiar signification of spectators at the theatre and public ambassadors to foreign sanctuaries and festivals, was specially applied to certain public magistrates, whose function it was to superintend and take charge of religious affairs in general, though they often possessed along with this some more extensive political power."—G. Schömann, *Antiq. of Greece: The State, pt.* 2, *ch.* 5.

THEORICON, The.—"By means of the Theoricon . . . , the most pernicious issue of the age of Pericles, there arose in a small free state [Athens] a lavish expenditure, which was relatively not less than in the most voluptuous courts, and which consumed large sums, while the wars were unsuccessful for the want of money. By it is understood the money which was distributed among the people for the celebration of the festivals and games, partly to restore to the citizens the sum required for their admission into the theatre, partly to enable them to procure a better meal. In part it was expended for sacrifices, with which a public feast was connected. . . . The superintendents of the theoricon were not called treasurers; but they evidently had a treasury. Their office was one of the administrative offices of the government, and indeed of the most eminent. They were elected by the assembly of the people through cheirotonia. Their office seems to have been annual. Their number is nowhere given. Probably there were ten of them, one from each tribe. . . . The Athenian people was a tyrant, and the treasury of the theorica its private treasury."—A. Boeckh, *Public Economy of Athens* (*tr. by Lamb*), *bk.* 2, *ch.* 7; *also ch.* 13.

THEOW.—"In the earliest English laws . . . slaves are found; the 'theow' [from the same root as 'dienen,' to serve] or slave simple, whether 'wealh'—that is, of British extraction, captured or purchased—or of the common German stock descended from the slaves of the first colonists; the 'esne' or slave who works for hire; the 'wite-theow' who is reduced to slavery because he cannot pay his debts."—W. Stubbs, *Const. Hist. of Eng., ch.* 5, *sect.* 37.

THERA.—The ancient name of the Greek island of Santorin, one of the Sporades, whose inhabitants were enterprising navigators, and weavers and dyers of purple stuffs. They are said to have founded Cyrene, on the north African coast.—E. Curtius, *Hist. of Greece, bk.* 2, *ch.* 3.—See CYRENAICA.

THERMÆ.—"The Roman thermæ were a combination on a huge scale of the common balneæ with the Greek gymnasia. Their usual form was that of a large quadrangular space, the sides of which were formed by various porticos, exedræ, and even theatres for gymnastic and literary exercises, and in the centre of which stood a block of buildings containing the bath rooms and spacious halls for undergoing the complicated process of the Roman warm bath. The area covered by the whole group of buildings was, in many cases, very large. The court of the Baths of Caracalla enclosed a space of 1,150 feet on each side, with curvilinear projections on two sides. The central mass of building was a rectangle, 730 feet by 380. . . . The other great Imperial thermæ of Rome, those of Nero, Titus, Domitian, Diocletian, and Constantine, were probably upon the same plan as the Thermæ Caracallæ. All were built of brick, and the interior was decorated with stucco, mosaics, or slabs of marble, and other ornamental stones. . . . The public balneæ, as distinct from thermæ, . . . were used simply as baths, and had none of the luxurious accessories attached to them which were found in the courts of the great thermæ."—R. Burn, *Rome and the Campagna, introd.*

THERMIDOR, The month. See FRANCE: A. D. 1793 (OCTOBER) THE NEW REPUBLICAN CALENDAR.

THERMIDORIANS.—The Ninth of Thermidor. See FRANCE: A. D. 1794 (JULY), and 1794–1795 (JULY—APRIL).

THERMOPYLÆ, The Pass of. See THESSALY.

B. C. 480.—The defense by Leonidas against the Persians. See GREECE: B. C. 480 (THERMOPYLÆ).

B. C. 352.—Repulse of Philip of Macedon. See GREECE: B. C. 357–336.

B. C. 279.—Defense against the Gauls. See GAULS: B. C. 280–279.

B. C. 191.—Defeat of Antiochus by the Romans. See SELEUCIDÆ: B. C. 224–187.

A. D. 1822.—Greek victory over the Turks. See GREECE: A. D. 1821–1829.

THERVINGI, The. See GOTHS (VISIGOTHS): A. D. 376.

THESES OF LUTHER, The Ninety-five. See PAPACY: A. D. 1517.

THESMOPHORIA, The. See GREECE: B. C. 383.

THESMOTHETES. See ATHENS: FROM THE DORIAN MIGRATION TO B. C. 683.

THESPROTIANS. See EPIRUS; and HELLAS.

THESSALONICA.—Therma, an unimportant ancient city of Macedonia, received the name of Thessalonica, about 315 B. C., in honor of the sister of Alexander the Great, who married Cassander. Cassander gave an impetus to the city which proved lasting. It rose to a high commercial rank, acquired wealth, and became, under the Romans, the capital of the Illyrian provinces.

A. D. 390.—Massacre ordered by Theodosius.—A riotous outbreak at Thessalonica, A. D. 390, caused by the imprisonment of one of the popular favorites of the circus, was punished by the Emperor Theodosius in a manner so fiendish that it seems wellnigh incredible. He caused the greatest possible number of the inhabitants to be invited, in his name, to witness certain games in the circus. "As soon as the assembly was complete, the soldiers, who had secretly been posted round the circus, received the signal, not of the races, but of a general massacre. The promiscuous carnage continued three hours,

without discrimination of strangers or natives, of age or sex, of innocence or guilt; the most moderate accounts state the number of the slain at 7,000; and it is affirmed by some writers that more than 15,000 victims were sacrificed. . . . The guilt of the emperor is aggravated by his long and frequent residence at Thessalonica."—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, ch.* 27.

A. D. 904.—Capture and pillage by the Saracens.—The capture of Thessalonica by a piratical expedition from Tarsus, A. D. 904, was one of the most terrible experiences of its kind in that age of blood and rapine, and one of which the fullest account, by an eye-witness and sufferer, has come down to posterity. The wretched inhabitants who escaped the sword were mostly sold into slavery, and the splendid city — then the second in the Byzantine Empire — was stripped of all its wealth. The defense of the place had been neglected, with implicit dependence on the goodwill and the power of St. Demetrius.—G. Finlay, *Hist. of the Byzantine Empire, from* 716 *to* 1057, *bk.* 2, *ch.* 1, *sect.* 2.

A. D. 1204-1222.—Capital of the kingdom of Saloniki. See Saloniki.

A. D. 1222-1234.—The Greek empire. See Epirus: A. D. 1204–1350.

A. D. 1430.—Capture by the Turks.—Thessalonica, feebly defended by Venetians and Greeks, was taken by the Turks, under Amurath II., in February, 1430. "'The pillage and the carnage,' relates the Greek Anagnosta, an eye-witness of this disastrous night, 'transcended the hopes of the Turks and the terror of the Greeks. No family escaped the swords, the chains, the flames, the outrages of the Asiatics fierce for their prey. At the close of the day, each soldier drove like a herd before him, through the streets of Salonica, troops of women, of young girls, of children, of caloyers and anchorites, of monks of all the monasteries. Priests were chained with virgins, children with old men, mothers with their sons, in derision of age, of profession, of sex, which added a barbarous irony to nudity and death itself.'"—A. Lamartine, *Hist. of Turkey, bk.* 10, *sect.* 27.

THESSALY. — "The northern part of Greece is traversed in its whole length by a range of mountains, the Greek Apennines, which issue from the same mighty root, the Thracian Scomius, in which Hæmus, and Rhodopé and the Illyrian Alps likewise meet. This ridge first takes the name of Pindus, where it intersects the northern boundary of Greece, at a point where an ancient route still affords the least difficult passage from Epirus into Thessaly. From Pindus two huge arms stretch towards the eastern sea and enclose the vale of Thessaly, the largest and richest plain in Greece: on the north the Cambunian Hills, after making a bend towards the south, terminate in the loftier heights of Olympus, which are scarcely ever entirely free from snow; the opposite and lower chain of Othrys parting, with its eastern extremity, the Malian from the Pagasæan Gulf, sinks gently towards the coast. A fourth rampart, which runs parallel to Pindus, is formed by the range which includes the celebrated heights of Pelion and Ossa; the first a broad and nearly even ridge, the other towering into a steep and conical peak, the neighbour and rival of Olympus, with which, in the songs of the country, it is said to dispute the pre-eminence in the depth and duration of its snows. The mountain barrier with which Thessaly is thus encompassed is broken only at the northeast corner by a deep and narrow cleft, which parts Ossa from Olympus; the defile so renowned in poetry as the vale, in history as the pass, of Tempe. The imagination of the ancient poets and declaimers delighted to dwell on the natural beauties of this romantic glen and on the sanctity of the site, from which Apollo had transplanted his laurel to Delphi. . . . South of this gulf [the Gulf of Pagasæ], the coast is again deeply indented by that of Malia, into which the Spercheius, rising from Mount Tymphrestus, a continuation of Pindus, winds through a long, narrow vale, which, though considered as a part of Thessaly, forms a separate region, widely distinguished from the rest by its physical features. It is intercepted between Othrys and Œta, a huge, rugged pile, which stretching from Pindus to the sea at Thermopylæ, forms the inner barrier of Greece, as the Cambunian range is the outer, to which it corresponds in direction and is nearly equal in height. From Mount Callidromus, a southern limb of Œta, the same range is continued without interruption, though under various names and different degrees of elevation, along the coast of the Eubœan Sea. . . . Another branch, issuing from the same part of Pindus, connects it with the loftier summits of Parnassus, and afterward skirting the Corinthian Gulf under the names of Cirphis and Helicon, proceeds to form the northern boundary of Attica under those of Cithæron and Parnes."—C. Thirlwall, *Hist. of Greece, ch.* 1 (*v.* 1).—In the mythical legends of Greece, Thessaly was the kingdom of Hellen, transmitted to his son Æolus and occupied originally by the Æolic branch of the Hellenic family. The Æolians, however, appear to have receded from the rich Thessalian plain, into Bœotia and elsewhere, before various invading tribes. The people who fixed their name, at last, upon the country, the Thessalians, came into it from Epirus, crossing the Pindus mountain-range.—See, also, Greece: The Migrations; and Dorians and Ionians.

THETES, The. See Debt, Ancient legislation concerning: Greek; also, Athens: B. C. 594.

THEUDEBERT, King of the Franks (Austrasia), A. D. 596–612.

THIASI.—"The name denotes associations [in ancient Athens] which had chosen as their special protector and patron some deity in whose honour at certain times they held sacrifices and festal banquets, whilst they pursued in addition objects of a very varied nature, sometimes joint-stock businesses, sometimes only social enjoyments."—G. F. Schömann, *Antiq. of Greece, pt.* 3, *ch.* 3, *sect.* 2.

THIBAULT I., King of Navarre, A. D. 1236–1253.....Thibault II., King of Navarre, 1253–1270.

THIBET. See Tibet.

THIERRY I., King of the Franks, at Metz, A. D. 511–534.....Thierry II., King of the Franks (Austrasia), 612–613; King of Burgundy, 596–613.....Thierry III., King of the Franks (Neustria and Burgundy), 670–691..... Thierry IV., King of the Franks (Neustria, Austrasia, and Burgundy), 720–737.

THIERS, Adolphe, and the founding of the third French Republic. See FRANCE: A. D. 1871–1876.

THIN.—THINÆ. See CHINA: The NAMES OF THE COUNTRY.

THING.—THINGVALLA.—ALTHING.—"The judicial and legislative assembly of the Northmen represented by the word 'thing' (from 'tinga'=to speak, and allied to our English word 'think') can be traced in many local names throughout England, and more especially in the extreme North, where the Scandinavian race prevailed, and where the 'thing' was primitively held upon the site of, or as an appanage to, a 'hof' or temple. It is plainly seen in the Tynwald Court or general legislative assembly for the Isle of Man, where the distinctive feature of the primitive open-air assembly still survives in the custom of the whole assembly going once a year in solemn procession, attended by the governor of the island and a military escort, to a hill known as the Tynwald Hill, whence all the laws that have been passed in the course of the past year are proclaimed in English and Manx. . . . In Norway there is an 'Al-thing' or general assembly, and four district 'things' for the several provinces, as well as a Norwegian Parliament familiar to us as 'Stor-thing' or great council."—R. R. Sharpe, *Introd. to Calendar of Wills, Court of Husting, London, v.* 1.—"By the end of the period of the first occupation of Iceland, a number of little kingdoms had been formed all round the coast, ruled by the priests, who, at stated times, convened their adherents and retainers to meetings for the settlement of matters which concerned any or all of them. These were called 'Things'—meetings, i. e. Mot-things. Each was independent of the other, and quarrels between the members of two separate Things could only be settled as the quarrels of nations are settled, by treaty or war. But the time soon arrived when the progress of political thought began to work upon this disjointed constitution; and then amalgamation of local Things into an Althing, of local jurisdiction into a commonwealth jurisdiction, was the historical result. . . . The Thingvalla, or Thing-field itself, was a vast sunken plain of lava, about four miles broad and rather more than four miles deep, lying with a dip or slope from north-east to south-west, between two great lips or furrows. A stream called Öxará, (Axewater) cuts off a rocky portion of the plain, so as almost to form an island. This is the famous Hill of Laws, or Lögberg, which was the heart of the Icelandic body politic. . . . This example of the Icelandic Thing is the most perfect that is known to history."—G. L. Gomme, *Primitive Folk-Moots, ch.* 2.

ALSO IN: G. W. Dasent, *introd. to "The Story of Burnt Njal."*—See, also, NORMANS.—NORTHMEN: A. D. 860–1100; and SCANDINAVIAN STATES (DENMARK—ICELAND): A. D. 1849–1874.

THINGMEN. See HOUSECARLS.

THINIS. See MEMPHIS, EGYPT; also EGYPT: THE OLD EMPIRE AND THE MIDDLE EMPIRE.

THIONVILLE: A. D. 1643.—Siege and capture by the French. See FRANCE: A. D. 1643.

A. D. 1659.—Ceded to France. See FRANCE: A. D. 1659–1661.

THIRD ESTATE, The. See ESTATES, THE THREE.

THIRTEEN COLONIES, The. See MASSACHUSETTS; RHODE ISLAND; CONNECTICUT; NEW HAMPSHIRE; NEW YORK; NEW JERSEY; PENNSYLVANIA; DELAWARE; MARYLAND; VIRGINIA; NORTH CAROLINA; SOUTH CAROLINA; GEORGIA; also, NEW ENGLAND.

THIRTEENTH AMENDMENT. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1865 (JANUARY).

THIRTY TYRANTS OF ATHENS, The. See ATHENS: B. C. 404–403.

THIRTY TYRANTS OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE, The. See ROME: A. D. 192–284.

THIRTY YEARS TRUCE, The. See GREECE: B. C. 449–445.

THIRTY YEARS WAR, The. See GERMANY: A. D. 1608–1618, to 1648; and BOHEMIA: A. D. 1611–1618, and 1621–1648.

THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES, The.—"In 1563 the Articles of the English Church, forty-two in number, originally drawn up in 1551 under Edward VI., were revised in Convocation, and reduced to their present number, thirty-nine; but it was not until 1571 that they were made binding upon the clergy by Act of Parliament."—T. P. Taswell-Langmead, *English Const. Hist., ch.* 12.

THIS, OR THINIS. See EGYPT: THE OLD EMPIRE AND THE MIDDLE EMPIRE; also, MEMPHIS, EGYPT.

THISTLE: Its adoption as the national emblem of Scotland. See SAINT ANDREW: THE SCOTTISH ORDER.

THISTLE, Order of the.—A Scottish order of knighthood instituted by James V. in 1530.

THOMAS, General George H.: Campaign against Zollicoffer. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1862 (JANUARY—FEBRUARY: KENTUCKY—TENNESSEE).....**Refusal of the command of the Army of the Ohio.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1862 (JUNE—OCTOBER: TENNESSEE—KENTUCKY).....**At Chickamauga, and in the Chattanooga Campaign.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1863 (AUGUST—SEPTEMBER) ROSECRANS' ADVANCE; and (OCTOBER—NOVEMBER: TENNESSEE).....**The Atlanta campaign.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1864 (MAY: GEORGIA), to (SEPTEMBER—OCTOBER: GEORGIA).....**Campaign against Hood.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1864 (NOVEMBER: TENNESSEE), and (DECEMBER: TENNESSEE).

THOMAS À BECKET, Saint, and King Henry II. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1162–1170.

THOMPSON'S STATION, Battle at. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1863 (FEBRUARY—APRIL: TENNESSEE).

THORN, Peace of (1466). See POLAND: A. D. 1333–1572.

"THOROUGH," Wentworth and Laud's government system. See IRELAND: A. D. 1633–1639.

THRACE: B. C. 323-281.—The kingdom of Lysimachus and its overthrow. See MACEDONIA, &C.: B. C. 323–316 to 297–280.

THRACIANS, The.—"That vast space comprised between the rivers Strymon and Danube, and bounded to the west by the easternmost Illyrian tribes, northward of the Strymon, was occupied by the innumerable subdivisions of the race called Thracians, or Threïcians. They were the

most numerous and most terrible race known to Herodotus: could they by possibility act in unison or under one dominion (he says) they would be irresistible. . . . Numerous as the tribes of Thracians were, their customs and character (according to Herodotus) were marked by great uniformity: of the Getæ, the Trausi, and others, he tells us a few particularities. . . . The general character of the race presents an aggregate of repulsive features unredeemed by the presence of even the commonest domestic affections. . . . It appears that the Thynians and Bithynians, on the Asiatic side of the Bosphorus, perhaps also the Mysians, were members of this great Thracian race, which was more remotely connected, also, with the Phrygians. And the whole race may be said to present a character more Asiatic than European; especially in those ecstatic and maddening religious rites, which prevailed not less among the Edonian Thracians than in the mountains of Ida and Dindymon of Asia, though with some important differences. The Thracians served to furnish the Greeks with mercenary troops and slaves."—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece, pt.* 2, *ch.* 26.—"Under Seuthes [B. C. 424—] Thrace stood at the height of its prosperity. It formed a connected empire from Abdera to the Danube, from Byzantium to the Strymon. . . . The land abounded in resources, in corn and flocks and herds, in gold and silver. . . . No such state had as yet existed in the whole circuit of the Ægean. . . . But their kingdom failed to endure. After Seuthes it broke up into several principalities."—E. Curtius, *Hist. of Greece, bk.* 7, *ch.* 1.—"Herodotus is not wrong in calling the Thracians the greatest of the peoples known to him after the Indians. Like the Illyrian, the Thracian stock attained to no full development, and appears more as hard-pressed and dispossessed than as having any historically memorable course of its own. . . . The Thracian [language] disappeared amidst the fluctuations of peoples in the region of the Danube and the overpowerful influence of Constantinople, and we cannot even determine the place which belongs to it in the pedigree of nations. . . . Their wild but grand mode of worshipping the gods may perhaps be conceived as a trait peculiar to this stock—the mighty outburst of the joy of spring and youth, the nocturnal mountain-festivals of torch-swinging maidens, the intoxicating sense-confusing music, the flowing of wine and the flowing of blood, the giddy festal whirl, frantic with the simultaneous excitement of all sensuous passions. Dionysos, the glorious and the terrible, was a Thracian god." Under the supremacy of the Romans, the Thracians were governed by a native line of vassal kings, reigning at Bizye (Wiza), between Adrianople and the coast of the Black Sea, until the Emperor Claudius, A. D. 46, suppressed the nominal kingdom and made Thrace a Roman province.—T. Mommsen, *Hist. of Rome, bk.* 8, *ch.* 6.—In the 8th and 9th centuries, "the great Thracian race, which had once been inferior in number only to the Indian, and which, in the first century of our era, had excited the attention of Vespasian by the extent of the territory it occupied, had . . . almost disappeared. The country it had formerly inhabited was peopled by Vallachian and Sclavonian tribes."—G. Finlay, *Hist. of the Byzantine Empire, bk.* 1, *ch.* 1, *sect.* 1.

THREE CHAPTERS, The dispute of the.—A famous church dispute raised in the sixth century by the Emperor Justinian, who discovered an heretical taint in certain passages, called the Three Chapters, culled out of the works of Theodore of Mopsuestia and two other doctors of the church who had been teachers and friends of Nestorius. A solemn Church Council called (A. D. 553) at Constantinople—the fifth general Council—condemned the Three Chapters and anathematized their adherents. But this touched by implication the decrees of the Council of Chalcedon, which were especially cherished in the Latin Church, and Rome became rebellious. In the end, the Roman opposition prevailed, and, "in the period of a century, the schism of the three chapters expired in an obscure angle of the Venetian province."—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, ch.* 47.

Also in: H. H. Milman, *Hist. of Latin Christianity, bk.* 1, *ch.* 4.

THREE F'S, The. See Ireland: A. D. 1873–1879.

THREE HENRYS, War of the. See France: A. D. 1584–1589.

THREE HUNDRED AT THERMOPYLÆ, The. See Greece: B. C. 480 (Thermopylæ).

THREE HUNDRED OF THEBES, The. See Thebes: B. C. 378.

THREE KINGS, Battle of the. See Morocco: The Arab conquest, and since.

THREE LEGS OF MAN, The. See Triskelion.

THREE PRESIDENCIES OF INDIA, The. See India: A. D. 1600–1702.

THUCYDIDES: The origin of his history. See Amphipolis.

THUGS.—THUGGEE. See India: A. D. 1823–1833.

THULE.—Pytheas, a Greek traveller and writer of the time (as supposed) of Alexander the Great, was the first to introduce the name of Thule into ancient geography. He described it vaguely as an island, lying six days' voyage to the north of Britain, in a region where the sea became like neither land nor water, but was of a thick and sluggish substance, resembling that of the jelly fish. "It appears to me impossible to identify the Thule of Pytheas with any approach to certainty; but he had probably heard vaguely of the existence of some considerable island, or group of islands, to the north of Britain, whether the Orkneys or the Shetlands it is impossible to say."—E. H. Bunbury, *Hist. of Ancient Geog., ch.* 15, *sect.* 2, *foot-note.*—Some modern writers identify Thule with Iceland; some with the coast of Norway, mistakenly regarded as an island. But, whichever land it may have been, Thule to the Greeks and Romans, was Ultima Thule,—the end of the known world,—the most northerly point of Europe to which their knowledge reached.—R. F. Burton, *Ultima Thule, introd., sect.* 1 (*v.* 1).

THUNDERING LEGION, The.—During the summer of the year 174, in a campaign which the Emperor Marcus Aurelius Antoninus conducted against the Quadi, on the Danube, the Roman army was once placed in a perilous position. It was hemmed in by the enemy, cut off from all access to water, and was reduced to despair. At the last extremity, it is said, the army was saved by a miraculous storm, which

poured rain on the thirsty Romans, while lightning and hail fell destructively in the ranks of the barbarians. According to the Pagan historians, Aurelius owed this "miraculous victory," as it was called, to the arts of one Arnuphis, an Egyptian magician. But later Christian writers told a different story. They relate that the distressed army contained one legion composed entirely of Christians, from Melitene, and that these soldiers, being called upon by the emperor to invoke their God, united in a prayer which received the answer described. Hence, the legion was known thereafter, by imperial command, as the Thundering Legion.—P. B. Watson, *Marcus Aurelius Antoninus, ch.* 5.

ALSO IN: Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History, bk.* 5, *ch.* 5.

THURII.—THURIUM. See SIRIS.

THURINGIA.—THURINGIANS, The.—"To the eastward of the Saxons and of the Franks, the Thuringians had just formed a new monarchy. That people had united to the Varni and the Heruli, they had spread from the borders of the Elbe and of the Undstrut to those of the Necker. They had invaded Hesse or the country of the Catti, one of the Frankish people, and Franconia, where they had distinguished their conquests by frightful cruelties. . . . It is not known at what period these atrocities were committed, but Thierri [or Theoderic, one of the four Frank kings, sons of Clovis] towards the year 528, reminds his soldiers of them to excite their revenge; it is probable that they were the motives which induced the Franks of Germany and those of Gaul to unite, in order to provide more powerfully for their defence." Thierry, the Frank king at Metz, and Clotaire, his brother, who reigned at Soissons, united in 528 against the Thuringians and completely crushed them. "This great province was then united to the monarchy of the Franks, and its dukes, during two centuries, marched under the standards of the Merovingians."—J. C. L. S. de Sismondi, *The French under the Merovingians, ch.* 6.

ALSO IN: W. C. Perry, *The Franks, ch.* 3.—See, also, GERMANY: A. D. 481–768.

Absorbed in Saxony. See SAXONY: THE OLD DUCHY.

THURM AND TAXIS, Prince, and the German postal system. See POST.

THYMBRÆAN ORACLE. See ORACLES OF THE GREEKS.

THYNIANS, The. See BITHYNIANS.

TIBARENIANS, The.—A people who anciently inhabited the southern coast of the Euxine, toward its eastern extremity.—G. Rawlinson, *Five Great Monarchies: Persia, ch.* 1.

TIBBOOS, The. See LIBYANS.

TIBERIAS, Battle of (1187). See JERUSALEM: A. D. 1149–1187.

TIBERIAS, The Patriarch of. See JEWS: A. D. 200–400.

TIBERIUS, Roman Emperor, A. D. 14–37; German campaigns, see GERMANY: B. C. 8–A. D. 11.....Tiberius II, Roman Emperor (Eastern), 578–582.....Tiberius Absimarus, Roman Emperor (Eastern), 698–704.

TIBET.—"The name of Tibet is applied not only to the south-west portion of the Chinese Empire, but also to more than half of Kashmîr occupied by peoples of Tibetan origin. These regions of 'Little Tibet' and of 'Apricot Tibet'—so called from the orchards surrounding its villages—consist of deep valleys opening like troughs between the snowy Himalayan and Karakorum ranges. Draining towards India, these uplands have gradually been brought under Hindu influences, whereas Tibet proper has pursued a totally different career. It is variously known as 'Great,' the 'Third,' or 'East Tibet'; but such is the confusion of nomenclature that the expression 'Great Tibet' is also applied to Ladak, which forms part of Kashmîr. At the same time, the term Tibet itself, employed by Europeans to designate two countries widely differing in their physical and political conditions, is unknown to the people themselves. Hermann Schlagintweit regards it as an old Tibetan word meaning 'strength,' or 'empire' in a pre-eminent sense and this is the interpretation supplied by the missionaries of the seventeenth century, who give the country the Italian name of Potente, or 'Powerful.' But however this be, the present inhabitants use the term Bod-yul alone; that is, 'land of the Bod,' itself probably identical with Bhutan, a Hindu name restricted by Europeans to a single state on the southern slope of the Himalayas. The Chinese call Tibet either Si-Tsang—that is, West Tsang, from its principal province—or Wei-Tsang, a word applied to the two provinces of Wei and Tsang, which jointly constitute Tibet proper. To the inhabitants they give the name of Tu-Fan, or 'Aboriginal Fans,' in opposition to the Si-Fan, or 'Western Fans,' of Sechuen and Kansu. . . . Suspended like a vast terrace some 14,000 or 16,000 feet above the surrounding plains, the Tibetan plateau is more than half filled with closed basins dotted with a few lakes or marshes, the probable remains of inland seas whose overflow discharged through the breaks in the frontier ranges. . . . During the present century the Tibetan Government has succeeded better than any other Asiatic state in preserving the political isolation of the people, thanks chiefly to the relief and physical conditions of the land. Tibet rises like a citadel in the heart of Asia; hence its defenders have guarded its approaches more easily than those of India, China, and Japan. The greater part of Tibet remains still unexplored. . . . The great bulk of the inhabitants, apart from the Mongolo-Tartar Horsoks of Khachi and the various independent tribes of the province of Kham, belong to a distinct branch of the Mongolian family. They are of low size, with broad shoulders and chests, and present a striking contrast to the Hindus in the size of their arms and calves, while resembling them in their small and delicate hands and feet. . . . The Tibetans are one of the most highly endowed people in the world. Nearly all travellers are unanimous in praise of their gentleness, frank and kindly bearing, unaffected dignity. Strong, courageous, naturally cheerful, fond of music, the dance and song, they would be a model race but for their lack of enterprise. They are as easily governed as a flock of sheep, and for them the word of a lama has force of law. Even the mandates of the Chinese authorities are scrupulously obeyed, and thus it happens that against their own friendly feelings they jealously guard the frontiers against all strangers. The more or less mixed races of East Tibet on the Chinese

frontier, on the route of the troops that plunder them and of the mandarins who oppress them, seem to be less favourably constituted, and are described as thievish and treacherous. . . . The Tibetans have long been a civilised people. . . . In some respects they are even more civilised than those of many European countries, for reading and writing are general accomplishments in many places, and books are here so cheap that they are found in the humblest dwellings, though several of these works are kept simply on account of their magical properties. In the free evolution of their speech, which has been studied chiefly by Foucaux, Csoma de Körös, Schiefner, and Jäschke, the Tibetans have outlived the period in which the Chinese are still found. The monosyllabic character of the language, which differs from all other Asiatic tongues, has nearly been effaced. . . . The Tibetan Government is in theory a pure theocracy. The Dalia-lama, called also the Gyalba-remboché, 'Jewel of Majesty,' or 'Sovereign Treasure,' is at once god and king, master of the life and fortunes of his subjects, with no limit to his power except his own pleasure. [On Lamaism in Tibet, see LAMAS.] Nevertheless he consents to be guided in ordinary matters by the old usages, while his very greatness prevents him from directly oppressing his people. His sphere of action being restricted to spiritual matters, he is represented in the administration by a viceroy chosen by the Emperor in a supreme council of three high priests. . . . Everything connected with general politics and war must be referred to Peking, while local matters are left to the Tibetan authorities. . . . Pope, viceroy, ministers, all receive a yearly subvention from Peking and all the Tibetan mandarins wear on their hats the button, or distinctive sign of the dignities conferred by the empire. Every third or fifth year a solemn embassy is sent to Peking with rich presents, receiving others in exchange from the 'Son of Heaven.'. . . The whole land belongs to the Dalai-lama, the people being merely temporary occupants, tolerated by the real owner. The very houses and furniture and all movable property are held in trust for the supreme master, whose subjects must be grateful if he takes a portion only for the requirements of the administration. One of the most ordinary sentences, in fact, is wholesale confiscation, when the condemned must leave house and lands, betaking themselves to a camp life, and living by begging in the districts assigned to them. So numerous are these chong long, or official mendicants, that they form a distinct class in the State. . . . Since the cession of Ladak to Kashmîr, and the annexation of Batang, Litang, Aten-tze, and other districts to Sechuen and Yunnan, Si-tsang, or Tibet proper, comprises only the four provinces of Nari, Tsang, Wei, or U, and Kham. Certain principalities enclosed in these provinces are completely independent of Lassa, and either enjoy self-government or are directly administered from Peking. . . . Even in the four provinces the Chinese authorities interfere in many ways, and their power is especially felt in that of Nari, where, owing to its dangerous proximity to Kashmir and India, the old spirit of independence might be awakened. Nor is any money allowed to be coined in Tibet, which in the eyes of the Imperial Government is merely a dependency of Sechuen, whence all orders are received in Lassa."—É. Reclus, *The Earth and its Inhabitants: Asia, v.* 2, *ch.* 2.

ALSO IN: H. Bower, *Diary of a Journey across Tibet, ch.* 16.

TIBISCUS, The.—The ancient name of the river Theiss.

TIBUR.—An important Latin city, more ancient than Rome, from which it was only 20 miles distant, on the Anio. Tibur, after many wars, was reduced by the Romans to subjection in the 4th century, B. C., and the delightful country in its neighborhood became a favorite place of residence for wealthy Romans in later times. The ruins of the villa of Hadrian have been identified in the vicinity, and many others have been named, but without historical authority. Hadrian's villa is said to have been like a town in its vast extent. The modern town of Tivoli occupies the site of Tibur.—R. Burn, *Rome and the Campagna, ch.* 14.

TIBURTINE SIBYL. See SIBYLS.

TICINUS, Battle on the. See PUNIC WARS: THE SECOND.

TICKET-OF-LEAVE SYSTEM, The. See LAW, CRIMINAL: A. D. 1825.

TICONDEROGA, Fort: A. D. 1731.—Built by the French. See CANADA: A. D. 1700–1735.

A. D. 1756.—Reconstructed by the French. See CANADA: A. D. 1756.

A. D. 1758.—The bloody repulse of Abercrombie. See CANADA: A. D. 1758.

A. D. 1759.—Taken by General Amherst. See CANADA: A. D. 1759 (JULY—AUGUST).

A. D. 1775.—Surprised and taken by the Green Mountain Boys. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1775 (MAY).

A. D. 1777.—Recapture by Burgoyne. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1777 (JULY—OCTOBER).

TIEN-TSIN, Treaty of (1858). See CHINA: A. D. 1856–1860.

TIERRA FIRME.—"The world was at a loss at first [after Columbus' discovery] what to call the newly found region to the westward. It was easy enough to name the islands, one after another, as they were discovered, but when the Spaniards reached the continent they were backward about giving it a general name. . . . As the coast line of the continent extended itself and became known as such, it was very naturally called by navigators 'tierra firme,' firm land, in contradistinction to the islands which were supposed to be less firm. . . . The name Tierra Firme, thus general at first, in time became particular. As a designation for an unknown shore it at first implied only the Continent. As discovery unfolded, and the magnitude of this Firm Land became better known, new parts of it were designated by new names, and Tierra Firme became a local appellation in place of a general term. Paria being first discovered, it fastened itself there; also along the shore to Darien, Veragua, and on to Costa Rica, where at no well defined point it stopped, so far as the northern seaboard was concerned, and in due time struck across to the South Sea, where the name marked off an equivalent coast line. . . . As a political division Tierra Firme had existence for a long time. It comprised the provinces of Darien, Veragua, and Panamá, which last bore

also the name of Tierra Firme as a province. The extent of the kingdom was 65 leagues in length by 18 at its greatest breadth, and 9 leagues at its smallest width. It was bounded on the east by Cartagena, and the gulf of Urabá and its river; on the west by Costa Rica, including a portion of what is now Costa Rica; and on the north and south by the two seas. . . . Neither Guatemala, Mexico, nor any of the lands to the north were ever included in Tierra Firme. English authors often apply the Latin form, Terra Firma, to this division, which is misleading."—H. H. Bancroft, *Hist. of the Pacific States, v.* 1, *p.* 290, *foot-note.*—See, also, Spanish Main.

TIERS ETAT. See Estates, the Three.

TIGORINI, OR TIGURINI, in Gaul, The.—After the Cimbri had defeated two Roman armies, in 113 and 109 B. C., "the Helvetii, who had suffered much in the constant conflicts with their north-eastern neighbours, felt themselves stimulated by the example of the Cimbri to seek in their turn for more quiet and fertile settlements in western Gaul, and had, perhaps, even when the Cimbrian hosts marched through their land, formed an alliance with them for that purpose. Now, under the leadership of Divico, the forces of the Tougeni (position unknown) and of the Tigorini (on the lake of Murten) crossed the Jura and reached the territory of the Nitiobroges (about Agen on the Garonne). The Roman army under the consul Lucius Cassius Longinus, which they here encountered, allowed itself to be decoyed by the Helvetii into an ambush, in which the general himself and his legate, the consular Gaius Piso, along with the greater portion of the soldiers, met their death."—T. Mommsen, *Hist. of Rome, bk.* 4, *ch.* 5.—Subsequently the Tigorini and the Tougeni joined the Cimbri, but were not present at the decisive battle on the Raudine Plain and escaped the destroying swords of the legions of Marius, by flying back to their native Helvetia.

TIGRANOCERTA, Battle of (B. C. 69). See Rome: B. C. 78–68.

TIGRANOCERTA, The building of. See Gordyene.

TILDEN, Samuel J.—In the Free Soil Movement. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1848.....**The overthrow of the Tweed Ring.** See New York: A. D. 1863–1871.....**Defeat in Presidential Election.** See United States of Am.: A. D. 1876–1877.

TILLEMONT: A. D. 1635.—Stormed and sacked by the Dutch and French. See Netherlands: A. D. 1635–1638.

TILLY, Count von: Campaigns. See Germany: A. D. 1620, to 1631–1632.

TILSIT, Treaty of. See Germany: A. D. 1807 (June—July).

TIMAR.—TIMARLI.—SAIM.—SPAHI.—"It was Alaeddin who first instituted a division of all conquered lands among the 'Sipahis,' or Spahis (horsemen), on conditions which, like the feudal tenures of Christian Europe, obliged the holders to service in the field. Here, however, ends the likeness between the Turkish 'Timar' and the European fief. The 'Timarli' were not, like the Christian knighthood, a proud and hereditary aristocracy almost independent of the sovereign and having a voice in his councils, but the mere creatures of the Sultan's breath. The Ottoman constitution recognised no order of nobility, and was essentially a democratic despotism. The institution of military tenures was modified by Amurath I., who divided them into the larger and smaller ('Siamet' and 'Timar'), the holders of which were called 'Saim' and 'Timarli.' Every cavalier, or Spahi, who had assisted to conquer by his bravery, was rewarded with a fief, which, whether large or small, was called 'Kilidsch' (the sword). The symbols of his investment were a sword and colours ('Kilidsch' and 'Sandjak')."—T. H. Dyer, *The History of Modern Europe, v.* 1, *introd.*—See, also, Spahis.

TIMOCRACY. See Geomori.

TIMOLEON, and the deliverance of Sicily. See Syracuse: B. C. 344.

TIMOUR, The Conquests of.—"Timour the Tartar, as he is usually termed in history, was called by his countrymen Timourlenk, that is, Timour the Lame, from the effects of an early wound; a name which some European writers have converted into Tamerlane, or Tamberlaine. He was of Mongol origin [see below], and a direct descendant, by the mother's side, of Zenghis Khan. He was born at Sebzar, a town near Samarcand, in Transoxiana, in 1336. . . . Timour's early youth was passed in struggles for ascendency with the petty chiefs of rival tribes, but at the age of thirty-five he had fought his way to undisputed pre-eminence, and was proclaimed Khan of Zagatai by the 'couroultai,' or general assembly of the warriors of his race. He chose Samarcand as the capital of his dominion, and openly announced that he would make that dominion comprise the whole habitable earth. . . . In the thirty-six years of his reign he raged over the world from the great wall of China to the centre of Russia on the north; and the Mediterranean and the Nile were the western limits of his career, which was pressed eastward as far as the sources of the Ganges. He united in his own person the sovereignties of twenty-seven countries, and he stood in the place of nine several dynasties of kings. . . . The career of Timour as a conqueror is unparalleled in history; for neither Cyrus, nor Alexander, nor Cæsar, nor Attila, nor Zenghis Khan, nor Charlemagne, nor Napoleon, ever won by the sword so large a portion of the globe, or ruled over so many myriads of subjugated fellow-creatures."—E. S. Creasy, *Hist. of the Ottoman Turks, ch.* 3.—"Born of the same family as Jenghiz, though not one of his direct descendants, he bore throughout life the humble title of Emir, and led about with him a nominal Grand Khan [a descendant of Chagatai, one of the sons of Jenghiz Khan], of whom he professed himself a dutiful subject. His pedigree may in strictness entitle him to be called a Mogul; but, for all practical purposes, himself and his hordes must be regarded as Turks. Like all the eastern Turks, such civilization as they had was of Persian origin; and it was of the Persian form of Islam that Timour was so zealous an assertor."—E. A. Freeman, *Hist. and Conquests of the Saracens, lect.* 6.—In 1378 Timour overran Khuarezm. Between 1380 and 1386 he subjugated Khorassan, Afghanistan, Baluchistan and Sistan. He then passed into southern Persia and forced the submission of the Mozafferides who reigned over Fars, punishing the city of Isfahan for a rebellious rising by the massacre of 70,000 of its inhabitants. This done, he returned to Samarkand for a period of rest and prolonged carousal. Taking the field again in

1389, he turned his arms northward and shattered the famous "Golden Horde," of the Khanate of Kiptchak, which dominated a large part of Russia. In 1392–93 the Tartar conqueror completed the subjugation of Persia and Mesopotamia, extinguishing the decayed Mongol Empire of the Ilkhans, and piling up a pyramid of 90,000 human heads on the ruins of Bagdad, the old capital of Islam. Thence he pursued his career of slaughter through Armenia and Georgia, and finished his campaign of five years by a last destroying blow struck at the Kiptchak Khan whom he is said to have pursued as far as Moscow. Once more, at Samarkand, the red-handed, invincible savage then gave himself up to orgies of pleasure-making; but it was not for many months. His eyes were now on India, and the years 1398–1399 were spent by him in carrying death and desolation through the Punjab, and to the city of Delhi, which was made a scene of awful massacre and pillage. No permanent conquest was achieved; the plunder and the pleasure of slaughter were the ends of the expedition. A more serious purpose directed the next movement of Timour's arms, which were turned against the rival Turk of Asia Minor, or Roum — the Ottoman, Bajazet, or Bayezid, who boasted of the conquest of the Roman Empire of the East. In 1402, Bajazet was summoned from the siege of Constantinople to defend his realm. On the 20th of July in that year, on the plain of Angora, he met the enormous hosts of Timourlenk and was overwhelmed by them — his kingdom lost, himself a captive. The merciless Tartar hordes swept hapless Anatolia with a besom of destruction and death. Nicæa, Prusa and other cities were sacked. Smyrna provoked the Tartar savage by an obstinate defense and was doomed to the sword, without mercy for age or sex. Even then, the customary pyramid of heads which he built on the site was not large enough to satisfy his eye and he increased its height by alternate layers of mud. Aleppo, Damascus, and other cities of Syria had been dealt with in like manner the year before. When satiated with blood, he returned to Samarkand in 1404, rested there until January 1405, and then set out upon an expedition to China; but he died on the way. His empire was soon broken in pieces.—A. Vambery, *Hist. of Bokhara, ch.* 10, 11, 12.

Also in: J. Hutton, *Central Asia, ch.* 5–6.—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, ch.* 65.—A. Lamartine, *Hist. of Turkey, bk.* 7.—H. G. Smith, *Romance of Hist., ch.* 4.

TIMUCHI.—This was the name given to the members of the senate or council of six hundred of Massilia—ancient Marseilles.—G. Long, *Decline of the Roman Republic, v.* 1, *ch.* 21.

TIMUCUA, The. See American Aborigines: Timuquanan Family.

TINNEH. See American Aborigines: Athapascan Family.

TIOCAJAS, Battles of. See Ecuador: Aboriginal kingdom.

TIPPECANOE, The Battle of. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1811.

TIPPERMUIR, Battle of (1644). See Scotland: A. D. 1644–1645.

TIPPOO (OR TIPU) SAIB, English wars with. See India: A. D. 1785–1793, and 1798–1805.

TIROL. See Tyrol.

TIRSHATHA. — An ancient Persian title, borne by an officer whose functions corresponded with those of High Sheriff.—H. Ewald, *Hist. of Israel, bk.* 5, *sect.* 1.

TIRYNS. See Argos; and Heracleidæ.

TITHE.—"To consecrate to the Sanctuary in pure thankfulness towards God the tenth of all annual profits, was a primitive tradition among the Canaanites, Phoenicians and Carthaginians. The custom, accordingly, very early passed over to Israel."—H. Ewald, *Antiquities of Israel, introd.*, 3*d sect.*, *II.*, 3.—Modern "recognition of the legal obligation of tithe dates from the eighth century, both on the continent and in England. In A. D. 779 Charles the Great ordained that every one should pay tithe, and that the proceeds should be disposed of by the bishop; and in A. D. 787 it was made imperative by the legatine councils held in England."—W. Stubbs, *Const. Hist. of Eng., ch.* 8, *sect.* 86 (*v.* 1).

TITHE OF SALADIN. See Saladin, The Tithe of.

TITHES, Irish. See England: A. D. 1832–1833.

TITIES, The. See Rome: The beginnings.

TITUS, Roman Emperor, A. D. 79–81.

TIVITIVAS, The. See American Aborigines: Caribs and their Kindred.

TIVOLI. See Tibur.

TLACOPAN. See Mexico: A. D. 1325–1502.

TLASCALA. See Mexico: A. D. 1519 (June—October).

T'LINKETS, The. See American Aborigines: Athapascan Family.

TOBACCO: Its introduction into the Old World from the New. See America: A. D. 1584–1586.

The systematic culture of the plant introduced in Virginia. See Virginia: A. D. 1609–1616.

TOBACCO NATION, The. See American Aborigines: Hurons; and Iroquois Confederacy: Their Name.

TOBAS, The. See American Aborigines: Pampas Tribes.

TOGA, The Roman.—"The toga, the specifically national dress of the Romans, was originally put on the naked body, fitting much more tightly than the rich folds of the togas of later times. About the shape of this toga, which is described as a semicircular cloak . . . , many different opinions prevail. Some scholars consider it to have been an oblong piece of woven cloth . . . ; others construct it of one or even two pieces cut into segments of a circle. Here again we shall adopt in the main the results arrived at through practical trials by Weiss ('Costümkunde,' p. 956 et seq.). The Roman toga therefore was not . . . a quadrangular oblong, but 'had the shape of an oblong edged off into the form of an oval, the middle length being equal to about three times the height of a grown-up man (exclusive of the head), and its middle breadth equal to twice the same length. In putting it on, the toga was at first folded lengthwise, and the double dress thus originated was laid in folds on the straight edge and thrown over the left shoulder in the simple manner of the Greek or Tuscan cloak; the toga, however, covered the whole left side and even dragged on the ground to a considerable extent. The cloak was then pulled across the back and through the

right arm, the ends being again thrown over the left shoulder backwards. The part of the drapery covering the back was once more pulled towards the right shoulder, so as to add to the richness of the folds.'. . . The simpler, that is narrower, toga of earlier times naturally clung more tightly to the body."—E. Guhl and W. Koner, *Life of the Greeks and Romans, sect.* 95.—"No tacks or fastenings of any sort indeed are visible in the toga, but their existence may be inferred from the great formality and little variation displayed in its divisions and folds. In general, the toga seems not only to have formed, as it were, a short sleeve to the right arm, which was left unconfined, but to have covered the left arm down to the wrist. . . . The material of the toga was wool; the colour, in early ages, its own natural yellowish hue. In later periods this seems, however, only to have been retained in the togas of the higher orders; inferior persons wearing theirs dyed, and candidates for public offices bleached by an artificial process. In times of mourning the toga was worn black, or was left off altogether. Priests and magistrates wore the 'toga pretexta,' or toga edged with a purple border, called pretexta. This . . . was, as well as the bulla, or small round gold box suspended on the breast by way of an amulet, worn by all youths of noble birth to the age of fifteen. . . . The knights wore the 'trabea,' or toga striped with purple throughout."—T. Hope, *Costume of the Ancients, v.* 1.

TOGATI, The. See Rome: B. C. 275.

TOGGENBURG WAR, The. See Switzerland: A. D. 1652–1789.

TOGRUL BEG, Seljuk Turkish Sultan. A. D. 1037–1063.

TOHOMES, The. See American Aborigines: Muskhogean Family.

TOHOPEKA, Battle of (1814). See United States of Am.: A. D. 1813–1814 (August—April).

TOISECH. See Ri.

TOISON D'OR.—The French name of the Order of Knighthood known in the English-speaking world as the "Order of the Golden Fleece." See Golden Fleece.

TOLBIAC, Battle of. See Alemanni: A. D. 496–504; also, Franks: A. D. 481–511.

TOLEDO, Ohio: A. D. 1805-1835.—Site in dispute between Ohio and Michigan. See Michigan: A. D. 1837.

TOLEDO, Spain: A. D. 531-712.—The capital of the Gothic kingdom in Spain. See Goths (Visigoths): A. D. 507–711.

A. D. 712.—Surrender to the Arab-Moors. See Spain: A. D. 711–713.

A. D. 1083-1085.—Recovery from the Moors. — On the crumbling of the dominions of the Spanish caliphate of Cordova, Toledo became the seat of one of the most vigorous of the petty kingdoms which arose in Moorish Spain. But on the death of its founder, Aben Dylnun, and under his incapable son Yahia, the kingdom of Toledo soon sank to such weakness as invited the attacks of the Christian king of Leon, Alfonso VI. After a siege of three years, on the 25th of May, A. D. 1085, the old capital of the Goths, which the Moslems had occupied for nearly four centuries, was restored to their descendants and successors.—S. A. Dunham, *Hist. of Spain and Portugal, bk.* 3, *sect.* 1, *ch.* 1.

A. D. 1520-1522.—Revolt against the government of Charles, the emperor.—Siege and surrender. See Spain: A. D. 1518–1522.

TOLEDO, Councils of. See Goths (Visigoths): A. D. 507–711.

TOLENTINO, Treaty of (1797). See France: A. D. 1796–1797 (October—April).

TOLERATION, and the Puritan theocracy of Massachusetts. See Massachusetts: A. D. 1631–1636.

In Maryland. See Maryland: A. D. 1649.

TOLERATION ACT, The. See England: A. D. 1689 (April—August).

TOLOSA, Battle of Las Navas de (1211 or 1212). See Spain: A. D. 1146–1232; also, Almohades.

TOLTECS, The. See Mexico, Ancient.

TOMI.—An ancient Greek city on the western shore of the Euxine, which was Ovid's place of banishment. Its site is occupied by the modern town of Kustendje.

TONE, Theobald Wolf, and the United Irishmen. See Ireland: A. D. 1793–1798.

TONIKAN FAMILY, The. See American Aborigines: Tonikan Family.

TONKAWAN FAMILY, The. See American Aborigines: Tonkawan Family.

TONKIN.—COCHIN-CHINA.—ANNAM.—CAMBOJA.—"The whole region which recent events have practically converted into French territory comprises four distinct political divisions: Tonkin in the north; Cochin-China in the centre; Lower Cochin-China and Camboja in the south. The first two, formerly separate States, have since 1802 constituted a single kingdom, commonly spoken of as the empire of Annam. This term Annam (properly An-nan) appears to be a modified form of Ngan-nan, that is, 'Southern Peace,' first applied to the frontier river between China and Tonkin, and afterwards extended not only to Tonkin, but to the whole region south of that river after its conquest and pacification by China in the third century of the new era. Hence its convenient application to the same region since the union of Tonkin and Cochin-China under one dynasty and since the transfer of the administration to France in 1883, is but a survival of the Chinese usage, and fully justified on historic grounds. Tonkin (Tongking, Tungking), that is, 'Eastern Capital,' a term originally applied to Ha-noi when that city was the royal residence, has in quite recent times been extended to the whole of the northern kingdom, whose true historic name is Yüeh-nan. Under the native rulers Tonkin was divided into provinces and sub-divisions bearing Chinese names, and corresponding to the administrative divisions of the Chinese empire. . . . Since its conquest by Cochin-China the country has been administered in much the same way as the southern kingdom. From this State Tonkin is separated partly by a spur of the coast range projecting seawards, partly by a wall built in the sixteenth century and running in the same direction. After the erection of this artificial barrier, which lies about 18° N. lat., between Hatinh and Dong-koi, the northern and southern kingdoms came to be respectively distinguished by the titles of Dang-ngoai and Dang-trong, that is, 'Outer' and 'Inner Route.' The term Cochin-

China, by which the Inner Route is best known, has no more to do with China than it has with the Indian city of Cochin. It appears to be a modified form of Kwe-Chen-Ching, that is, the 'Kingdom of Chen-Ching,' the name by which this region was first known in the 9th century of the new era, from its capital Chen-Ching. Another although less probable derivation is from the Chinese Co-Chen-Ching, meaning 'Old Champa,' a reminiscence of the time when the Cham (Tsiam) nation was the most powerful in the peninsula. . . . Before the arrival of the French, Cochin-China comprised the whole of the coast lands from Tonkin nearly to the foot of the Pursat hills in South Camboja. . . . From the remotest times China claimed, and intermittently exercised, suzerain authority over Annam, whose energies have for ages been wasted partly in vain efforts to resist this claim, partly in still more disastrous warfare between the two rival States. Almost the first distinctly historic event was the reduction of Lu-liang, as Tonkin was then called, by the Chinese in 218 B. C., when the country was divided into prefectures, and a civil and military organisation established on the Chinese model. . . . Early in the ninth century of the new era the term Kwe-Chen-Ching (Cochin-China) began to be applied to the southern, which had already asserted its independence of the northern, kingdom. In 1428 the two States freed themselves temporarily from the Chinese protectorate, and 200 years later the Annamese reduced all that remained of the Champa territory, driving the natives to the uplands, and settling in the plains. This conquest was followed about 1750 by that of the southern or maritime provinces of Camboja since known as Lower (now French) Cochin-China. In 1775 the King of Cochin-China, who had usurped the throne in 1774, reduced Tonkin, and was acknowledged sovereign of Annam by the Chinese emperor. But in 1798 Gia-long, son of the deposed monarch, recovers the throne with the aid of some French auxiliaries, and in 1802 reconstitutes the Annamese empire under the Cochin-Chinese sceptre. From this time the relations with France become more frequent. . . . After his death in 1820 the anti-European national party acquires the ascendant, the French officers are dismissed, and the Roman Catholic religion, which had made rapid progress during the reign of Gia-long, is subjected to cruel and systematic persecution. Notwithstanding the protests and occasional intervention of France, this policy is persevered in, until the execution of Bishop Diaz in 1857 by order of Tu-Duc, third in succession from Gia-long, calls for more active interference. Admiral Rigault de Genouilly captures Tourane in 1858, followed next year by the rout of the Annamese army at the same place, and the occupation of the forts at the entrance of the Donnai and of Gia-dińh (Saigon), capital of Lower Cochin-China. This virtually established French supremacy, which was sealed by the treaty of 1862, ceding the three best, and that of 1867 the three remaining, provinces of Lower Cochin-China. It was further strengthened and extended by the treaty of 1863, securing the protectorate of Camboja and the important strategical position of 'Quatre-Bras' on the Mekhong. Then came the scientific expedition of Mekhong (1866–68), which dissipated the hopes entertained of that river giving access to the trade of Southern China. Attention was accordingly now attracted to the Song-koi basin, and the establishment of French interests in Tonkin secured by the treaties of peace and commerce concluded with the Annamese Government in 1874. This prepared the way for the recent diplomatic complications with Annam and China, followed by the military operations in Cochin-China and Tonkin [see FRANCE: A. D. 1875–1889], which led up to the treaties of 1883 and 1884, extending the French protectorate to the whole of Annam, and forbidding the Annamese Government all diplomatic relations with foreign powers, China included, except through the intermediary of France. Lastly, the appointment in 1886 of a French Resident General, with full administrative powers, effaced the last vestige of national autonomy, and virtually reduced the ancient kingdoms of Tonkin and Cochin-China to the position of an outlying French possession."—A. H. Keane, *Eastern Geography, pp.* 98–104.—"In the south-eastern extremity of Cochin-China, and in Camboja, still survive the scattered fragments of the historical Tsiam (Cham, Khiam) race, who appear to have been at one time the most powerful nation in Farther India. According to Gagelin, they ruled over the whole region between the Menam and the Gulf of Tongking. . . . Like the Tsiams, the Cambojans, or Khmers, are a race sprung from illustrious ancestry, but at present reduced to about 1,500,000, partly in the south-eastern provinces of Siam, partly forming a petty state under French protection, which is limited east and west by the Mekong and Gulf of Siam, north and south by the Great Lake and French Cochin-China. During the period of its prosperity the Cambojan empire overshadowed a great part of Indo-China, and maintained regular intercourse with Cis-gangetic India on the one hand, and on the other with the Island of Java. The centre of its power lay on the northern shores of the Great Lake, where the names of its great cities, the architecture and sculptures of its ruined temples, attest the successive influences of Brahmanism and Buddhism on the local culture. A native legend, based possibly on historic data, relates how a Hindu prince migrated with ten millions of his subjects, some twenty-three centuries ago, from Indraspathi (Delhi) to Camboja, while the present dynasty claims descent from a Benares family. But still more active relations seem to have been maintained with Lanka (Ceylon), which island has acquired almost a sacred character in the eyes of the Cambojans. The term Camboja itself (Kampushea, Kamp'osha) has by some writers been wrongly identified with the Camboja of Sanskrit geography. It simply means the 'land of the Kammen,' or 'Khmer.' Although some years under the French protectorate, the political institutions of the Cambojan state have undergone little change. The king, who still enjoys absolute power over the life and property of his subjects, chooses his own mandarins, and these magistrates dispense justice in favour of the highest bidders. Trade is a royal monopoly, sold mostly to energetic Chinese contractors; and slavery has not yet been abolished, although the severity of the system has been somewhat mitigated since 1877. Ordinary slaves now receive a daily pittance, which may help to purchase their freedom. . . . On the eastern slopes, and in the lower Mekong basin,

the dominant race are the Giao-shi (Giao-kii) or Annamese, who are of doubtful origin, but resemble the Chinese more than any other people of Farther India. Affiliated by some to the Malays, by others to the Chinese, Otto Kunze regards them as akin to the Japanese. According to the local traditions and records they have gradually spread along the coast from Tongking southwards to the extremity of the Peninsula. After driving the Tsiams into the interior, they penetrated about 1650 to the Lower Mekong, which region formerly belonged to Camboja, but is now properly called French Cochin-China. Here the Annamese, having driven out or exterminated most of the Cambojans, have long formed the great majority of the population."—É. Reclus, *The Earth and its Inhabitants: Asia, v.* 3, *ch.* 22.

TONNAGE AND POUNDAGE. See TUNNAGE AND POUNDAGE; also, ENGLAND: A. D. 1629.

TONQUIN. See TONKIN.

TONTONTEAC. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: PUEBLOS.

TONTOS, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: APACHE GROUP.

TOPASSES, The. See INDIA: A. D. 1600–1702.

TOPEKA CONSTITUTION, The. See KANSAS: A. D. 1854–1859.

TOQUIS. See CHILE: THE ARAUCANIANS.

TORBAY, Landing of William of Orange at. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1688 (JULY—NOVEMBER).

TORDESILLAS, Treaty of. See AMERICA: A. D. 1494.

TORGAU: A. D. 1525.—Protestant League. See PAPACY: A. D. 1525–1529.

A. D. 1645.—Yielded to the Swedes. See GERMANY: A. D. 1640–1645.

A. D. 1760.—Victory of Frederick the Great. See GERMANY: A. D. 1760.

A. D. 1813.—Siege and capture by the Allies. See GERMANY: A. D. 1813 (OCTOBER—DECEMBER).

TORIES, English: Origin of the Party and the Name. See RAPPAREES; ENGLAND: A. D. 1680; and CONSERVATIVE PARTY.

Of the American Revolution, and their exile.—"Before the Revolution the parties in the colonies were practically identical with the Whigs and Tories of the mother country, the Whigs or anti-prerogative men supporting ever the cause of the people against arbitrary or illegal acts of the governor or the council. In the early days of the Revolution the ultra Tories were gradually driven into the ranks of the enemy, until for a time it might be said that all revolutionary America had become Whig; the name Tory, however, was still applied to those who, though opposed to the usurpations of George III., were averse to a final separation from England."—G. Pellew, *John Jay, p.* 269.—"The terms Tories, Loyalists, Refugees, are burdened with a piteous record of wrongs and sufferings. It has not been found easy or satisfactory for even the most candid historian to leave the facts and arguments of the conflict impartially adjusted. Insult, confiscation of property, and exile were the penalties of those who bore these titles. . . . Remembering that the most bitter words of Washington that have come to us are those which express his scorn of Tories, we must at least look to find some plausible, if not justifying, ground for the patriot party. Among those most frank and fearless in the avowal of loyalty, and who suffered the severest penalties, were men of the noblest character and of the highest position. So, also, bearing the same odious title, were men of the most despicable nature, self-seeking and unprincipled, ready for any act of evil. And between these were men of every grade of respectability and of every shade of moral meanness. . . . As a general rule, the Tories were content with an unarmed resistance, where they were not reinforced by the resources or forces of the enemy. But in successive places in possession of the British armies, in Boston, Long Island, New York, the Jerseys, Philadelphia, and in the Southern provinces, there rallied around them Tories both seeking protection, and ready to perform all kinds of military duty as allies. By all the estimates, probably below the mark, there were during the war at least 25,000 organized loyalist forces. . . . When the day of reckoning came at the close of the war, it needed no spirit of prophecy to tell how these Tories, armed or unarmed, would fare, and we have not to go outside the familiar field of human nature for an explanation. That it was not till six months after the ratification of the treaty by Congress that Sir Guy Carleton removed the British army from New York — the delay being caused by his embarrassment from the crowds of loyalists seeking his protection — is a reminder to us of their forlorn condition. . . . From all over the seaboard of the continent refugees made their way to New York in crowds. . . . They threw themselves in despair upon the protection of the British commander. . . . He pleaded his encumbrances of this character in answer to the censures upon him for delaying his departure, and he vainly hoped that Congress would devise some measures of leniency to relieve him. It is difficult to estimate with any approach to exactness the number of these hounded victims. Many hundreds of them had been seeking refuge in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick since the autumn of 1782, and additional parties, in increasing number, followed to the same provinces. An historian [Murdoch, "Hist. of Nova Scotia"] sets the whole number at the close of 1783 at 25,000. Large numbers of the loyalists of the Southern provinces were shipped to the Bahamas and to the West India Islands. At one time Carleton had upon his hands over 12,000 Tories clamorous for transportation. . . . A celebration of the centennial of the settlement of Upper Canada by these exiles took place in 1884. At a meeting of the royal governor, Lord Dorchester, and the council, in Quebec, in November, 1789, in connection with the disposal of still unappropriated crown lands in the province, order was taken for the making and preserving of a registry of the names of all persons, with those of their sons and daughters, 'who had adhered to the unity of the empire, and joined the royal standard in America before the treaty of separation in the year 1783.' The official list contains the names of several thousands. It was by their descendants and representatives that the centennial occasion referred to was observed. . . . Some bands passed to Canada by Whitehall, Lake Champlain, Ticonderoga, and Plattsburg, then south-

ward to Cornwall, ascending the St. Lawrence, and settling on the north bank. Others went from New Brunswick and Nova Scotia up the St. Lawrence to Sorel, where they wintered, going afterwards to Kingston. Most of the exiles ascended the Hudson to Albany, then by the Mohawk and Wood Creek to Oneida and Ontario lakes. . . . As these exiles had stood for the unity of the empire, they took the name of the 'United Empire Loyalists'" (a name which is often abbreviated in common use to U. E. Loyalists).— G. E. Ellis, *The Loyalists and their Fortunes (Narrative and Critical Hist. of Am., v. 7, pp. 185–214).*— "Some 10,000 refugees had, in 1784, and the few years following, found homes in Western Canada, just as it is estimated . . . that 20,000 had settled in the provinces by the sea. Assuming full responsibility for the care and present support of her devoted adherents, Great Britain opened her hand cheerfully to assist them. . . . The sum paid by the British Government to the suffering refugees was about $15,000,000."— G. Bryce, *Short Hist. of the Canadian People, ch. 7, sect. 2.*

Also in: E. Ryerson, *The Loyalists of Am. and their Times.*—L. Sabine, *Biog. Sketches of the Loyalists of Am.*

TORNOSA, Battle of. See Spain: A. D. 1808 (September—December).

TORO, Battle of (1476). See Spain: A. D. 1368–1479.

TOROMONOS, The. See Bolivia: Aboriginal inhabitants.

TORONTO: A. D. 1749.—The hospitable origin of the city.—"The Northern Indians were flocking with their beaver-skins to the English of Oswego; and in April, 1749, an officer named Portneuf had been sent with soldiers and workmen to build a stockaded trading-house at Toronto, in order to intercept them,— not by force, which would have been ruinous to French interests, but by a tempting supply of goods and brandy. Thus the fort was kept well stocked, and with excellent effect."— F. Parkman, *Montcalm and Wolfe, ch. 3 (v. 1).*

A. D. 1813.—Taken and burned by the Americans. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1813 (April—July).

A. D. 1837.—The Mackenzie rising.—Defeat of the rebels. See Canada: A. D. 1837–1838.

TORQUES.—"The Latin word torques has been applied in a very extended sense to the various necklaces or collars for the neck, found in Britain, and other countries inhabited by the Celtic tribes. This word has been supposed to be derived from the Welch or Irish 'torc,' which has the same signification, but the converse is equally plausible, that this was derived from the Latin."— S. Birch, *On the Torc of the Celts (Archaeological Journal, v. 2).*

TORRES VEDRAS, The Lines of. See Spain: A. D. 1809–1810 (October—September), and 1810–1812.

TORTONA: A. D. 1155.— Destruction by Frederick Barbarossa. See Italy: A. D. 1154–1162.

TORTOSA: A. D. 1640.—Spanish capture and sack. See Spain: A. D. 1640–1642.

TORTUGAS: The Rendezvous of the Buccaneers. See America: A. D. 1639–1700.

TORTURE. See Law, Criminal: A. D. 1708.

TORY. See Tories.

TOTEMS.—"A peculiar social institution exists among the [North American] Indians, very curious in its character; and though I am not prepared to say that it may be traced through all the tribes east of the Mississippi, yet its prevalence is so general, and its influence on political relations so important, as to claim especial attention. Indian communities, independent of their local distribution into tribes, bands, and villages, are composed of several distinct clans. Each clan has its emblem, consisting of the figure of some bird, beast, or reptile; and each is distinguished by the name of the animal which it thus bears as its device; as, for example, the clan of the Wolf, the Deer, the Otter, or the Hawk. In the language of the Algonquins, these emblems are known by the name of 'Totems.' The members of the same clan, being connected, or supposed to be so, by ties of kindred more or less remote, are prohibited from intermarriage. Thus Wolf cannot marry Wolf; but he may, if he chooses, take a wife from the clan of Hawks, or any other clan but his own. It follows that when this prohibition is rigidly observed, no single clan can live apart from the rest; but the whole must be mingled together, and in every family the husband and wife must be of different clans. To different totems attach different degrees of rank and dignity; and those of the Bear, the Tortoise, and the Wolf are among the first in honor. Each man is proud of his badge, jealously asserting its claims to respect; and the members of the same clan, though they may, perhaps, speak different dialects, and dwell far asunder, are yet bound together by the closest ties of fraternity. If a man is killed, every member of the clan feels called upon to avenge him; and the wayfarer, the hunter, or the warrior is sure of a cordial welcome in the distant lodge of the clansman whose face perhaps he has never seen. It may be added that certain privileges, highly prized as hereditary rights, sometimes reside in particular clans; such as that of furnishing a sachem to the tribe, or of performing certain religious ceremonies or magic rites."— F. Parkman, *Conspiracy of Pontiac, ch. 1.*—"A totem is a class of material objects which a savage regards with superstitious respect, believing that there exists between him and every member of the class an intimate and altogether special relation. The name is derived from an Ojibway (Chippeway) word 'totem,' the correct spelling of which is somewhat uncertain. It was first introduced into literature, so far as appears, by J. Long, an Indian interpreter of last century, who spelt it 'totam.'. . . The connexion between a man and his totem is mutually beneficent; the totem protects the man, and the man shows his respect for the totem in various ways, by not killing it if it be an animal, and not cutting or gathering it if it be a plant. As distinguished from a fetich, a totem is never an isolated individual, but always a class of objects, generally a species of animals or of plants, more rarely a class of inanimate natural objects, very rarely a class of artificial objects. Considered in relation to men, totems are of at least three kinds:— (1) the clan totem, common to a whole clan, and passing by inheritance from generation to generation; (2) the sex totem, common either to all the males or to all

the females of a tribe, to the exclusion in either case of the other sex; (3) the individual totem, belonging to a single individual and not passing to his descendants."—J. G. Frazer, *Totemism, pp.* 1–2.

Also in: L. H. Morgan, *League of the Iroquois, ch.* 4.—The same, *Ancient Society, pt.* 2.—L. Fison and A. W. Howitt, *Kamilaroi and Kurnai, app. B.*—W. R. Smith, *Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia, ch.* 7.

TOTILA, King of the Ostrogoths. See Rome: A. D. 535–553.

TOTONACOS, The. See American Aborigines: Totonacos.

TOUL: A. D. 1552-1559.—Possession acquired by France. See France: A. D. 1547–1559.

A. D. 1648.—Ceded to France in the Peace of Westphalia. See Germany: A. D. 1648.

TOULON: A. D. 1793-1794. — Revolt against the Revolutionary Government at Paris.—English aid called in.—Siege, capture and frightful vengeance by the Terrorists. See France: A. D. 1793 (July—December); and 1793–1794 (October—April).

TOULOUSE: B. C. 106.—Acquisition by the Romans.— Tolosa, modern Toulouse, was the chief town of the Volcæ Tectosages (see Volcæ, The), a Gallic tribe which occupied the upper basin of the Garonne, between the western prolongation of the Cévennes and the eastern Pyrenees. Some time before 106 B. C. the Romans had formed an alliance with the Tectosages which enabled them to place a garrison in Tolosa; but the people had tired of the arrangement, had risen against the garrison and had put the soldiers in chains. On that provocation, Q. Servilius Cæpio, one of the consuls of the year 106, advanced upon the town, found traitors to admit him within its gates, and sacked it as a Roman general knew how to do. He found a great treasure of gold in Tolosa, the origin of which has been the subject of much dispute. The treasure was sent off under escort to Massilia, but disappeared on the way, its escort being attacked and slain. Consul Cæpio was accused of the robbery; there was a great scandal and prosecution at Rome, and "Aurum Tolosanum"—"the gold of Toulouse"—became a proverbial expression, applied to ill-gotten wealth.—G. Long, *Decline of the Roman Republic, v.* 2, *ch.* 1.

A. D. 410-509.—The Gothic kingdom. See Goths (Visigoths): A. D. 410–419, and after.

A. D. 721.—Repulse of the Moslems. See Mahometan Conquest: A. D. 715–732.

A. D. 781.—Made a county of Aquitaine. See Aquitaine: A. D. 781.

10-11th Centuries.—The rise of the Counts. — The counts of Toulouse "represented an earlier line of dukes of Aquitaine, successors of the dukes of Gothia or Septimania, under whom the capital of southern Gaul had been not Poitiers but Toulouse, Poitou itself counting as a mere underfief. In the latter half of the tenth century these dukes of Gothia or Aquitania Prima, as the Latin chroniclers sometimes called them from the Old Roman name of their country, had seen their ducal title transferred to the Poitevin lords of Aquitania Secunda — the dukes of Aquitaine with whom we have had to deal. But the Poitevin overlordship was never fully acknowledged by the house of Toulouse; and this latter in the course of the following century again rose to great importance and distinction, which reached its height in the person of Count Raymond IV., better known as Raymond of St. Gilles, from the name of the little county which had been his earliest possession. From that small centre his rule gradually spread over the whole territory of the ancient dukes of Septimania. In the year of the Norman conquest of England [1066] Rouergue, which was held by a younger branch of the house of Toulouse, lapsed to the elder line; in [1088] the year after the Conqueror's death Raymond came into possession of Toulouse itself; in 1094 he became, in right of his wife, owner of half the Burgundian county of Provence. His territorial influence was doubled by that of his personal fame; he was one of the chief heroes of the first Crusade; and when he died in 1105 he left to his son Bertrand, over and above his Aquitanian heritage, the Syrian county of Tripoli. On Bertrand's death in 1112 these possessions were divided, his son Pontius succeeding him as count of Tripoli, and surrendering his claims upon Toulouse to his uncle Alfonso Jordan, a younger son of Raymond of St. Gilles. Those claims, however, were disputed. Raymond's elder brother, Count William IV., had left an only daughter who, after a childless marriage with King Sancho Ramirez of Aragon, became the wife of Count William VIII. of Poitou. From that time forth it became a moot point whether the lord of St. Gilles or the lord of Poitiers was the rightful count of Toulouse. . . . With all these shiftings and changes of ownership the kings of France had never tried to interfere. Southern Gaul — 'Aquitaine' in the wider sense — was a land whose internal concerns they found it wise to leave as far as possible untouched."—K. Norgate, *England under the Angevin Kings, v.* 1, *ch.* 10.—See, also, Burgundy: A. D. 1032.

12th Century.—The joyous court. See Provence: A. D. 1179–1207.

A. D. 1209.—The beginning of the Albigensian Crusades. See Albigenses: A. D. 1209.

A. D. 1213.—Conquest by Simon de Montfort and his crusaders. See Albigenses: A. D. 1210–1213.

A. D. 1229-1271.—End of the reign of the Counts. See Albigenses: A. D. 1217–1229.

A. D. 1814.—The last battle of the Peninsular War.—Occupation of the city by the English. See Spain: A. D. 1812–1814.

TOURCOIGN, Battle of. See France: A. D. 1794 (March—July).

TOURNAY: A. D. 1513.—Capture by the English. See France: A. D. 1513–1515.

A. D. 1581.—Siege and capture by the Spaniards. See Netherlands: A. D. 1581–1584.

A. D. 1583. — Submission to Spain. See Netherlands: A. D. 1584–1585.

A. D. 1667. — Taken by the French. See Netherlands (The Spanish Provinces): A. D. 1667.

A. D. 1668.—Ceded to France. See Netherlands (Holland): A. D. 1668.

A. D. 1709.—Siege and reduction by Marlborough and Prince Eugene. See Netherlands: A. D. 1708–1709.

A. D. 1713. — Ceded to Holland. See UTRECHT: A. D. 1712–1714; and NETHERLANDS (HOLLAND): A. D. 1713–1715.

A. D. 1745-1748. — Siege. — Battle of Fontenoy and surrender to the French. — Restoration at the Peace. See NETHERLANDS (AUSTRIAN PROVINCES): A. D. 1745; and AIX-LA-CHAPELLE, THE CONGRESS.

A. D. 1794. — Battles near the city. — Surrender to the French. See FRANCE: A. D. 1794 (MARCH—JULY).

TOURNEY.—TOURNAMENT.—JOUST. —"The word tourney, sometimes tournament, and in Latin 'torneamentum,' clearly indicates both the French origin of these games and the principal end of that exercise, the art of manœuvring, of turning ('tournoyer') his horse skilfully, to strike his adversary and shield himself at the same time from his blows. The combats, especially those of the nobility, were always fought on horseback, with the lance and sharp sword; the knight presented himself, clothed in armour which covered his whole body, and which, while it preserved him from wounds, bent to every movement and retarded those of his war horse. It was important, therefore, that constant exercise should accustom the knight's limbs to the enormous weight which he must carry, and the horse to the agility which was expected of him. In a 'passage' or 'pass of arms' ('passage' or 'pas d'armes') the generic name of all those games, this exercise was composed of two parts: the joust, which was a single combat of knight against knight, both clothed in all their arms, and the tourney, which was the image of a general battle, or the encounter and evolutions of two troops of cavalry equal in number."—J. C. L. de Sismondi, *France under the Feudal System* (*Tr. by W. Bellingham*), *ch.* 8.

TOURS: A. D. 732.—Defeat of the Moors by Charles Martel. See MAHOMETAN CONQUEST: A. D. 715–732; also, FRANKS: A. D. 511–752.

A. D. 1870.—Seat of a part of the provisional Government of National Defense. See FRANCE: A. D. 1870 (SEPTEMBER — OCTOBER).

TOUSSAINT L'OUVERTURE, The career of. See HAYTI: A. D. 1632–1803.

TOWER AND SWORD, The Order of the. — This was an order of knighthood founded in Portugal by Alfonso V., who reigned from 1438 to 1481. "The institution of the order related to a sword reputed to be carefully guarded in a tower of the city of Fez: respecting it there was a prophecy that it must one day come into the possession of a Christian king; in other words, that the Mohammedan empire of northwestern Africa would be subverted by the Christians. Alfonso seemed to believe that he was the destined conqueror."—S. A. Dunham, *Hist. of Spain and Portugal, v.* 3, *p.* 225 (*Am. ed.*).

TOWER OF LONDON, The. — "Built originally by the Conqueror to curb London, afterwards the fortress-palace of his descendants, and in the end the State prison, from which a long procession of the ill-starred great went forth to lay their heads on the block on Tower Hill; while State murders, like those of Henry VI. and the two young sons of Edward IV., were done in the dark chambers of the Tower itself."—Goldwin Smith, *A Trip to England, p.* 56.—"Even as to length of days, the Tower has no rival among palaces and prisons. . . . Old writers date it from the days of Caesar; a legend taken up by Shakspeare and the poets in favour of which the name of Caesar's Tower remains in popular use to this very day. A Roman wall can even yet be traced near some parts of the ditch. The Tower is mentioned in the Saxon Chronicle, in a way not incompatible with the fact of a Saxon stronghold having stood upon the spot. The buildings as we have them now in block and plan were commenced by William the Conqueror; and the series of apartments in Caesar's Tower [the great Norman keep now called the White Tower] — hall, gallery, council chamber, chapel — were built in the early Norman reigns and used as a royal residence by all our Norman kings."—W. H. Dixon, *Her Majesty's Tower, ch.* 1.—"We are informed by the 'Textus Roffensis' that the present Great or White Tower was constructed by Gundulph, Bishop of Rochester, under the direction of King William I., who was suspicious of the fidelity of the citizens. The date assigned by Stow is 1078."—J. Britton and E. W. Brayley, *Memoirs of the Tower of London, ch.* 1.

ALSO IN: Lord de Ros, *Memorials of the Tower.*

TOWN.—"Burh, burgh, borough, in its various spellings and various shades of meaning, is our native word for urbes of every kind from Rome downward. It is curious that this word should in ordinary speech have been so largely displaced by the vaguer word tun, town, which means an enclosure of any kind, and in some English dialects is still applied to a single house and its surroundings."—E. A. Freeman, *City and Borough* (*Macmillan's Mag., May,* 1889).— See, also, TOWNSHIP; BOROUGH; GUILDS; and COMMUNE.

TOWNSHEND MEASURES, The. See UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: A. D. 1766–1767.

TOWNSHIP.—"In recent historical writing dealing with Anglo-Saxon conditions, a great place has been occupied by the 'township.' The example was set sixty years ago by Palgrave; but it does not seem to have been generally followed until in 1874 Dr. Stubbs gave the word a prominent place in his 'Constitutional History.' With Dr. Stubbs the 'township' was 'the unit of the constitutional machinery or local administration'; and since then most writers on constitutional and legal history have followed in the same direction. . . . The language commonly used in this connection need not, perhaps, necessarily be understood as meaning that the phenomenon which the writers have in mind was actually known to the Saxons themselves as a 'township' ('tunscipe'). It may be said that 'township' is merely a modern name which it is convenient to apply to it. Yet, certainly, that language usually suggests that it was under that name that the Saxons knew it. . . . It is therefore of some interest, at least for historical terminology,—and possibly for other and more important reasons,—to point out that there is no good foundation in Anglo-Saxon sources for such a use of the term; that 'tunscipe' in the few places where it does appear does not mean an area of land, an extent of territory, or even the material houses and crofts of a village; that it is probably nothing more than a loose general term

for 'the villagers.' . . . Only three passages in Anglo-Saxon literature have as yet been found in which the word 'tunscipe' appears,—the Saxon translation of Bede's 'Ecclesiastical History,' v. 10, the laws of Edgar, iv. 8, and the 'Saxon Chronicle,' s. a 1137. . . . The later history of the word 'township' would probably repay investigation. It is certainly not a common word in literature until comparatively recent times; and, where it does appear, its old meaning seems often to cling to it. . . . There is a good deal to make one believe that 'town' [see, above, TOWN] continued to be the common popular term for what we may describe in general language as a rural centre of population even into the 18th century. . . . The far more general use of the word 'town' than of 'township' in early New England is most naturally explained by supposing that it was the word ordinarily employed in England at the time of the migration,—at any rate, in East Anglia. . . . It might very naturally be said that the effect of the foregoing argument is no more than to replace 'township' by town, and that such a change is immaterial,—that it is a difference between tweedle-dum and tweedle-dee. I cannot help thinking, however, that the adoption of a more correct terminology will be of scientific advantage; and for this reason. So long as we speak of the Anglo-Saxon 'township' we can hardly help attaching to the word somewhat of the meaning which it has borne since the sixteenth century. We think of it as an area inhabited by freemen with an administrative machinery in the hands of an assembly of those inhabitants and of officers chosen by them. We start, therefore, with a sort of unconscious presumption that the 'township' was what we call 'free.' . . . Now, it is this question as to the position of the body of the population in the earliest Anglo-Saxon times that is just now at issue; and no student would say that at present the question is settled."—W. J. Ashley, *The Anglo-Saxon "Township"* (*Quarterly Journal of Economics, April*, 1894).

TOWNSHIP AND TOWN-MEETING, The New England.—"When people from England first came to dwell in the wilderness of Massachusetts Bay, they settled in groups upon small irregular-shaped patches of land, which soon came to be known as townships. . . . This migration . . . was a movement, not of individuals or of separate families, but of church-congregations, and it continued to be so as the settlers made their way inland and westward. . . . A township would consist of about as many farms as could be disposed within convenient distance from the meeting-house, where all the inhabitants, young and old, gathered every Sunday, coming on horseback or afoot. The meeting-house was thus centrally situated, and near it was the town pasture or 'common,' with the school-house and the block-house, or rude fortress for defence against the Indians. . . . Around the meeting-house and common the dwellings gradually clustered into a village, and after a while the tavern, store, and town-house made their appearance. . . . Under these circumstances they developed a kind of government which we may describe in the present tense, for its methods are pretty much the same to-day that they were two centuries ago. In a New England township the people directly govern themselves; the government is the people. or, to speak with entire precision, it is all the male inhabitants of one-and-twenty years of age and upwards. The people tax themselves. Once each year, usually in March but sometimes as early as February or as late as April, a 'town-meeting' is held, at which all the grown men of the township are expected to be present and to vote, while any one may introduce motions or take part in the discussion. . . . The town-meeting is held in the town-house, but at first it used to be held in the church, which was thus a 'meeting-house' for civil as well as ecclesiastical purposes. At the town-meeting measures relating to the administration of town affairs are discussed and adopted or rejected; appropriations are made for the public expenses of the town, or in other words the amount of the town taxes for the year is determined; and town officers are elected for the year. . . . The principal executive magistrates of the town are the selectmen. They are three, five, seven, or nine in number. . . . It [the town] was simply the English parish government brought into a new country and adapted to the new situation. Part of this new situation consisted in the fact that the lords of the manor were left behind. There was no longer any occasion to distinguish between the township as a manor and the township as a parish; and so, as the three names had all lived on together, side by side, in England, it was now the oldest and most generally descriptive name, 'township,' that survived, and has come into use throughout a great part of the United States. . . . New York had from the very beginning the rudiments of an excellent system of local self-government. The Dutch villages had their assemblies, which under the English rule were developed into town-meetings, though with less ample powers than those of New England. . . . The New York system is of especial interest, because it has powerfully influenced the development of local institutions throughout the Northwest."—J. Fiske, *Civil Government in the U. S., ch.* 2 *and* 4.—"The name town first occurs in the record of the second colonial meeting of the Court of Assistants [Massachusetts Bay, Sept. 7, 1630], in connection with the naming of Boston, Charlestown and Watertown. . . . A rude pattern of a frame of town government was shaped by Dorchester, when, in place of the earlier practice of transacting business at meetings of the whole body of its freemen (the grants of land being certified by a committee consisting of the clergymen and deacons), it designated certain inhabitants, twelve in number, to meet weekly, and consult and determine upon public affairs,—without any authority, however, beyond other inhabitants who should choose to come and take part in their consultations and votes. About the same time, at Watertown, it was 'agreed by the consent of the freemen, that there should be three persons chosen for the ordering of the civil affairs.' In the fourth year from the settlement of Boston, at which time the earliest extant records were made, three persons were chosen 'to make up the ten to manage the affairs of the town.' The system of delegated town action was there perhaps the same which was defined in an 'Order made by the inhabitants of Charlestown, at a full meeting [Feb. 10, 1635], for the government of the town by Selectmen,'—the name presently extended throughout New England to the municipal governors. . . . The towns have

been, on the one hand, separate governments, and, on the other, the separate constituents of a common government. In Massachusetts, for two centuries and a quarter, the Deputies in the General Court — or Representatives, as they have been named under the State Constitution — continued to represent the municipal corporations. In New Hampshire, Vermont, Connecticut and Rhode Island, that basis of representation still subsists."—J. G. Palfrey, *Hist. of New Eng., v. 1, ch. 9.*—"Boston . . . is the largest community that ever maintained the town organization, probably the most generally able and intelligent. No other town ever played so conspicuous a part in connection with important events. It led Massachusetts, New England, the thirteen colonies, in the struggle for independence. Probably in the whole history of the Anglo-Saxon race, there has been no other so interesting manifestation of the activity of the Folk-mote. Of this town of towns, Samuel Adams was the son of sons. . . . One may almost call him the creature of the town-meeting."—J. K. Hosmer, *Samuel Adams, the Man of the Town-Meeting (Johns Hopkins Univ. Studies, series 2, no. 4).*

ALSO IN: E. Channing, *Town and County Gov't in the Eng. Colonies (Johns Hopkins Univ. Studies, series 2, no. 10).*—See, also, NEW ENGLAND: A. D. 1640–1644; and SELECTMEN.

TOWTON, Battle of (A. D. 1461).— On Palm Sunday, March 29, 1461, two armies of Englishmen met on a "goodly plain," ten miles from the city of York, between the villages of Towton and Saxton, to fight out the contention of the parties of the "two roses,"— of Lancaster and York. The battle they fought is called the bloodiest that ever dyed English soil. It raged through an afternoon and a night until the following day, and the slain of the two sides has been variously reckoned by different historians at 20,000 to 38,000. No quarter was given by the victorious partisans of Edward IV. and the Lancastrians were utterly crushed. Henry VI. fled to Scotland and Queen Margaret repaired to France.— See ENGLAND: A. D. 1455–1471.— C. Ransome, *Battle of Towton (English Historical Rev., July*, 1889).

TOXANDRIA. — After Julian's successful campaigns against the Franks, A. D. 358, the latter were permitted to remain, as subjects of the Roman Empire, in "an extensive district of Brabant, which was then known by the appellation of Toxandria, and may deserve to be considered as the original seat of their Gallic monarchy. . . . This name seems to be derived from the 'Toxandri' of Pliny, and very frequently occurs in the histories of the middle age. Toxandria was a country of woods and morasses, which extended from the neighbourhood of Tongres to the conflux of the Vahal and the Rhine."—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, ch. 19, with foot-note.*—See, also, GAUL: A. D. 355–361.

TOXARCHI, The.—The commanders of the Athenian archers and of the city-watch (known as Scythians) were so called.— A. Boeckh, *Public Economy of Athens, bk. 2, ch. 11.*

TRACHIS.—TRACHINIA. See GREECE: B. C. 480 (THERMOPYLÆ).

TRACTARIAN MOVEMENT.— TRACTS FOR THE TIMES.—TRACT NINETY. See OXFORD OR TRACTARIAN MOVEMENT.

TRADES UNIONS. See SOCIAL MOVEMENTS.

TRAFALGAR, Naval Battle of. See FRANCE: A. D. 1805 (MARCH—DECEMBER).

TRAJAN, Roman Emperor, A. D. 98–117.

TRAJAN'S WALL.— The Emperor Trajan "began a fortified line, afterwards completed, from the Rhine to the Danube. This great work was carried from Ratisbon to Mayence. It was known as Trajan's Wall. It may still be traced to some extent by the marks of a mound and a ditch."— Church and Brodribb, *Notes to The Germany of Tacitus, ch. 29.*

TRAMELI, The. See LYCIANS.

TRANSALPINE.—Beyond the Alps, looking from the Roman standpoint.

TRANSLEITHANIA. See AUSTRIA: A. D. 1866–1867.

TRANSOXANIA. See BOKHARA.

TRANSPADANE GAUL.—Cisalpine Gaul north of the Padus, or Po. See PADUS.

TRANSRHENANE.—Beyond the Rhine,— looking from the Roman standpoint; that is, on the eastern and northern side of the Rhine.

TRANSVAAL REPUBLIC, The. See SOUTH AFRICA: A. D. 1806–1881.

TRANSYLVANIA: Early history. See DACIA.

The Huns in possession. See HUNS: A. D. 433–453.

12th Century.— Conquest by Hungary.— Settlement of Germans. See HUNGARY: A. D. 1114–1301.

A. D. 1526-1567.—John Zapolya, the waivod, elected King of Hungary.—His contest with Ferdinand of Austria.— His appeal to the Turks.—The Sultan assumes suzerainty of the country. See HUNGARY: A. D. 1526–1567.

A. D. 1567-1660. — Struggles between the Austrian and the Turk. See HUNGARY: A. D. 1567–1604; and 1606–1660.

A. D. 1575. — Stephen Batory, the Duke, elected King of Poland. See POLAND: A. D. 1574–1590.

A. D. 1599-1601. — Wallachian conquest. See BALKAN AND DANUBIAN STATES, 14–18TH CENTURIES (ROUMANIA, ETC.).

A. D. 1606.—Yoke of the Ottomans partly broken. See HUNGARY: A. D. 1595–1606.

A. D. 1660-1664.—Recovery of independence from the Turks. See HUNGARY: A. D. 1660–1664.

A. D. 1699.—Ceded to the House of Austria by the Turks, in the Treaty of Carlowitz. See HUNGARY: A. D. 1683–1699.

TRANSYLVANIA, The Kentucky colony of. See KENTUCKY: A. D. 1765–1778.

TRAPPISTS.—The monks of La Trappe are often referred to as Trappists. "This celebrated abbey was one of the most ancient belonging to the Order of Cisteaux [the Cistercians]. It was established [A. D. 1140] by Rotrou, the second count of Perche, and undertaken to accomplish a vow made whilst in peril of shipwreck." In the 17th century the monks had become scandalously degenerate and dissolute. Their institution was reformed by M. de Rancé, who assumed the direction as abbot in 1662, and who introduced the severe discipline for which the monastery was afterwards famous.

Among its rules was one of absolute silence.—C. Lancelot, *A Tour to Alet and La Grande Chartreuse, v.* 1, *pp.* 113–186.

TRASIMENE, Lake, Battle of (B. C. 217). See Punic Wars: The Second.

TRASTEVERE.—Trastevere was a suburb of Rome "as early as the time of Augustus; it now contains the oldest houses in Rome, which belong to the 11th and 12th centuries."—B. G. Niebuhr, *Lect's on ancient Ethnog. and Geog., v.* 2, *p.* 103.

TRAUSI, The. See Thracians.

TRAVENDAHL, Treaty of (1700). See Scandinavian States: A. D. 1697–1700.

TRAVENSTADT, Battle of (1706). See Scandinavian States (Sweden): A. D. 1701–1707.

TREASON. See Majestas.

TREATIES.—The Treaties of which account is given in this work are so numerous that no convenience would be served by collecting references to them under this general heading. They are severally indexed under the names by which they are historically known.

TREATY PORTS, The. See China: A. D. 1839–1842.

TREBIA, OR TREBBIA, Battle of the. See Punic Wars: The Second.....Battle. See France: A. D. 1799 (April—September).

TREBIZOND: Origin of the city.—"Trebizond, celebrated in the retreat of the Ten Thousand as an ancient colony of Greeks, derived its wealth and splendour from the munificence of the Emperor Hadrian, who had constructed an artificial port on a coast left destitute by nature of secure harbours. The city was large and populous."—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, ch.* 10.

A. D. 258.—Capture by the Goths. See Goths: A. D. 258–267.

A. D. 1204-1461.—The Greek empire.—"The empire of Trebizond was the creation of accident. . . . The destruction of a distant central government, when Constantinople was conquered by the Frank Crusaders, left [the] provincial administration without the pivot on which it had revolved. The conjuncture was seized by a young man, of whom nothing was known but that he bore a great name, and was descended from the worst tyrant in the Byzantine annals. This youth grasped the vacant sovereignty, and, merely by assuming the imperial title, and placing himself at the head of the local administration, founded a new empire. Power changed its name and its dwelling, but the history of the people was hardly modified. The grandeur of the empire of Trebizond exists only in romance. Its government owed its permanence to its being nothing more than a continuation of a long-established order of civil polity, and to its making no attempt to effect any social revolution." The young man who grasped the sovereignty of this Asiatic fragment of the shattered Byzantine empire was Alexius, a grandson of Andronicus I., the last emperor at Constantinople of the family of Comnenos. This Alexius and his brother David, who had been raised in obscurity at Constantinople, escaped from the city before it was taken by the Crusaders, and fled to the coast of Colchis, "where their paternal aunt, Thamar, possessed wealth and influence. Assisted by her power, and by the memory of their tyrannical grandfather, who had been popular in the east of Asia Minor, they were enabled to collect an army of Iberian mercenaries. At the head of this force Alexios entered Trebizond in the month of April 1204, about the time Constantinople fell into the hands of the Crusaders. He had been proclaimed emperor by his army on crossing the frontier. To mark that he was the legitimate representative of the imperial family of Komnenos, and to prevent his being confounded with the numerous descendants of females, or with the family of the emperor Alexius III. (Angelos), who had arrogated to themselves his name, he assumed the designation of Grand-Komnenos. Wherever he appeared, he was acknowledged as the lawful sovereign of the Roman empire." For a time Alexius of Trebizond, with the help of his brother David, extended his dominions in Asia Minor with rapidity and ease, and he was brought very soon into collision with the other Greek emperor, Theodore Lascaris, who had established himself at Nicæa. It seemed likely, at first, that Trebizond would become the dominant power; but the movement of events which favored that one of the rival empires was presently stayed, and then reversed, even though Alexius took aid from the Latin emperor at Constantinople. Not many years later, in fact, the empire of Trebizond evaded extinction at the hands of the Turkish Sultan of Iconium, or Roum, only by paying tribute and acknowledging vassalage to that sovereign. For sixty years the so-called empire continued in a tributary relationship to the Seljuk sultans and to the grand khan of the Mongols who overthrew them in 1244. But, if not a very substantial empire during that period, it seems to have formed an exceedingly prosperous and wealthy commercial power, controlling not only a considerable coast territory on its own side of the Euxine, but also Cherson, Gothia, and all the Byzantine possessions in the Tauric Chersonesos; and "so close was the alliance of interest that these districts remained dependent on the government of Trebizond until the period of its fall." On the decline of the Mongol power, the empire of Trebizond regained its independence in 1280, and maintained it for nearly a century, when it was once more compelled to pay tribute to the later Mongol conqueror, Timur. At the end of the 14th century the little "empire" was reduced to a strip of coast, barely forty miles wide, extending from Batoun to Kerasunt, and the separated city of Oinaion, with some territory adjoining it. But, within this small compass, "few countries in Europe enjoyed as much internal tranquility, or so great security for private property." The commerce of Trebizond had continued to flourish, notwithstanding frequent quarrels and hostilities with the Genoese, who were the chief managers of its trade with the west. But the decay of the empire, politically, commercially, and morally, was rapid in its later years. First becoming tributary to the Ottoman conqueror of Constantinople, it finally shared the fate of the Byzantine capital. The city of Trebizond was surrendered to Mohammed II. in 1461. Its last emperor, David, was permitted to live for a time, with his family, in the European dominions of the Turk; but after a few years, on some suspicion of a plot, he was put to death with his seven sons, and their bodies were cast unburied to the dogs. The wife and mother

of the dead — the fallen empress Helena — guarded them and dug a grave for them with her own hands. The Christian population of Trebizond was expelled from the city and mostly enslaved. Its place was taken by a Moslem colony. — G. Finlay, *Hist. of the Empire of Trebizond* (*History of Greece and of the Empire of Trebizond*).

TREBONIAN LAW, The. See Rome: B. C. 57–52.

TREK, The Great. See South Africa: A. D. 1806–1881.

TREMECEN, The Kingdom of. See Barbary States: A. D. 1516–1535.

TREMONT, The Name. See Massachusetts: A. D. 1630.

TRENT, The Council of. See Papacy: A. D. 1537–1563.

TRENT AFFAIR, The. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1861 (November).

TRENTON: A. D. 1776.—The surprise of the Hessians. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1776–1777 Washington's retreat.

TRÈVES: Origin.— Trèves was originally the chief town of the Treviri, from whom it derived its name. When the Romans established a colony there they called it Augusta Trevirorum. In time, the Augusta was dropped and Trevirorum became Trèves, or Trier. See Treviri.

Under the Romans.—"The town of the Treveri, named Augusta probably from the first emperor, soon gained the first place in the Belgic province; if, still, in the time of Tiberius, Durocortorum of the Remi (Rheims) is named the most populous place of the province and the seat of the governors, an author from the time of Claudius already assigns the primacy there to the chief place of the Treveri. But Treves became the capital of Gaul — we may even say of the West — only through the remodelling of the imperial administration under Diocletian. After Gaul, Britain and Spain were placed under one supreme administration, the latter had its seat in Treves; and thenceforth Treves was also, when the emperors stayed in Gaul, their regular residence, and, as a Greek of the fifth century says, the greatest city beyond the Alps."—T. Mommsen, *Hist. of Rome, bk.* 8, *ch.* 3.

A. D. 306.— The Ludi Francici at. See Franks: A. D. 306.

A. D. 364-376.—Capital of Valentinian and the Western Empire. See Rome: A. D. 363–379.

A. D. 402.—Abandoned by the Roman prefecture. See Britain: A. D. 407.

A. D. 1125-1152.—Origin of the Electorate. See Germany: A. D. 1125–1152.

A. D. 1675.—Taken from the French by the Imperialists. See Netherlands (Holland): A. D. 1674–1678.

A. D. 1689.—Threatened destruction by the French. See France: A. D. 1689–1690.

A. D. 1697.—Restored to the Empire. See France: A. D. 1697.

A. D. 1704.—Taken by Marlborough. See Germany: A. D. 1704.

A. D. 1801-1803.—Extinction of the Electorate. See Germany: A. D. 1801–1803.

TREVILLIAN'S STATION, Battle of. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1864 (May—June: Virginia) Campaigning in the Shenandoah.

TREVIRI, The.— The Treviri were one of the peoples of Gaul, in Cæsar's time, "whose territory lay on the left bank of the Rhine and on both sides of the Mosella (Mosel). Trier [ancient Treves] on the Mosel was the head-quarters of the Treviri."— G. Long, *Decline of the Roman Republic, v.* 4, *ch.* 8.

TREVISAN MARCHES, Tyranny of Eccelino di Romano in the. See Verona: A. D. 1236–1259.

TRIAD SOCIETY, OR WATER-LILY SECT, The.— The most extensive of the many secret societies among the Chinese is "the Tienti hwui, or San-hoh hwui, i. e. the Triad Society. It was formerly known by the title of the Pih-lien kiau, or Water-lily Sect, but having been proscribed by the government, it sought by this alteration of name, and some other slight changes, to evade the operation of the laws. In fact, it still subsists in some of the remoter provinces under its old name and organization. The known and indeed almost openly avowed object of this society has been, for many years, the overturn of the Mant-chou dynasty."— *The Chinese Rebellion* (*North Am. Rev., July*, 1854).

Also in: Abbé Huc, *Christianity in China, &c., v.* 2, *pp.* 274–277.— H. A. Giles, *Historic China, pp.* 395–399.

TRIAL BY COMBAT. See Wager of Battle.

TRIANON TARIFF, The. See France: A. D. 1806–1810.

TRIARII. See Legion, Roman.

TRIBE.— TRIBUS. See Rome, The Beginning.

TRIBES, Greek. See Phylæ.

TRIBOCES, The. — A people who, in Cæsar's time, were established on both banks of the Rhine, occupying the central part of the modern Grand Duchy of Baden and the opposite region of Gaul.— Napoleon III., *Hist. of Cæsar, bk.* 3, *ch.* 2, *foot-note.*— See, also, Vangiones.

TRIBON, The.— A garment of thick cloth and small size worn by Spartan youths, and sometimes by old men.— C. C. Felton, *Greece, Ancient and Modern, course* 2, *lect.* 7.

TRIBUNAL, The Revolutionary. See France: A. D. 1793 (February—April).

TRIBUNES, Consular, or Military. See Consular Tribunes.

TRIBUNES OF THE PLEBS. See Rome: B. C. 494–492.

TRIBUNITIA, Potestas. See Potestas Tribunitia.

TRIBUTUM, The.—The tributum, a war-tax, collected from the Roman people in the earlier periods of the Republic, was "looked upon as a loan, and was returned on the termination of a successful war out of the captured booty. . . . The principle that Rome was justified in living at the expense of her subjects was formally acknowledged when, in the year 167 B. C., the tributum — the only direct tax which the Roman citizens paid — was abolished, because the government could dispense with it after the conquest of Macedonia. The entire burden and expense of the administration were now put off upon the subjects."—W. Ihne, *Hist. of Rome, bk.* 6, *ch.* 7 (*v.* 4).

TRICAMARON, Battle of (A. D. 533). See Vandals: A. D. 533–534.

TRICASSES.—The earlier name of the city of Troyes, France.

TRICHINOPOLY: Siege and relief (1751). See India: A. D. 1743–1752.

TRICOTEUSES. See France: A. D. 1793 (October).

TRIDENTINE COUNCIL.—The Council of Trent (see Papacy: A. D. 1537–1563); from the Latin name of the town.

TRIENNIAL ACTS. See Parliament, The English: A. D. 1641–1664, and 1693.

TRIERARCHY. See Liturgies.

TRINACRIA.—The ancient Greek name of the island of Sicily.

TRINCOMALEE, Battle of (1767). See India: A. D. 1767–1769.

TRINIDAD: A. D. 1498.—Discovery by Columbus. See America: A. D. 1498–1505.

A. D. 1801.—Acquisition by England. See France: A. D. 1801–1802.

TRINITY HOUSE.—"Perhaps there is throughout Britain no more interesting example of the innate power and varied developments of the old gild principle, certainly no more illustrious survival of it to modern times, than the Trinity House. It stands out now as an institution of high national importance, whose history is entwined with the early progress of the British navy and the welfare and increase of our sea craft and seamanship; in an age when the tendency is to assume state control over all matters of national interest the Trinity House, a voluntary corporation, still fulfils the public functions to which its faithful labours, through a long course of years, have established its right and title. Although its earliest records appear to be lost or burned, there seems to be no doubt that Henry VIII's charter of 1514 was granted to a brotherhood already existing. . . . In the charter itself we read that the shipmen or mariners of England 'may anew erect' a gild, and lands and tenements in Deptford Strond, already in possession, are referred to. Similar bodies were formed in other places; in the fourteenth century there was a shipmen's gild at Lynn and another at Hull; in the fifteenth century the shipmen were one of the crafts of York. Mr. Barrett mentions that they also had houses at Newcastle and Dover. The Hull gild (which also happens to have been dedicated to the Trinity) flourished for seventy-four years before receiving its first royal grant. The objects to which it was devoted were akin to those of the Deptford House, and Henry VIII incorporated it in 1547, just about the time when most gilds, not of crafts, were destroyed. . . . The charitable side of the Trinity House functions has always been considerable; in 1815 they possessed no less than 144 almshouses, besides giving 7,012 pensions; but of late years their funds applicable to such purposes have been curtailed. . . . It is significant that in Edward VI's reign the name and style of Gild was abandoned by the brethren for the title of 'the Corporation of the Trinity House of Deptford Strond.' Gilds now had come into disrepute. The functions of the Trinity House have long been recognised of such value to the public service that their honourable origin, so consonant with other English institutions is apt to be forgotten. . . . To cherish the 'science and art of mariners,' and to provide a supply of pilots, especially for the Thames up to London, were their prime duties. The Admiralty and Navy boards were established as administrative bodies in 1520, and the ship-building yard at Deptford, with the storehouses there, 'was placed under the direct control of the gild.' The Sea Marks Act of 1566, which throws considerable light on the position of the company at that time, endued them with the power of preserving old and setting up new sea marks or beacons round the coasts, among which trees came under their purview. How far their jurisdiction extended is not stated; it would be interesting to know whether their progress round the whole shores of Britain were gradual or not. It is, perhaps, for its work in connexion with light-houses, light-ships, buoys, and beacons, that the Trinity House is best known to the general public. . . . It was only in 1836 that parliament 'empowered the corporation to purchase of the crown, or from private proprietors, all lights then in existence,' which are therefore at present under their efficient central control. . . . The principal matters in their sphere of action—the important provision of pilots, the encouragement and supply of seamen, ballastage and ballast, lights and buoys, the suppression of piracy and privateers, tonnage measurement, the victualling of the navy, their intimate connexion with the gradual growth and armament of the navy, the curious right to appoint certain consuls abroad—all these receive illustration at first hand from the author's careful researches among state papers and the muniments of the corporation."—Lucy T. Smith, *Review of "The Trinity House of Deptford Strond"; by C. R. B. Barrett* (*English Historical Rev., April*, 1894).

TRINOBANTES, The.—The Trinobantes were the first of the tribes of Britain to submit to Cæsar. They inhabited the part of the country now embraced in the county of Essex and part of Middlesex. Their chief town, or stronghold ("oppidum") was Camulodunum, where the Romans afterwards founded a colony which became the modern city of Colchester. Cunobelin, the Cymbeline of Shakespeare, was a king of the Trinobantes who acquired extensive power. One of the sons of Cunobelin, Caractacus, became the most obstinate enemy of the Romans when they seriously began the conquest of Britain, in the reign of Claudius.—E. L. Cutts, *Colchester, ch.* 2–3.

Also in: C. Merivale, *Hist. of the Romans, ch.* 51.—See, also, Britain: Celtic Tribes.

TRIOBOLON.—Three oboli,—the daily compensation paid in Athens to citizens who served as judges in the great popular courts; afterwards paid, likewise, to those who attended the assemblies of the people.—A. Boeckh, *Public Economy of Athens, bk.* 2, *ch.* 15.

TRIPLE ALLIANCE, The.—There have been a number of Triple Alliances formed in European history; see, for example, Netherlands (Holland): A. D. 1668, and Spain: A. D. 1713–1725; but the one in recent times to which allusion is often made is that in which Germany, Austria-Hungary, and Italy, are the three parties. It was formed by treaty in February, 1882, and renewed in 1887. Its purpose is mutual defense, especially, no doubt, against the apprehended combination of Russia with France.

TRIPOLI, North Africa: Origin of the name of. See Leptis Magna.

History. See BARBARY STATES.

TRIPOLI, Syria: Capture by the Crusaders.—Destruction of the Library.—Formation of the Latin county. See CRUSADES: A. D. 1104–1111; and JERUSALEM: A. D. 1099–1144.

TRIPONTIUM.— A town in Roman Britain, where one of the great roads crossed the Avon, near modern Lilburne.— T. Wright, *Celt, Roman and Saxon, ch.* 5.

TRISAGION, The. See CONSTANTINOPLE: A. D. 511–512.

TRI-SKELION.—GAMMADION.—FYLFOT-CROSS.—SVASTIKA.—"One of the most remarkable instances of the migration of a symbol is that afforded by the 'tri-skelion,' or, as we more familiarly know it, 'the three legs of Man.' It first appears on the coins of Lycia, circa B. C. 480; and then on those of Sicily, where it was adopted by Agathocles, B. C. 317–307, but not as a symbol of the morning, midday, and afternoon sun, but of the land of Trinacria, i. e., 'Three Capes,' the ancient name of Sicily; and finally on the coins of the Isle of Man, on which it seems to refer rather to the position of that island between England, Scotland, and Ireland, than to its triangular shape. The tri-skelion of Lycia is made up of three cocks' heads. . . . But on the coins of Sicily and of the Isle of Man the tri-skelion consists of three human legs of an identical pattern, excepting that those of the latter island are spurred. This form of tri-skelion is borne on the arms of several old English families, and it was in all probability first introduced into this country [England] by some Crusader returning from the East by way of Sicily. . . . The tri-skelion is but a modification of the 'gammadion' or 'fylfot-cross,' the 'svastika' of the Hindus. The latter was long ago suspected by Edward Thomas to be a sun-symbol; but this was not positively proved until Mr. Percy Gardner found a coin of the ancient city of Mesembria in Thrace stamped with a gammadion bearing within its open centre an image of the sun—Mesembria meaning the city of 'Mid-day,' and this name being figured on some of its coins by the decisive legend *ME*Σ卐. . . . The gammadion has travelled further afield than any other symbol of antiquity. . . . Count Goblet d'Alviella traces it back at last to the Troad as the cradle of its birth, some time anterior to the 13th century B. C."—*The Athenæum, Aug.* 13, 1892 (*Reviewing Comte Goblet d'Alviella's "La Migration des Symboles"*).

TRITTYES. See PHYLÆ.

TRIUMPH AND OVATION, The Roman.—"The highest reward of the commander was the triumphal entrance. At first it was awarded by senate and people to real merit in the field, and its arrangement was simple and dignified; but soon it became an opportunity of displaying the results of insatiable Roman rapacity and love of conquest. Only the dictators, consuls, prætors, and, in late republican times, occasionally legates, were permitted by the senate to enter Rome in triumph, the permission to the legate being granted only in case he had commanded independently ('suis auspiciis'), and conducted the army to Rome from a victorious campaign 'in sua provincia.' As in later times it was impossible to conduct the whole army from distant provinces to Rome, the last-mentioned condition was dispensed with, the claim of the commander to a triumph being acknowledged in case in one of the battles gained by him 5,000 enemies had been killed. The senate granted the expenses necessary for the procession after the quæstor urbanus had examined and confirmed the commander's claim. Streets and squares through which the procession had to pass were festively adorned. The temples were opened, and incense burnt on the altars. Improvised stands were erected in the street, filled with festive crowds shouting 'Io triumphe!' The commander, in the meantime, collected his troops near the temples of Bellona and Apollo, outside the gates of Rome. . . . The victor was met at the 'porta triumphalis' by the senate, the city magistrates, and numerous citizens, who took the lead of the procession, while lictors opened a way through the crowd. After the city dignitaries followed tibicines, after them the booty. . . . Fettered kings, princes, and nobles followed, doomed to detention in the Mamertine prison. Next came sacrificial oxen with gilt horns, accompanied by priests; and, finally, preceded by singers, musicians, and jesters, the triumphal chariot drawn by four horses. Clad in a toga picta and the tunica palmata, temporarily taken from the statue of the Capitoline Jupiter, the triumphator stood in his chariot holding the eagle-crowned ivory sceptre in his hand, while a servus publicus standing behind him held the corona triumphalis over his head. The army brought up the rear of the procession, which moved from the Campus Martius through the circus of Flaminius to the Porta Carmentalis, and thence, by way of the Velabrum and the Circus Maximus, the Via Sacra and the Forum, to the Capitol. Here the triumphator deposited his golden crown in the lap of the Capitoline Jupiter, and sacrificed the usual suovetaurilia. . . . The ovatio was granted for less important conquests, or to a general for victories not won 'suis auspiciis.' The victor, adorned with the toga prætexta and the myrtle crown, originally used to walk; in later times he rode on horseback."—E. Guhl and W. Koner, *Life of the Greeks and Romans, sect.* 109.—See, also, VIA SACRA.

TRIUMVIRATE, The First. See ROME: B. C. 63–58.....**The Second.** See ROME: B. C. 44–42.

TROIS ÉVÊCHÉS, Les, and their acquisition by France. See FRANCE: A. D. 1547–1559, and 1679–1681; and GERMANY: A. D. 1648.

TROISVILLE, Battle of. See FRANCE: A. D. 1794 (MARCH—JULY).

TROJA.—TROY.—TROAD.—ILIUM.—"In the whole long extent of this Western coast [of Asia Minor] no region occupies a fairer situation than the northern projection, the peninsula jutting out between Archipelago, Hellespont, and Propontis, of which the mountain-range of Ida, abounding in springs, forms the centre. Its woody heights were the seat of the Phrygian Mother of the Gods; in its depths it concealed treasures of ore, which the dæmons of mining, the Dactyli of Ida, were here first said to have been taught by Cybele to win and employ. A hardy race of men dwelt on the mountains so rich in iron, divided into several tribes, the Cebrenes, the Gergithians, and above all the beauteous Dardani, among whom the story went, how their ancestor, Dardanus, had, under the protec-

tion of the Pelasgian Zeus, founded the city of Dardania. Some of these Dardani descended from the highlands into the tracts by the coast, which has no harbours, but an island lying in front of it called Tenedos. Here Phœnicians had settled and established purple-fisheries in the sea of Sigeum; at a later period Hellenic tribes arrived from Crete and introduced the worship of Apollo. In the secure waters between Tenedos and the mainland took place that contact which drew the Idæan peninsula into the intercourse subsisting between the coasts of the Archipelago. . . . In the midst of this intercourse on the coast arose, out of the tribe of the Dardani, which had deserted the hills, the branch of the Trojans. . . . Thus, in the midst of the full life of the nations of Asia Minor, on the soil of a peninsula (itself related to either side) on which Phrygians and Pelasgians, Assyrians, Phœnicians, and Hellenic mariners met, grows up the empire of the Dardanides. The springs of the Ida range collect into rivers, of which two flow to the Propontis, and one, the Scamander, into the Ægean. The latter first flows through his bed high in the mountains, through which he then breaks in a narrow rocky gorge, and quitting the latter enters the flat plain of his water-shed, surrounded on three sides by gentle declivities, and open on the West to the sea. . . . In the innermost corner of this plain projects a rocky height with precipitous sides, as if it would bar the passage of the river breaking forth from the ravine. Skirted in a wide curve by Scamander on the East, it sinks to the West in gentle declivities, where numerous veins of water spring from the earth; these unite into two rivulets, distinguished by the abundance and temperature of their water, which remain the same at all seasons of the year. This pair of rivulets is the immutable mark of nature, by which the height towering above is recognized as the citadel of Ilium. They are the same rivulets to which of old the Trojan women descended from the Scæan gate to fetch water or to wash linen, and to this day the same ancient walls close around the flowing water and render it more easily available. The source of these rivulets was the seat of power. On the gentler declivity lay Troja; over which towered the steep citadel of Pergamus, the view from whose turrets commanded the entire plain, . . . and beyond the plain the broad sea itself. . . . No royal seat of the ancient world could boast a grander site than this Trojan citadel."—E. Curtius, *Hist. of Greece, bk.* 1, *ch.* 3.—The site contemplated by Dr. Curtius in the description quoted above is some five miles higher up the valley of the Scamander than Hissarlik, where Dr. Schliemann's excavations are believed by many scholars to have now established the location of ancient Troy.—H. Schliemann, *Ilios: the City and Country of the Trojans.*—"Dr. Schliemann described in his 'Troja' and 'Ilios' seven successive layers of city ruins found in his excavations at Hissarlik. This number was increased in 1890 to nine by the discovery of two layers intervening between the highest (or Roman) layer, formerly called the seventh, and the sixth, or so-called Lydian layer. These two layers were, from the character of the finds, attributed to the early and the later Greek period. Dr. Schliemann was baffled by the fact that he could discover no acropolis for the sixth, seventh, or eighth layers. Dr. Dörpfeld, who in May [1893] resumed the excavations at the expense of Dr. Schliemann's widow, makes in the Mittheilungen of the German Archæological Society (xviii, 2), which appeared November 7, a significant report clearly establishing the fact that the Romans, in building the great temple of Ilian Athene, cut down the highest part of the acropolis, and thus destroyed all traces of the acropolis belonging to those layers. The excavations of 1890 had brought to light two magnificent buildings in the sixth layer, besides 'Lydian' jars, much pottery, and one entire vase of the Mykenæan or Homeric period. The evidence favored the identification of this layer with the Homeric Troy or the period of Mykenæ and Tiryns. On the other hand, the fact that only two buildings and no city wall had been discovered for this layer seemed to indicate that the Troy of Priam must be referred to a lower level, namely, the second, where a magnificent wall of prehistoric style had been discovered, although its architecture and the character of the finds suggested a more primitive culture than that painted in Homeric song. The sixth layer has now in large part been exposed by Dr. Dörpfeld and reveals the most imposing wall of pre-Roman times. The remains of seven vast buildings have been brought to light which have in part the ground plan of the ancient Greek temples and of the halls of Tiryns and Mykenæ, though surpassing those in proportions and in the carefulness of their architecture. The remains of one admirable building contained a hall 37 feet by 30. . . . Further, Dr. Dörpfeld uncovered the fortifications of this city in many places, and found them some sixteen feet in thickness with a still greater height. On the outside the wall has a uniform slope. A strong-tower fifty-eight feet in diameter contains an inner staircase. In strength, proportions, and careful architecture this tower will compare favorably with any tower of Greek antiquity. The neat work of the corners and the nice dressing of the stones might refer it to a period later than Homer, to the historical Greek period, did we not know that in historical times Troy was too insignificant to need the erection of such walls. Moreover, the tower, built over in Greek times, and partly damaged by the addition of an outer stair, was finally in Roman times buried under massive foundations. The correspondences in stone-work of the wall and the houses place the tower and the buildings evidently in the same layer. In the houses were found both local pottery and also pottery of the Mykenæan style."—*The Nation, Nov.* 30, 1893.—"The latest news from the explorations at Hissarlik (Levant Herald July 7) comes to us from the owner of the site, Mr. Frank Calvert, United States consul, Dardanelles. It was readily seen that the second, or burned city which Dr. Schliemann enthusiastically assumed to be the city of Priam, instead of solving the question of the 'Iliad,' offered new problems to the archæologist. The precious objects and the works of art there found were evidently ruder and more ancient by some centuries than those of Mycenæ, and therefore decidedly earlier than Homeric Troy. In the sixth city, however, pottery of a Mycenæan type was discovered, and this led Dr. Dörpfield, assisted by Mrs. Schliemann, and later by the German Government, to extend excavations on this level, with results that are now proving fruitful, and

that may possibly be conclusive. Curiously enough, Dr. Schliemann's excavations obscured rather than aided this particular investigation. The area of the sixth city was twice as great as the space covered by the successive acropolises of the other five; and, in consequence, their debris was dumped on the very spot which Dr. Dörpfield has just been clearing. The massive walls he has uncovered, from five to six metres broad, the lofty towers, and the street which has been traced, may provisionally be assumed to belong to the Homeric Troy."—*The Nation, August* 9, 1894.

ALSO IN: C. Schuchardt, *Schliemann's Excavations.* — See, also, ASIA MINOR: THE GREEK COLONIES; and HOMER.

TROPAION.—The trophy erected by a victorious army, among the Greeks, on the spot from which the enemy had been driven. The trophy was constructed in some manner out of the booty taken.—E. Guhl and W. Koner, *Life of the Greeks and Romans, sect.* 54.

TROPPAU, Congress of. See VERONA, CONGRESS OF.

TROUBADOURS.—TROUVÈRES.—JOGLARS.—JONGLEURS.—"The poets of the South of France during the Middle Age called themselves 'Trobadors,' that is to say, 'inventers' or 'finders'; and they adapted the 'langue d'oc,' also called the Romansh of the South, or the Provençal, to the expression of poetical sentiments. It is probable that poets of this description existed as early as the formation of the idiom in which they wrote. At any rate, we know that toward the year 1000 they already enjoyed considerable distinction, although there is scarcely anything now left us from the earliest period of their existence. . . . In regard to the time within which the poetry of the Troubadours was in vogue, M. Fauriel assumes only two periods. But it may perhaps be more conveniently divided into three, as follows: The first commences with its origin, as a popular poetry, and extends to the time when it became an art and a profession, the poetry of the nobles and the courts, that is to say, from about 1090 to 1140. The second is the period of its culmination, which extends from the year 1140 to 1250. The third is the period of its decadence, from 1250 to 1290."—G. J. Adler, *Introd. to Fauriel's "History of Provençal Poetry."*—"Sufficient has been said . . . to show the superiority of lyrical over epic poetry in Provence. This inequality of the two branches implied a commensurate difference of praise and social esteem awarded to those who excelled in either of them, and it is perhaps from this point of view that the two great divisions of poets in the 'langue d'oc,' respectively described as 'joglars' and 'trobadors,' or, in the French and generally adopted form of the word, 'troubadours,' may be most distinctly recognised. . . . It seems sufficiently established that the verb 'trobar' and its derivative noun first and foremost apply to lyrical poetry. To speak therefore of the Troubadour as the singer of songs, of cansos and sirventeses and albas and retroensas is a correct and tolerably comprehensive definition."—F. Hueffer, *The Troubadours, ch.* 6.—"In the twelfth century, the Romance-Wallon [or the 'langue d'oil' of northern France] became a literary language, subsequent, by at least a hundred years, to the Romance-provençal. . . . The reciters of tales, and the poets, giving the name of Troubadour a French termination, called themselves Trouvères. With the exception of the difference of language, it may be thought that the Troubadour and the Trouvère, whose merit was pretty nearly equal; who were equally ignorant or well-informed; who both of them spent their lives at courts, at which they composed their poems, and where they mingled with knights and ladies; and who were both accompanied by their jongleurs and minstrels, should have preserved the same resemblance in their productions. Nothing, however, can be more dissimilar than their poems. All that remains of the poetry of the Troubadours is of a lyrical character, while that of the Trouvères is decidedly epic. . . . The Trouvères have left us many romances of chivalry, and fabliaux."—J. C. L. S. de Sismondi, *Literature of the South of Europe, ch.* 7 (*v.* 1).—"We know nothing of the rise or origin of the two classes of Trouveurs and Jongleurs. The former (which it is needless to say is the same word as Troubadour, and Trobador, and Trovatore) is the term for the composing class, the latter for the performing one. But the separation was not sharp or absolute."—G. Saintsbury, *Short Hist. of French Literature, bk.* 1, *ch.* 1.

TROY. See TROJA.

TROYES, Treaty of (1420). See FRANCE: A. D. 1417–1422. . . . .**Treaty of (1564).** See FRANCE: A. D. 1563–1564.

TRUCE, The Five Years. See FIVE YEARS TRUCE.

TRUCE, The Sacred. See OLYMPIC GAMES.

TRUCE, The Thirty Years. See GREECE: B. C. 449–445.

TRUCE OF GOD, The.—"This extraordinary institution is the most speaking witness, at once to the ferocity of the times [11th century], and also to the deep counter feeling which underlay men's minds. Clergy and laity alike felt that the state of things which they saw daily before their eyes was a standing sin against God and man, repugnant alike to natural humanity and to the precepts of the Christian religion. States were everywhere so subdivided, governments were everywhere so weak, that, in most parts of Europe, every man who had the needful force at his command simply did that which was right in his own eyes. . . . Every man claimed the right of private war against every other man who was not bound to him by some special tie as his lord or his vassal. And the distinction between private war and mere robbery and murder was not always very sharply drawn. . . . A movement on behalf of peace and good will towards men could not fail in those days to assume an ecclesiastical form. As of old the Amphiktyonic Council, the great religious synod of Greece, strove to put some bounds to the horrors of war as waged between Greek and Greek, so now, in the same spirit, a series of Christian synods strove, by means of ecclesiastical decrees and ecclesiastical censures, to put some bounds to the horrors of war as waged between Christian and Christian. . . . The movement began in Aquitaine [A. D. 1034], and the vague and rhetorical language of our authority would seem to imply that all war, at any rate all private war, was forbidden under pain of ecclesiastical censures. It must not be forgotten that, in that age, it must have been exceedingly difficult to draw the distinction between public and private

war. . . . But the doctrine, hard as it might be to carry out in practice, was rapturously received at its first announcement. As the first preaching of the Crusade was met with one universal cry of 'God wills it,' so the Bishops, Abbots, and other preachers of the Truce were met with a like universal cry of Peace, Peace, Peace. Men bound themselves to God and to one another to abstain from all wrong and violence, and they engaged solemnly to renew the obligation every five years. From Aquitaine the movement spread through Burgundy Royal and Ducal. But it seems to have been gradually found that the establishment of perfect peace on earth was hopeless. After seven years from the first preaching of peace, we find the requirements of its apostles greatly relaxed. It was found vain to forbid all war, even all private war. All that was now attempted was to forbid violence of every kind from the evening of Wednesday till the morning of Monday. It was in this shape that the Truce was first preached in northern and eastern Gaul. The days of Christ's supper, of His passion, of His rest in the grave and His resurrection, were all to be kept free from strife and bloodshed."—E. A. Freeman, *Norman Conquest, ch.* 8, *sect.* 2 (*v.* 2).

ALSO IN: P. Schaff, *Hist. of the Christian Church, v.* 4, *ch.* 6, *sect.* 78.

TRUCELESS WAR, The. See CARTHAGE: B. C. 241–238.

TRUELLAS, Battle of. See FRANCE: A. D. 1793 (JULY—DECEMBER) PROGRESS OF THE WAR.

TRYON, Governor, The flight of. See NEW YORK: A. D. 1775 (APRIL—SEPTEMBER), and UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1776 (AUGUST).

TSHEKHS, The. See BOHEMIA: ITS PEOPLE &C.

TSING, OR CH'ING, Dynasty, The. See CHINA: A. D. 1294–1882.

TUARIKS, The. See LIBYANS.

TUATH.—"Among the people of Gaelic race [in Ireland and Scotland] the original social unit appears to have been the 'Tuath,' a name originally applied to the tribe, but which came to signify also the territory occupied by the tribe community. . . . Several of these Tuaths were grouped together to form a still larger tribe, termed a Mortuath or great tribe, over whom one of the kings presided as Ri Mortuath. . . . Then several of these Mortuath formed a province, called in Irish 'Cuicidh,' or a fifth. . . . Over each province was the Ri Cuicidh, or provincial king, and then over the whole was the Ardri, or sovereign of all Ireland. The succession to these several grades of Ri, or king, was the same as that of the Ri Tuath, and was regulated by the law of Tanistry, that is, hereditary in the family but elective in the individual, the senior of the family being usually preferred."—W. F. Skene, *Celtic Scotland, v.* 3, *pp.* 136–150.

TUATHA-DE-DANAAN.—One of the races named in Irish legend as original settlers of Ireland, represented to have come from Greece and to have been extraordinarily proficient in the arts of magic. They were conquered, after two centuries, as the legend runs, by the Milesians, or Scots.—T. Wright, *Hist. of Ireland, bk.* 1, *ch.* 2 (*v.* 1).—See IRELAND: THE PRIMITIVE INHABITANTS.

TUBANTES, The. See FRANKS: ORIGIN AND EARLIEST HISTORY.

TUCUMAN, The province of. See ARGENTINE REPUBLIC: A. D. 1580–1777.

TUDELA, Battle of. See SPAIN: A. D. 1808 (SEPTEMBER—DECEMBER).

TUDORS, The. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1485–1603.

TUGENDBUND, The. See GERMANY: A. D. 1808 (APRIL—DECEMBER).

TUILERIES, The.—The palace of the Tuileries is said to have taken its name from the tile-making which had been carried on formerly in the vicinity of the ground on which it was built. "The history of it begins in the year 1564, when Catherine de Medicis conceived the idea of having a palace to herself near the Louvre, yet independent, in which she might be near enough to her son Charles IX. to have influence over him. . . . The palace was never very long or very closely connected with the history of the monarchy. It is not at all comparable to Windsor in that respect. Henry IV. liked it, Louis XIV. preferred Versailles, Louis XV. lived at the Tuileries in his minority. The chosen association of the palace with the sovereigns of France is very recent. Louis XVI. lived in it, and so did Charles X. and Louis-Philippe. The two Napoleons were fond of it. . . . The last inhabitant was the Empress Eugénie, as Regent. . . . The parliamentary history of the Tuileries is important, as it has been not only a palace but a parliament house. . . . The destruction of the Tuileries by the Communards [1871] was a lamentable event from the point of view of the historian and the archaeologist, but artistically the loss is not great."—P. G. Hamerton, *Paris in Old and Present Times, ch.* 5.

ALSO IN: *Hist. of Paris* (*London:* 1827), *v.* 2, *ch.* 2.

A. D. 1792.—Mobbing of the King.—The attack of August 10.—Massacre of the Swiss. See FRANCE: A. D. 1792 (JUNE—AUGUST).

TUKUARIKAS. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: SHOSHONEAN FAMILY.

TULCHAN BISHOPS. See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1572.

TULLAHOMA CAMPAIGN, The. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1863 (JUNE—JULY: TENNESSEE).

TULLIANUM, The. See MAMERTINE PRISON.

TUMULT OF AMBOISE. See FRANCE: A. D. 1559–1561.

TUMULUS.—A mound; usually a grave mound, or barrow.

TUN.—TUNSCIPE. See TOWN; TOWNSHIP; and BOROUGH.

TUNIC, The Roman.—"The tunica was put on in the same way as the Greek chiton. Its cut was the same for men and women, and its simple original type was never essentially modified by the additions of later fashion. It was light and comfortable, and was worn especially at home; out of doors the toga was arranged over it."—E. Guhl and W. Koner, *Life of the Greeks and Romans, sect.* 95.

TUNIS, Ancient. See CARTHAGE, THE DOMINION OF; also, AFRICA, THE ROMAN PROVINCE.

A. D. 1270-1271.—Crusade of Saint Louis. See CRUSADES: A. D. 1270–1271.

Modern history. See BARBARY STATES.